

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes

Thursday, November 29, 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, B. Frakes, R. Gearhart, I. Kasselstrand, C. Lam (Alt), A. Lauer, Y. Lee, M. Martinez, J. Millar (Alt.), M. Rush, L. Sakomoto, A. Schmidt, M. Slaughter, B. Street, K. Szick, J. Tarjan, D. Zhou, K. Ziegler-Lopez, J. Zorn

Visitors: L. Zelezny, D. Schecter, V. Harper, M. Harville, F. Gorham, K. Krishnan, D. Jackson, B. Zeng

1) Call to Order

D. Boschini called the meeting to order

2) Approval of Minutes

M. Danforth moved to approve the minutes. L. Sakomoto seconded. Approved.

3) Announcements and Information

President Zelezny Report and Q&A (**Time Certain**) **10:05** The President presented updates on the Strategic Plan and its movement toward the Capital Campaign, Administrator Review, and the Graduation Initiative 2025 Preliminary Progress Update.

The Strategic Planning Open Forums have been well attended and every minute utilized.

Plus, there has been a lot of ideas submitted on the [feedback page](#). The students have been a key constituent and have been providing their input. The need for Tenure Track additional hires has been heard. The timeline is as follows: The quality of the data is being organized to give to the Strategic Planning Committee in February. The President will return to the Senate to share the three themes/priorities identified by the Strategic Planning Committee. The President will make a presentation to the Cabinet. In spring, there will be appointments made to the Strategic Planning Task Force. They are to work with each theme. There will be goals assigned to each of the three. Metrics will be established so we can make sure they are accountable. The Strategic Planning Task Force is responsible to bring together sub-committee(s) for each of the themes which will have representation to reflect shared governance. This is typical of strategic planning which she has been involved in many times before. In the spring, the President will bring a draft to

campus and to the external community for input. Then, the Strategic Plan will be edited for a final revision and ratification. Upon getting collective vision, CSUB will have a list of priorities in May (before faculty leaves), which is the essential first step toward a feasibility study to decide what goals are achievable. Typically, a consultant will come in using their survey to discover what our fundraising potential is. We will expect to use faculty in an effective way to gain financial support in the Strategic Plan. We are on target for timeline, and best practices. There will be a timeline posted on the website.

Administrator Review - The Provost's review is underway, with key members that have been [appointed and elected](#). To make sure we're able to continue service without impacting the timeline, Dean Madden will replace J. Mimms, and P. Miser replaces A. Escalante.

Graduation Initiative 2025 Preliminary Progress Update (handout) - The information came from calstate.edu/dashboard. The first page is a shock. Of the six goals that we all are responsible for there is only one, Transfer 4-Year Graduation Rate, where we made good progress. Two areas, Transfer 2-Year Graduation Rate and Pell Equity Gap we made moderate progress. Three areas, Freshman 4-year Graduation Rate, Freshman 6-Year Graduation Rate, and Under Represented Minority Equity Gap show limited progress. She said we don't have answers today. She asked that Senate Chair D. Boschini, ASI President A. Schmidt, and Provost J. Zorn broadcast our status and be transparent on the data because we are all responsible. In the spring, the President will ask along shared governance lines, what are the proactive and specific actions we have to drive good progress. We do have issues with freshman. We are losing them by a 30% drop rate on their first year. She is optimistic we can turn it around and bring speakers and use best practices to turn it around. The reason there are three Board of Trustees (BOT) coming to CSUB this month is because of the lack of progress in GI 2025. It's important to be optimistic and care for each other; renewed commitment to work together. It matters to our students that we care, we understand, we're transparent and committed in the spring to make on these goals. She shared her gratitude for everyone who serve the students, and that's why we're here. M. Slaughter asked what a different commitment looks like. President Zelezny responded that the caring of the faculty is very important, but the practice issues need [improvement for service in those students](#). V. Harper shared that there is student data on whether they feel supported from the Survey for Student Engagement. President Zelezny said the students take us seriously when asked for feedback. D. Boschini commented that this is a new way of sharing information that she has not seen in the 15 years she's been here. President Zelezny said that not everyone will be able to attend the GI 2025 Summit. She will share the data. Social justice is why we are here.

Six faculty new hires are planned for Fall 2019 – there may be one line per school. D. Boschini appreciates the decision made by President and Provost, taken from faculty recommendation on new hires. Faculty is pleased to see six new hire positions, and we

need more discussion to make adjustment to fill the gap for more new hires. President Zelezny said it was always her intention to add additional lines. She'll be meeting with the ASI President, A. Schmidt, about the money given for tenure density and also working on [high-impact practices](#). E. Correa said that faculty motivation is key. She requested progress reports. J. Zorn shared the GI Task Force website to see what they have been doing the last few years. <https://www.csub.edu/success/>

Trustees visit December 12, 2018 – The President's office is working on their activities. President Zelezny said that the BOT members are interested in meeting with Students, Faculty, and the GI Initiative Task Force. The meeting with the Senate EC is a given. There will be a separate meeting with ASI and Dr. Harper.

Budget Forum – December 5, 3:30-4:30, Student Union MPR Room

D. Boschini thanked President Zelezny for her attendance. It has been very helpful.

Elections status was announced by A. Hegde:

Call for Nominations Academic Senate A&H – the call ends at 5:30 this afternoon.

Result of Call for Interest to the Academic Petitions Committee, A& H:

Stephen Campagna-Pinto to serve a three year term, 2018-2021

Results of Call for Search Committees: Assoc. Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies

A&H Mary Slaughter

BPA Ji Li

NSME Anna Jacobsen

SS&E Brian Street

Result of Election of the Search Committee for the Director of Academic Programs, At-Large
Danielle Solano

4) Approval of Agenda

A. Lauer moved to approve the Agenda. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

5) ASCSU Report

J. Tarjan will be submitting a written report of the November meeting. The [Annual Institute for Teaching and Learning](#) (ITL) is in Fresno, March 8-9, 2019. Faculty from all 23 campuses convene to discuss how to reach the next generation of Californians. Proposals are due December 11. The themes are Empowering first-generation students, EO 1110, GI 2025, Supporting students in first-year writing, math, and quantitative reasoning, Equity, inclusion, and strength-based pedagogies, assessment for improvement, technology and innovation, online and blended learning, mindfulness and wellness. ASIs and CSSA typically have focused on voter registration and tuition-related issues as top priorities. This year they

have added meeting students' basic needs as a priority. The CSU is also paying increasing attention on meeting students' basic needs (shelter, food). There is a CSU call for proposals related to meeting student basic needs on CSU campuses including funding for community gardens, related research, etc. Consider putting together a proposal.

6) Provost Report

Nothing to 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) At the Executive Committee meeting of November 27, 2018, the committee prioritized the topics as follows:

Budget Forum to be held December 5 in the SU MPR. The chair of the BPC will open the meeting to acknowledge the accomplishments of the group driving transparency of the financial data and faculty involvement in the budgetary process. Questica, the software to dig into the budget, will not be ready until summer.

Dream Resource Center - Guests, C. Catota and R. Alvarez, talked about the intention to serve undocumented students, AB 540, and Deferred Action Childhood Arrival (DACA) students. Students prefer calling the initiative Scholars Beyond Borders. There is a website and a [booklet of resources](#) on how to get legal information, advising, financial aid, etc. The EC suggested adding academic mentors to the resource center. Students seeking mental health services can choose between two counselors at Student Health Services who are fluent in Spanish. There is an AB 540 Task Force. Senator M. Martinez is working on these issues. It was suggested that C. Catota and R. Alvarez inform the Department Chair Leadership Committee (DCLC) of these developments

Block Scheduling – V. Harper had made a presentation to the EC in prior meeting. There is a request to expand to 1000 students. One suggestion was to include every freshman. The campus is starting year three of the pilot in Fall Semester 2019.

Faculty Honorary Doctorate recommendation - The EC voted unanimously to pass the recommendation of the Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee (FHDC) to the President's office. Upon approval of the President and the Chancellor's office, this individual would be receiving a doctorate at CSUB graduation in May.

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

- a) Old Business

- i) RES 181903 – Instructor Initiated Drop Policy - Second Reading M. Danforth reminded the group that the charge is to address the current policy difference between face-to-face and on-line courses. A. Hegde reminded the group that there

was a pause in moving through the Second Reading at last Senate meeting pending input from the ASI representative. A. Schmidt said she doesn't want students punished. M. Slaughter clarified that the resolution is for the students who desperately needs to take a class in order to graduate, and are on the waitlist. They do all the work for week one, but the students who are enrolled that aren't doing the work should give up their seat for the student who will attend and do the work. It gives that student doing the work a chance to add the class. M. Rush noted that as professors, they have students who perform differently. Just because the student doesn't do well in the first week, it's too judgmental. The consequence for not doing the work is the grade. The on-line measure is the activity that comes back. M. Danforth reaffirmed that the intent is not to penalize. The resolution strikes a balance between students doing the work with those who don't. A. Hegde speaks in favor because it says either condition applies. If it's a waitlist class then you will be dropped. With the online class attendance is difficult to acknowledge that they are in the class. It's up to the instructor to give a graded or ungraded assignment. Another senator said that some students enroll in class to secure their financial aid and then drop as soon as they receive money. They had no intention of attending class. J. Tarjan suggested a reference to the absence allowance. M. Rush said there is a hierarchy. If you have a waitlisted class, anytime one doesn't show up, it makes sense that consideration go to the next prioritized student. B. Frakes said there are statistics for online courses. We know when they are logged on. F. Gorham's experience with the Masters online course at CSU Fullerton is that the professors look at those students that have not answered quizzes as the condition to drop them. Further, there is the ability to know who has logged in, for how long, and when present. However, CSUB hasn't purchased that feature for Blackboard. A. Lauer said that teaching online is different. For those students who can't get into class and there is a waitlist, they tend to over-enroll. D. Boschini said that the important piece is that we're already handling waitlists differently. The vote cannot accommodate every solution. The policy needs to give instructors the ability to fairly do what is expected to be true. M. Martinez suggested to give the students a three day notice to respond. M. Danforth said AAC did consider a window of time to respond, but it needs to be done before the record is purged – the day before the Schedule Adjustment period ends. M. Rush suggested putting forth an amendment. D. Boschini said the add days could be five or seven or nine. In the case of Nursing, there are long orientations involving several faculty. There's no way to repeat that first week of class orientation and instruction. J. Tarjan said that late additions may require a redo of the course schedules and group assignments. Some students shop for courses and then drop, creating a bottle neck. Give faculty the tools to address

the waitlist. It's a big issue at other campuses. We need to give access to the students who want to do the work. We may be disadvantaging many students who are willing and able to complete the course but unable to add due to limited space partially caused by students engaging in "course shopping."

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

b) **New Business**

- i) RES 181906 – Academic Master Plan 2019-2020 through 2029-2030 First Reading D. Boschini put for the resolution on behalf of the Executive Committee. V. Harper explained it's a multi-stage process. The document casts future academic programs that will potentially be launched by a campus in the next ten years. The AMP is unchanged from last year. The only changes are in the program review. This fall semester is the only window we have to put programs on the AMP. At this point, this needs to be approved by the Senate. It must be approved by the President. The Trustees meet in the spring. They approve the AMP. After the AMP is approved, each department that has a full-degree program approved then develops a full proposal that makes it all the way through the curricular process of the university. D. Boschini said the dates may not work as appears and it's always subject to change. A. Hegde moved to the Second Reading. J. Tarjan seconded. M. Danforth said that the Computer Engineering Program needs to be underlined to show that it is an accredited degree program. E. Correa moved to approve the resolution with the minor correction. M. Rush seconded. All in favor with minor correction. Approved.

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

On behalf of the Antelope Valley faculty, I. Kasselstrand reported that they are appreciative of attempts to improve communication between the campuses. In this effort, they would like to bring attention to Zoom technology that allows for students and faculty to connect more efficiently for office hours and meetings. All CSUB students, staff, and faculty have access to their own Zoom room to use for these purposes.

B. Street requested that the Senators think of questions and suggestions for the Budget Book and Budget Calendar and to bring to the Budget Forum on December 5.

10) **Adjournment**

D. Boschini adjourned the meeting at 11:30.

* Changes to the Handbook