CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE
Minutes
Thursday, November 7, 2019
Health Center Conference Room
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.


Absent: M. Martinez

1. Call to Order
   D. Boschini called the meeting to order. It’s good to be back.

2. Approval of Minutes
   R. Gearhart moved to approve the Minutes of October 24, 2019. J. Stark seconded. Approved.

3. Announcements and Information
   • The Call for Recommendations for the Honorary Doctorate is due to President’s Office November 15. The members of the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee (FHAC) are included in the Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee. The nominees are approved by the Board of Trustees (BOT).
   • CSU Board of Trustees Special Committee to Consider the Selection of the Chancellor – Open Forum – There are three faculty members on the committee. The two faculty members on the separate Advisory Committee will be visiting campuses in Spring and then submitting their feedback to the Special Committee. The new Chancellor is expected to be selected in Spring 2020.
   • Canvas Pilot Report– A. Lauer noted that the committees allocated a lot of time reviewing the report. Her recommendation for future reports is to state the limit(s) of the study, as one would do in peer reviewed journals. It facilitates focused discussion. It informs the audience that the authors have considered ideas and are honestly aware that no study is perfect. D. Boschini commented that it shows that the pros and the cons have been considered in the reporting of the issue(s).
4. **Approval of Agenda**
   S. Gamboa moved to approve the Agenda. B. Street seconded. Approved.

5. **ASCSU Report**
   D. Boschini noted that our campus submitted feedback on AS 3397 *Towards Implementation of an Ethnic Studies System Requirement* to the ASCSU as requested.

   J. Tarjan – The ASCSU Chair and the Vice Chair will be serving on the Advisory Committee to the Search Committee for Chancellor. The Faculty Trustee is a member of the Search Committee for Chancellor as are two members of the ASCSU. The next meeting of the ASCSU will include the feedback submitted by campuses in response to *AB 1460 CSU Graduation Requirement Ethnic Studies*. There is pessimism that anything we’ve done to demonstrate what CSU is currently doing is going to sway Assemblyperson Weber from pushing his bill next year. J. Tarjan, as a member of the Academic Preparation and Education Programs (AEP) committee, reported a lively discussion on the fourth year Quantitative Reasoning (QR) requirement. There will be a second reading in support of the new QR policy at next week’s ASCSU meeting. Advisory Committee is meeting as well.

   J. Millar is the vice chair of the ASCSU’s Academic Affairs committee and excited to see what campuses are already doing about Ethnic Studies and their student learning outcomes. She appreciates all that CSUB did to provide a quick response.

6. **Interim Provost Report** (V. Harper)
   No 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)
      i) The committee spent most of its time discussing the Response to Ethnic Studies Task Force Report, and *CSUB Recommendation RES AS-3397-19_AA* (handout) An Open Forum for faculty was held, and an invitation to email feedback to the AS Office. To recap, the Ethnic Studies Task Force sent its report in 2017, specifying the role of Ethnic Studies in the institution and in the curriculum. California Senators and Assembly people on the legislature had a different interpretation. Senator Pan asked the ASCSU for feedback. The Chair of the ASCSU sent a request to all campuses for their feedback. CSUB’s response was based on inputs from the AAC, Open Forum, emails, and GECCo. M. Danforth did an excellent job of capturing the
intent of opinions. In addition to the summary of faculty feedback, **CSUB Recommendation RES AS-3397-19_AA**, the Provost Office sent a separate response. Since the Academic Senate is the body that oversees faculty, the focus of our submittal was on themes. The big point is that Ethnic Studies as a GE Requirement needs to be more campus-based. The ASCSU asked campuses to include what is being done to address Ethnic Studies. We established GECCo as a separate body that oversees GE. What we are doing is itemized in **CSUB Current Practice, How is it defined by the Campus** (handout). There are models: require (3) three unit Ethnic Studies requirement in addition to the current JDYR units, which would adversely affect some of the programs. Another proposal is to have a (1) one unit SELF type requirement. He thanked M. Danforth for leading the collection and reporting of the campus feedback, the AAC, and GECCo.

ii) The Search Committee for the Provost Search - J. Tarjan informed the EC of the membership: J. Kegley/A & H, J. Tarjan/BPA, S. Forester/NSME, D. Anderson-Facile/SS&E, J. Paschal/Staff, T. Wallace/Administrator. The President appointed J. Kegley to serve as Chair. They decided to use a search firm to conduct a national search. A. Hegde said the Search Committee is working on the job description. It is not a closed search. Please participate by providing feedback.

iii) The EC discussed Campus Climate software to administrate online SOClS. The campus has been using it. IT requested to extend the license. Valid questions were raised about the cost and the issues with the current system. There are some features we need to bear the cost for. Qualtrics lacks features and doesn’t aggregate SOCl information nor does it match comments to questions score. The EC recommended renewing the software license and use where it does not change policy.

iv) The Interim Provost, the President, and Dr. K. LaGue attended the annual meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) to receive the **Christa McAuliffe Excellence in Teaching Award** for CSUB’s Rural Residency Program. CSUB was the sole recipient of this prestigious award.

v) The EC forwarded FHAC’s recommendation of Dr. I. Sumaya for the Wang Award.

b. Academic Affairs Committee (M. Danforth)

Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology – some improvements were addressed and the joint committee anticipates a resolution to be ready for November 21 Senate meeting. The program goes through Extended Education and Global Outreach. Thus, it does not affect faculty workload.
Referral 10—Ethnic Studies as a GE Requirement – Response to the Task Force Report – Most of the time was spent going over feedback from a dozen people and then drafting a report. See handout Summary of Feedback from CSUB. There was divided opinion whether to do it as a stand-alone GE course or incorporate Ethnic Studies in another GE area. The two prevailing models: 1) make it a required module in Junior Year Diversity (JDYR) covering four components of diversity. It would be a zero cost option for high unit major but wouldn’t give the topic of Ethnic Studies sufficient depth 2) treat it the same as SELF requirement whereby a class double-counts. For example, C-1, SELF or the student can opt to take a stand-alone class. It’s a tricky method 40 count as zero units in GE – because they have an option to get through with zero units even though they may choose to take a three unit class. The AAC discussed the need for more discussion since the feedback came from merely a dozen people. More discussion is needed on student outcome requirements. The clear consensus was that Ethnic Studies should have campus flexibility, so each campus can respond to the needs of their own students, and that CSUB doesn’t want to lose JDYR in the process.

Referral 13 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report – It’s tabled until the committee can meet with AS&SS to learn from their recent discussion with visitors.

Referral 14 New Course Forms and Process – L. Zuzarte has been asked to go through the forms and to identify what is absolutely essential to build a class or a program in PeopleSoft, and what would improve the process, and to decipher between the needs and the wants.

Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement - deferred

Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas - deferred

Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal - deferred

Referral 19 Winter Term Courses and Units Policy - deferred

Referral 20 Proposal for Energy and Power Engineering Emphasis within the B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering – this most recent referral has not been discussed.

c. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (J. Millar) The Chancellor’s Office is encouraging Counselors to refer students to online stress management. CSUB is currently not doing that.
Referral 05 Canvas Pilot – no update

Referral 12– Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain deferred

Referral 13 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force Report – next meeting.

Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas – There was a joint meeting with BPC and guest F. Gorham. The committees are better informed to make a decision.

d. Faculty Affairs Committee (M. Rees)

Referral 02 Faculty Workload – One WTU Defined – The committee reviewed three years of assigned time to look for patterns. One school had significant reassigned time for scholarly research, but reassigned time was not given to the other schools. D. Schecter provided FAC reports from years back that didn’t go anywhere. The committee continues its investigation and forming useful analysis. The resolution won’t solve everything, yet it will make the situation better and more transparent.

Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change – deferred

Referral 09 Faculty Membership on Search Committee for the Provost & VP of AA – Handbook Change – The committee began listing some pros and cons of having tenured faculty and non-tenured faculty on the search committee.

Referral 11– New Regulations on Consensual Relationship - Handbook Change – deferred

e. Budget & Planning Committee (B. Street)

Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology – To add to AAC’s reporting, the expected enrollment is 25 students.

Referral 07 Academic Calendar – Spring and Fall Semester Breaks – B. Street has received drafts of Fall Spring 2020-21 and for Summer 2021, and for Fall Spring 2021-22. The Calendar Committee will be attending the next meeting to walk through the key dates. The plan is to have a resolution at Senate, November 21.

Referral 17 Learning Management System – Canvas – The report from IT was somewhat subjective. The data was insufficient at the committee level. There was
good discussion with F. Gorham and the AS&SS. The committees arrived at items they need to see: 1) Make the conversion from Blackboard (BB) to Canvas that already occurred available to faculty so we can see the mechanism of what has been done. 2) Provide a report of one-to-one differences in features and characteristics and the direct cost associated per feature. BB can be made just as good as Canvas, but there would be development costs. Canvas in the generic setting would be a 20-50% increase cost. 3) What are the anticipated migration issues and how will they be addresses and facilitated, including associated costs. Canvas does have 24/7 support, but would that type of support be sufficient during the migration. The referral is waiting for F. Gorham’s response. Since there isn’t a time line, it’s important to do our due diligence. There is time to regroup to right some of the wrongs initiated in the approach to shared governance. J. Millar said that BB doesn’t have a very good mobile application and the cost to upgrade would be approximately $100,000. L. Lara added that BB doesn’t have plans to improve it. J. Choi asked if there was information from surveys that address the mobile application. L. Lara replied that anecdotally she wasn’t able to do a quiz on phone or ask a professor a question using BB’s mobile app. Canvas is more user-friendly for students who just carry their phone rather than laptop or desktop.

Referral 20 Proposal for Energy and Power Engineering Emphasis within the B.S. degree in Electrical Engineering –M. Danforth said that there is already an Energy and Power emphasis in Engineering Sciences. This proposal is for an Energy and Power emphasis in Electrical Engineering.

f. Staff Report (L. Lara)
   i. The 50th Anniversary Committee has two new subcommittees: The Event Committee - lead by E. Fergon, and the Public Affairs Committee - lead by J. Self. There is a running list of key programs and events. Send additions to L. Lara or E. Fergon. The 2019-2020 Alumni Hall of Fame Award will be announced on November 18. The 2020-2021 Alumni Hall of Fame Award will be a key event at the 50th Anniversary commemoration. The Alumni Foundation requests that faculty and staff to begin nominating alumni for the next year.
   ii. The University Budget Office is down to one person with others filling in temporarily.

 g. ASI Report (A. Wan)  R. Esparza provided the report on behalf of A. Wan.
   i. ASI’s Chief Justice and Justices have begun looking at scholarship applications. This year there will be 21 scholarships of $500 each.
   ii. 900 students participated in the Zombie Search.
iii. Transfer Studies Tuesdays is open to all students.
iv. ASI released their first Student Spotlight on Instagram.
v. ASI is recruiting for Budget Management and Diversity and Inclusion.
vi. ASI will be volunteering at the Bakersfield Homeless Shelter at the end of the month.

8. Resolutions – (Time Certain 10:45 a.m.)
   a. Old Business
      i. RES 192005 Academic Master Plan 2020-21 through 2030-31 – Second Reading A. Hegde announced that the feedback and changes requested at the last meeting were forwarded to the Interim Provost V. Harper. M. Danforth requested an edit, BM Music Education, for consistency. D. Boschini noted that it is unusual to have BPA programs show a range of academic years (AY) for expected implementation whereas other schools have specific AY. A. Hegde responded that the Interim Provost applied a more realistic, albeit non-binding AY. D. Jackson noted an edit to the naming of the MS in Brain, Behavior and Cognitive Sciences. D. Boschini said that the brief conversation about range of years and minor edits will be forwarded to V. Harper. She opened the floor for further comments. J. Stark moved to approve changes. D. Boschini asked for favor of approving the resolution with two minor edits. The resolution passed unanimously.
   b. New Business
      i. RES 192004 Addition of ASI Executive Director to Academic Support and Student Services Committee – First Reading J. Millar introduced the resolution. It’s a change in the By-laws to add the ASI Executive Director to AS&SS as an ex-officio member, for continuity of communication between the student organization and faculty. There are students on faculty standing committees, but the students can’t always attend. The ASI Executive Director, I. Pesco, is aware of campus policy, services, and administration which has an impact on what the committee is working to accomplish. D. Boschini asked for feedback. None given. J. Stark noted that the resolution is non-conversational. He moved to waive the First Reading. J. Tarjan seconded. D. Boschini called for favor to waive the First Reading. All in favor. No changes or corrections. D. Boschini called for approval of resolution, as is. All in favor. Resolution approved.

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

   Academic Integrity - A. Hegde broached the topic of academic integrity, for discussion around the Student Misconduct Task Force referral. One of his colleagues received an
email from Pakistan regarding his student. The student used *WhatsApp* to cheat in class. The student in the professor’s computer lab was told to put all devices away. The student took pictures during the test, and negotiated a price for the answers during the test. The student wouldn’t pay for the answers until his test results were available. Since there was a delay in grading and the Pakistani didn’t get paid, he shared the transcript and the student’s name with the professor. The same student was caught cheating in another class, but there wasn’t any physical proof. If we can’t expel a student for this, there isn’t any academic integrity here. The jilted person selling the answers sent pictures of all the work he did to supply the student. The student doesn’t come to class and still gets high grades. The student is getting credit for a class, and intentionally avoiding certain other classes. The computer lab was required, offered here and there wasn’t any way around it. This is a person who paid for his degree while we have honest students struggling to be successful, on their own merit. J. Tarjan said the campus has experienced many years of serial cheating, records are destroyed, no follow-up, etc. Our lecturers are vulnerable. If PT lecturers and Adjuncts take action on cheaters, they then get poor student evaluations. If we don’t enforce our policies and support lecturers, how much good will could be lost when their performance is contingent on students liking them? If the university doesn’t support faculty, imagine the result we’ll get long-term. R. Gearhart suggested that the majority of lecturer evaluation be measured by peer-observations instead of by SOCs. Another Senator noted that some schools on campus give SOC’s more than 50% weight. Faculty is concerned about that, especially at the Dean level. D. Boschini said that in order for it to be a referral, there needs to be evidence on more than one student, and that the university is failing to address cheating and/or failing to support faculty. For example, there is adjunct faculty who are being excoriated in SOCs due to drama related to student non-performance and/or retaliation from cracking down on academic dishonesty and then it results in the RTP committee giving the faculty a bad review. Is that happening enough to spend time following-up on the issue? If it’s a concern and we are already addressing it effectively, then there isn’t a Senate action item, here. What part of the situation would require new Senate action item? J. Millar asked for permission to use the information (transcript) to demonstrate the severity and audacity of students to the in AS&SS committee and the Director of OSRR. Also, more thought needs to be applied toward faculty preventing plagiarism. D. Boschini recommended the committee discuss whether the faculty had in his syllabus that egregious failure to academic integrity would result in failure. Was there advice from the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR), is the pressure from administration, etc. Address the layers and the units related to the process. J. Millar said that the OSSR Director offered a degree of confidence that the Student Code of Conduct gave
parameters equating to student expulsion and suspension. J. Stark said the campus addressed academic integrity fifteen years ago, and nothing really came of it. There are three potential levels of activity that happens on every incident of cheating: 1) The class level result, whereby the professor can do whatever they need to do; it’s their decision, their responsibility. 2) The program level – for example, we wouldn’t want someone cheating in accounting to go for their CPA exam. The Accounting department should be able to say, you’re no longer going to be an accountant. It would be similar with Nursing. 3) The university level decision - that’s what R. Alvarez/OSRR is trying to decide. Those levels need to be codified and made clear that these three things exist and there are the Rights and Responsibilities of students, faculty, programs and the university. It would be useful to have follow-up reporting to the professor who registered the academic dishonesty. The instructor has a right to know if anything has been done about it. It needs to be taken seriously, and something has to be done. As for Adjuncts, it a dual level issue: 1) SOCI’s reflect what goes on and could affect their tenure, 2) BPA has experienced intimidation of faculty, especially female faculty who typically teach at night. A group of students followed female faculty to her car, such that she get a public safety officer escort her to her vehicle. It’s more than unfair SOCI’s. We have lost adjunct faculty in the quantitative area because of threats to their safety in the work environment. D. Boschini –The Student Misconduct Report is not enough. AS&SS is listening to the feedback. If, at the end of the process, there is a penalty and no one knows it, people start questioning the integrity of the process. R. Alvarez is getting the information. There are concerns about student confidentially. However, if there are program rules – two offenses and you’re out – if faculty or department chairs don’t know what students have done before, how can one implement the rules on the program level if you don’t know whether the university has your back. M. Danforth said that a student has repeatedly doctored the proctor cover letters. Now, when the instructor turns the exam to the proctor, they ask to see the cover letter. If the cover letter has been changed, they let the proctor know. The student is still in the department even though he’s done this with multiple faculty members. The consequences are not realized. There is also the everyday cheating using GitHub and sharing the whole solution. If there are policies that come out of the Student Misconduct Task Force Report, faculty need to pay attention to them. There is a lot of faculty frustration about flagrant violations to academic integrity occurring without evidence of consequences as a result. A. Hegde read from the transcript. The negotiation started at $40 for the test answers, but the student would only pay $25. The person with the test answers said, I’m going to email your professor with your name. The student replied, I don’t care, nothing will happen. Some offenses are so bad, they call for expulsion. For any international student, the consequences are even
greater. They have to leave the country within two weeks. Some of the same students have presented fake doctor excuses to get medical withdrawals from class in week twelve of the semester. Since the Associate Deans got together to enforce a policy that says all classes need to be dropped, the doctors’ notes have decreased. It takes one serious action to end these kinds of academic dishonesty. E. Correa responded to the university level. She is working with Library staff to produce a video by students for students which addresses the three reasons students cheat, based on the research: 1) They would not be able to claim they didn’t know they shouldn’t cheat. 2) A number of instructors use same exam every year so it’s easy to get the answers in advance. 3) The night before something is due, a student doesn’t know what to do, they cut and paste something from the internet and send it in as their own. Since it worked the first time without consequence, the student is inclined to repeatedly plagiarize. When professors don’t grade by looking at the entire essay, the students will only apply effort at the first part. Further, a lot of students don’t know they can’t pass the same paper from class to class. The plan is to distribute the video on what constitutes cheating to freshman classes. J. Woods said that since we are in an interconnected information world – a broader discussion is needed about what academic integrity means in 2019. Is one contributing positive value to the world, society, and the people around them? For example, he studied how to manage teams for software development competitions by viewing YouTube videos for a month and asked questions of people who code. Faculty may want to think about what does it mean to access information and cooperative ability enabled by technology? How are we encouraging integrity in that environment? D. Boschini feels strongly that whenever she hears “these/those people” it’s uncomfortable. It’s easy to interpret one person to mean all of a segment doing a behavior. Make sure we are talking about student(s) who engage in academic dishonesty. First of all they are students. Take “these/those people” out of the conversation. As a department chair, the question is how to help new faculty, and the wise and experienced and talented faculty deal with academic dishonesty. It’s time consuming and there are pieces of it that send faculty to the brink. M. Suleiman reminded the group to be soft on people and aggressive on the problem. Language is important. The system has many loopholes and mistakes. We have to be sensitive to the vagaries. M. Danforth said that male faculty have also been intimidated, threatened, and harassed. D. Boschini ended the discussion with a request for reflection on making a positive contribution.

Insurance for Equipment and Building - M. Rees informed the group that the school(s) don’t have insurance to cover building or equipment damage. A leak caused the Music and Theatre building’s roof to collapse. The Theatre department lost tens of thousands
of dollars’ worth of equipment. If one has programs with a lot of equipment or expensive equipment, consider getting it insured. D. Boschini learned that the university carries insurance on structures, but the deductible is so high that the whole structure would have to go down to recoup the cost. There is no state budget for equipment. Unless there is a grant or outside funding for those pieces, there isn’t any money. J. Stark said that self-insurance in public entities means no insurance. The system only pays for catastrophic insurance.

Dropping Class for Serious and Compelling Reasons - D. Boschini is hearing an increase in students’ request to drop courses for serious and compelling reasons. Students who aren’t doing well academically seriously want to drop a course(s). The campus is shifting in the meaning of “serious and compelling reasons” in a way that is creating more conflict with students. This week, she saw more students who are more desperate, with more expectation for her to sign forms with less information about what the process is supposed to look like. She passed that concern to D. Schecter for the Department Chairs’ consideration.

Student Success Network (SSN) - D. Boschini said that the professional advisors have provided fantastic information that they share with the students they advise. However, that information doesn’t get to the faculty advisors and the information gap has become more evident. Because she’s the Academic Chair, she’s on the distribution list. As Department Chair, she has an advising load and that information is not getting to her from any other direction. She repeated an earlier request to include all faculty advisors in the distribution list on advising information. L. Zuzarte responded that she can take this request to the Advising Leadership Team so the Faculty Advisors can be included. The Department Chairs were recently added to the SSN. D. Boschini stressed the importance of listing the advisor for each department.

D. Boschini thanked the Senate for the great conversation.

10. Adjournment

D. Boschini adjourned the meeting at 11:30