

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE
Minutes
Thursday, March 7, 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 (Alt.), J. Tarjan, D. Zhou (Alt.), K. Ziegler-Lopez, V. Harper

Absent: A. Schmidt

Visitors: A. Jacobsen, J. Wang, D. Schecter, F. Gorham, D. Jackson, L. Zuzarte

1) Call to Order

D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2) Approval of Minutes

M. Rush moved to approve the minutes of February 21, 2019 via email. M. Slaughter seconded.

3) Announcements and Information

- Faculty Trustee visit: R. Sabalius on April 23.
- Strategic Plan Town Hall, Friday March 8, 08:30 – 11:30 The last opportunity to have input while the plan is under construction. There will be discussion on how and why things have gone this far, relative to the goals, and input on changes to the Vision Statement. J. Tarjan said someone could solicit how we measure; what are the measures of the five areas identified by the Strategic Planning Committee.
- Elections and Appointments (A. Hegde)

Academic Senate

- A&H – Mary Slaughter
- SS&E– Mahmoud Suleiman
- At-Large election ends Friday 5:00 p.m.
 - Reem Abu-Lughod - Criminal Justice
 - Charles Lam – Mathematics
 - Joshua Miller – Kinesiology

- Brian Street – Kinesiology
- Staff call for nominations next week

4) Approval of Agenda

M. Rush moved to approve the agenda. A. Jacobson seconded. Approved.

5) ASCSU Report

J. Tarjan said that the GE Task Force Advisory Committee will have a lengthy discussion about the GE Task Force Report at its meeting next week. J. Millar stated that Academic Affairs committee meets Wednesday about the GE Task Force Report and its implication. The Chancellor will be meeting the Senate next Thursday. The CO is conducting interviews for the Faculty Trustee position. J. Tarjan is a candidate. D. Boschini said there have been questions across campus about who released the GE Task Force Report and what is their relationship to the Chancellor's Office. J. Tarjan said that the Task Force is an outgrowth of recent attention on General Education (GE). Former Chancellor, Dr. Reed, had asked several times why there are upper division GE and the Chair of BOT has inquired too. In the aftermath EO 1000 Revised and EO 1100, there was concern that the BOT and parts of the Administration were taking control of curricular matters. J. Tarjan's opinion is that the GE Task Force is an attempt to get a broader perspective on GE and allay the fears about groups having undue influence. The former BOT Chair Eisen, Faculty Trustee, about six ASCSU Senators, and campus representatives, students, and UC and Community College representatives created the thought piece. However, there is concern that the GE Task Force Report is a precursor to changes to Title V concerning GE, American Institutions, GVAR, etc. There are a number of contentious issues and folks are upset. The report doesn't have any standing yet, because it is an ASCSU task force. But people are concerned about the implications. The Chancellor told the ASCSU Chair that there was no intent in making an EO to implement the recommendations. J. Tarjan invited the body to the ITL Symposium in Fresno on Saturday at 09:30 where he will be leading a discussion on the topic. There is concern that the report is foreshadowing something to come. D. Boschini reminded the group to use the ASCSU representative on campus as a resource. It's important that the GE Task Force Report is not mischaracterized. It is not a directive from

the CO at this point. J. Tarjan spoke with a member of the GE Task Force who referred to the no double counting in majors. The intent supposedly is no double counting of the upper division classes. With no double-counting, business and other majors would have to add units. D. Boschini said it's important to be clear with each other by staying close to the true origin and the intent.

6) Interim Provost Report (handout)

V. Harper stated that his approach is to take questions he's received and rely to a large extent on the input from the Provost's Office. The handout was compiled from input from F. Gorham, I. Ebong, D. Schechter, and his own. Two Factor Authentication is coming. It provides a third layer of security. There is a CO compliance mandate and audit. F. Gorham informed the group that there are 530 employees who have access to Level 1 data. The CO defines Level 1 as SS#, date of birth, driver's license, passport information, and other user information. There are approximately 75 faculty members who have Level 1 information. The 2step authentication will be using one's cell phone, or a token or fob issued by IT. An individual's authentication frequency depends on the individual's frequency of access to certain data. Someone who uses Box daily, they will authenticate daily. The process of bringing the campus into the system will start with faculty in early April. Every device that logs into the system will require authentication, including those used off campus. MyHR and MyCSUB will be added to the 2step authentication at a later date. This is done to prevent a breach, like CSUB had last year. A. Hegde asked if the authentication was tied to an individual or certain software. F. Gorham said that the basic login to PC won't require 2step. Email won't need 2step. However, where one has a "blue" login with the CSUB logo on the top, it will require 2step authentication such as BOX, PeopleSoft, CFS, and the data warehouse from the CO. Office 365 suite will not need Level 2. The 2step code can be updated through email, one's phone, or one can register the phone landline to get a call with their code. One will have to authenticate every 12 hours of use, per device. D. Boschini said that her department had a data breach. Despite her efforts and assumption that her data was protected, the security scan has found sensitive information stored on her

computer from 2002. This new procedure is to protect students and the rest of the campus community. V. Harper thanked F. Gorham for taking care of campus data security.

Both GRASP and Financial Aid had an audit situation that required BAS' expertise for 18 months to respond to those audits. BAS will only have the GRASP Post Award analysis of accounting and the PI compliance with federal regulation. A decision will be made in June 2020 whether GRASP Post Award returns to GRASP. The Auxiliary of the Sponsored Programs Administration is involved as well as Provost Council. GRASP Pre Award, general grants from the Provost Office and RCU mini-grants are not affected.

RSCA Funding - The application announcement for the 2019-20 academic year will be sent out, through an online platform called Infoready, on Friday, March 15, 2019. The University Research Council (URC) review committee will review the applications by Friday, May 3, 2019 and meet to deliberate and select winners on Tuesday, May 7, 2019. GRASP staff will send award letters to faculty on Thursday, May 9, 2018.

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 committee has met twice since the last update to the Senate. In the meeting on February 26, members of the committee expressed disappointment that the announcement of the Pathway Transfer Meeting CSUB/BC March 1 was delivered on short notice and it didn't convey to faculty the importance of their involvement. It was incorrectly cast as a survey. Rather, it was for a discussion on processes and procedure to facilitate the transfer of BC students. The focus is on associate degrees, ADT programs. According to the legislature, where there are equivalent bachelors program in a four-year program, transfer students could not be asked to complete more than 60 units. Curricula have to be aligned to make sure that transfers meet all the requirements. It's a complicated process. Senator Tarjan mentioned that the Community Colleges are moving toward getting more money and that he is a resource for the CSU system and volunteered to take questions. President Zelezny is scheduled to attend the EC meeting on April 30. The Interim Provost informed the EC about Financial Aid and the GRASP Post Award being "Park and Fix".

The EC minutes of February 26 contain the Interim Provost's handout he used to discuss a proposed process of enrollment management that includes cut-off dates to improve processes across campus and students' path to graduation. Next, V. Harper updated the EC on the status of the sixth faculty line/sustainability position. It will be moved to next year due to mixed input. The Leadership Academy is in the planning stages. The target is those individuals who have less experience than chair. V. Harper announced that the Academic Advising Resource Center will be moved to Academic Programs under Interim Associate Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, D. Jackson. The EC discussed that the scheduling of spring break in the 2019-2020 Academic Calendar was a failure. EC made six referrals: Workload issues to FAC, Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee Process referred to FAC, DLC role in Policy Making of the Committee was referred to FAC, Term Limits for Academic Directors was referred to FAC, a request from BJ Moore to consider a proposal for a Continuous Development Course for Graduate Students was referred to AAC, and Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification was referred to AAC and AS&SS. D. Boschini stressed the importance of faculty's work in committees and the need to have quorum to effect timely decision-making.

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

8) Scheduling Spring Break (Time Certain 10:30 a.m.)

D. Boschini informed the group that spring break has been an ongoing discussion with BPC and the Calendar Committee. By the time Senate saw the calendar it was late to contact the CO. In spite of our best efforts, we failed. Some people want spring break mid-semester for teaching and workload reasons, and others want it lined up with K-12. Be advised that there will be a lot of complaints next year. Please apologize and move on. Faculty have been asked for input. The suggestion was to have the Senate respond as a "committee as a whole". J. Tarjan moved to free flowing conversation and to take action out of the normal

business process. A. Jacobsen seconded. Approved. M. Rees said that besides pedagogic issues, it is extremely difficult when the calendar varies from year to year to do scheduling for Math and Science events, Music, Theater and other groups, especially find it challenging when spring break occurs so late in the semester. She requested a consistent schedule for spring break. A. Hegde reminded the group that Senator Kasselstrand mentioned that Kern County K-12 break is out of compliance with Antelope Valley school district's break. Furthermore, it's not appropriate to schedule around religious events because CSUB is a state institution. D. Boschini said that although we aren't naming the break Easter Break, the K-12 schedules are the week after Easter yet they have moved to calling it Winter Break. KHS still calls it Easter Break and Christmas Break. To say that we are not tying the break to a religious holiday is disingenuous. R. Gearhart said that child care constraints cause him to favor aligning the break with K-12 break. C. Lam said that Easter falls on the first full moon after March 20. If you look at the next ten years, every three years CSUB will have a late Spring Break. As a member of the Calendar Committee, he knows that the de facto choice is to follow the status quo. Unless the Senate has a strong opinion, it will stay as is. D. Boschini said that "as is" would take the campus back to Q-S conversation; line up with K-12 primarily for child care reasons. The counter conversation is that even though we can't have a parent-center institution, every student is part of the family that likely has the same time off as K-12. M. Martinez suggested that if we are going to be consistent, look at the Academic Calendar and then decide based on the academic needs rather than family or religious reasons. Faculty can then plan for mid-semester events and grants. Do what's good for this institution. D. Boschini said that ASI is still taking up this question. M. Rush clarified the status quo; when the campus was on the quarter system, we were not aligned with K12 and BC. That was status quo for a long time. In the three years that the campus moved to align with the high schools, it has created a problem. A. Jacobsen said that for students in the sciences, there is one week mid-March that is funded by the National Sciences Foundation to give students experiences of going to different campuses to engage in mini-research projects, etc. But our students can't attend because CSUB spring break is mis-aligned. K. Ziegler said that from an advising point of view, spring break is two weeks

before registration. We are missing a week of advising opportunities. D. Boschini called for a vote. The results: seventeen Senators voted for mid-semester spring break, and only three Senators voted to align to K12. The vote for mid-semester spring break and minutes will be passed to the Calendar Committee.

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

a) Old Business

- i) RES 181909 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change * Second Reading M. Rush said that the suggestions from the First Reading were put forth. Refer to section 308.2.2. underlined. The language appears in each of the awards. The issue of Chair as the nominee was addressed. The major concern was that FHAC could consult and get feedback on the nominees that was collected. We want to give FHAC Chair the ability to contact the department to make sure that it was a collective decision and not just relying on one person to validate the information. Upon no further discussion D. Boschini called for a vote for the resolution. All Senators voted in favor. M. Rush said that the resolution applies when the President approves the resolution. Nominations are due March 22, 2019.

b) New Business

- i) RES 181910 Annual Catalog First Reading
M. Danforth introduced on behalf of AAC. The referral identified issues with process control unique to the CSUB course catalog. When the campus moved from print to print and online, and then an online only catalog, somewhere in that timeframe (about 2009) the regularly updated catalog became a living document that people could make changes to at any time. The problems are particularly that the academic requirements report (which people refer to) with the degree audit is *tied to that updated catalog*. Every time someone makes a change to the degree requirements Academic Operations has to update the academic requirements report. Students have catalog rights to a two year catalog and there are multiple versions of that catalog. Therefore, which version do they have catalog rights; v1, v2, etc. The degree audit couldn't be kept up to date because there is too much in flux. The

students aren't clear on what they need to take; which version of the catalog do they follow? Advisors have difficulty getting students into an advising pathway. Also, the Evaluation Office has to do manual audits. That means they are pulling out an advising checklist and filling it out for every student. AAC's discussion was how to allow departments to still update their programs and to eliminate the fluctuation that comes from having a regularly updated catalog. AAC's proposal is to move to an annual catalog. Changes will go into effect that fall semester. Any changes submitted after the deadline will go into effect the following fall. Thus, there will be one version of the catalog for that year. Academic Operations, Enrollment Management, and Evaluations can streamline their processes, get the degree audit in sync. Theoretically, students can check his/her degree audit on MyCSUB and know the courses they still have remaining. They can get the snags in the degree audit ironed out, and students will have clear catalog rights, clear roadmaps in advising. It will be a stable annual catalog instead of a living document that is constantly changing. The AAC discussed timeline and then decided that the resolution is Step 1 to approve the concept, then step 2 will be to have Academic Operations follow-up on the timelines with staff, faculty members, and administrators. There will be a need for timelines and some exceptions. For example, new programs that have to go to the CO for late approval but need to take effect that following fall. First get the discussion on concept going, and then the process. The AAC had preliminary discussion related to timelines. The primary issues would be that existing programs have one timeline and new proposals would have to have a different timeline. The campus will be living in a nebulous situation because it's too late to establish timelines for a fall 2019 catalog. D. Boschini called on L. Zuzarte (Interim Director of Academic Operations). She approves of the annual catalog. There are tentative timelines in mind, and they need further review. She has been working closely with a number of faculty and chairs on cleaning the current 2018-2020 catalog. She offered to work with schools and their Curriculum Committees to get changes approved as soon as possible. She has a goal for

incoming Fall 2019 that Academic Operations would have the catalog clean (as possible) so the students are following the right version. D. Jackson offered a perspective from the Office of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies. Her office sees between 12-24 requests to go to the earlier version of the catalog. She is anxious about the possibility that students are going to ask to return to an earlier catalog during this regularly updated catalog period of time, and that there will not be a document to refer to because this regularly updated catalog is not static. She imagines strong challenges due to student appeals to a version of a catalog that doesn't exist any longer. D. Jackson requested a proposed solution in advance on how to address students who are on the regularly updated catalog are reaching their time for graduation period. A. Jacobson said that Senators need to talk with people they are representing about their programs (and assessment and information going into their courses) and provide their response to an annual catalog. M. Danforth said when the regularly updated catalog goes away and we don't yet have the annual catalog in effect, there will be a period between 2018-2020 catalog conversion to an annual catalog – where the regularly updated catalog was - we may want to fix the deadline. M. Rush agreed that the AAC chair is getting really good feedback on that interim. She suggested to freeze it during the interim. V. Harper invites faculty's questions. D. Boschini said that feedback has been given to AAC. Go back to one's constituents. AAC will discuss the removal of regularly updated catalog and the implementation of the new annual catalog so it transitions smoothly.

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

M. Martinez followed up on earlier discussion about the GE Task Force composition and possible intent. J. Millar confirmed that the Chancellor's Advisory meets next week, whereby the GE Task Force Report will be discussed. The report hasn't been accepted by the ASCSU. There is opportunity to add input. M. Martinez said there are thirty-seven Political Science and History department chairs looking at the GE Task Force Report. There is disagreement on many issues. Most important issues are 1) cutting the number of

required units in American Institutions in Government in half and replacing it with vague new coursework, Democracy in America. He requested that the Senate consider creating a resolution to reject the GE Task Force's recommendation. Once the system starts watering down civics and history requirements, we are moving where we don't want to go. He said that emails between the chairs of History and Political Science suggests that there are already many members from the state senate that are looking at this. Rather than have the legislature look at this, faculty would want to take action. M. Martinez suggested that 1) the Senate discuss where it stands on GE Task Force recommendation, and 2) What message do we want to send to ASCSU. He distributed a draft resolution for the members to consider. J. Tarjan shared background information: Section 405 of Title V on GE is separate from 404 Title IV on American Institutions. It does not require units. It requires competency. There is the possibility of having Democracy in America be a course and another that deals with global awareness and global engagement. M. Martinez said the recommendation waters down requirements that Political Science believes is part of our civic education. The key is to review pages 8 and 11 of the GE Task Force Report. See description, suggestion, and justification. It's important that the Senate take a stand on the broader issue of GE and what's going to happen when others' attempt to chop out what is faculty's charge. D. Boschini informed the group that referrals go to sub-committee or the through the Senate EC. The EC has already talked about it. Some campuses have drafted urgent responses. Some campuses have rejected, but they didn't include recommendations. There is a lot of concern in the system. J. Tarjan suggested that the Task Force send a document to advise what are the changes, rationale, and then have the Advisory Committee cast a response on the specific implications of the changing American Institutions, the lack of social science, upper division GE is gone (and its impact on departments), and why was GVAR not mentioned? One of the problems with EO 1100 revised was that there wasn't any context and common understanding across the campus; it may be more effective to respond to particular parts. D. Boschini sees the list serves and has been reading through campuses' resolution. She is concerned what the Nursing department would do if double counting was eliminated. It's a challenge to respond to

what we don't understand. We cannot use this GE Task Force Report. It is not useful, it has flaws in process and content. It requires clarification. J. Millar said that the statewide report was released by CO. The entire ASCSU hasn't accepted the GE Task Force Report. We can encourage the ASCSU not to accept because it doesn't address the problems and the implications that this body is in discussion today. Her opinion is that it needs to start all over again. It's important that this Senate know that the other campus Senate representatives don't accept it. E. Correa asked how is this report connected by GI 2025. J. Tarjan responded that it is part and parcel of GI 2025. The BOT and CO are laser focused on the state's projected workforce needs and increasing the student throughput. In eight days we'll know more. The GE Task Force Report goes to Academic Affairs and the APAC committees. J. Millar said that CSUB's statewide senators will take today's discussion of concerns and implications back to the greater Academic Senate CSU. D. Boschini stated that it is the Academic Senate's will that J. Millar and J. Tarjan deliver the message that CSUB has grave concerns about the vagueness in the GE Task Force Report and we've identified issues that need to be addressed.

11) Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

* Changes to the Handbook

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD

ACADEMIC SENATE

CSU Academic Senate / General Education Task Force Proposal

RESOLUTION ----

WHEREAS the CSU General Education Task Force (GETF) “Recommendations for GE Review and Reform” were not initiated by faculty, but by outside entities whose identities have not been made clear; and

WHEREAS there was little-to-no consultation with faculty on whether the GETF changes were necessary or in the best interests of our students; and

WHEREAS the GETF proposal states that GE requirements have not been updated in over 50 years, it ignores how they are updated regularly by individual campuses and were updated at CSU Bakersfield after a multi-year process of revision that concluded three years ago; and

WHEREAS the GETF rationale cites “mounting concerns about the erosion of confidence in the value of higher education, higher costs of education borne increasingly by students, attenuated times to degree completion, and low persistence rates,” the report gives no data showing how these “concerns” are tied to the current GE requirements, nor does it indicate how the new recommendations will solve any of these problems; and

WHEREAS the proposed GETF vision makes further cuts to humanities, social sciences, and other areas essential to a well-rounded education and civic engagement, which have high social value based on empirical studies; and

WHEREAS: The replacement of six units of American Government and U.S. History requirement with 3 units of an ambiguous “Democracy in the U.S.” course – which *may or may not* include California Government – is antithetical to educating an informed citizenry.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Academic Senate at CSU, Bakersfield, is opposed to the recommendations of the CSU General Education Task Force; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Academic Senate at CSU, Bakersfield, strongly recommends that the CSU Chancellor’s Office reject the recommendations of the GETF.