

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE
Minutes

Thursday, April 28, 2022

Zoom Video Conference

10:00 a.m. – 11:38 a.m.

Members: A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair), B. Frakes, R. Gearhart (Alt.), A. Grombly, V. Harper, H. He, J. Kraybill, C. Lam, A. Lauer, J. Li, S. Magaña, M. Martinez, J. Millar, S. Miller, J. Moraga, M. Rees, A. Rodriguez, A. Sanchez, D. Solano, B. Street, J. Tarjan

Visitors: D. Boschini, J. Basilio, E. Callahan, J. Deal, D. Dodd, R. Dugan, F. Gorham, D. Jackson, T. Salisbury, L. Vega, K. Watson, L. Zelezny

Absent: E. Correa (excused)

1. Call to Order

A. Hegde called the meeting to order. He read a statement acknowledging CSUB's stewardship of the land of the Tejon Tribe.

2. Approval of Minutes

J. Deal moved to approve March 17, 2022 minutes. C. Lam seconded. Approved. C. Lam moved to approve April 7, 2022 minutes. J. Deal seconded. Approved.

3. Approval of Agenda

Chair Hegde suggested to defer the sub-committee reports and go into the discussion of the Resolutions without being introduced. J. Tarjan requested that Resolutions be re-ordered to Old Business before the New Business. C. Lam moved to approve the agenda as amended. B. Street seconded. Approved.

4. Announcements and Information

- President's Report – L. Zelezny

- Sustainability Conference – Excellent event, thanks to A. Lauer
- Carbon Sequestering Conference – April 29, 2022, starting 8:00a.m. In partnership with Lawrence Livermore Labs.
- Commencement 2022 – Special events begin May 1. See [webpage](#)
- Staff and Faculty Service Awards – May 10, 1:00 p.m. Dore Theatre
- Faculty Awards 2022-2023 – D. Dodd announced that the committee reviewed and made recommendations in accordance with the University Handbook:
 - Millie Ablin Excellence in Teaching Award – A. Ressler, Theatre
 - Faculty Leadership and Service Award – B. Evans-Santiago, Teacher Education
 - Faculty Scholarship & Creative Activity Award – R. Gearhart, Economics
 - Promising New Faculty Award – A. Kemp, Mathematics
 - Outstanding Lecturer Award – J. Burger, Communications
- Elections and Appointments – See handout in agenda.

5. ASCSU Report (M. Martinez, J. Millar)

Committee meetings were recently held. Academic Affairs had a lengthy discussion with the Ethnic Studies (ES) Council. There are still some significant differences between the ASCSU resolution and what fits. The ASCSU and Chancellors Office are working to make the ES resolutions, processes, and classes clearer. (J. Millar) The ASCSU is moving forward on the lack of confidence in the Board of Trustees handling of former Chancellor Castro. The ASCSU is also looking at the hiring practices for Chancellors and Presidents. There are resolutions working through the ASCSU addressing cultural taxation, how we treat service and tying those together, and mental health. (M. Martinez)

6. Provost Report

- Faculty Awards – Acknowledgment to our outstanding faculty for those awards. It's a remarkable achievement for them all individually and for us collectively.
- Pandemic Research Group – Thank you for holding a wonderful event.

- AVP Grants and Sponsored Research (GRaSP) – Looking for an interim. The appointment to be announced very soon.
- Dean Antelope Valley – Interviews taking place this week.
- Dean Library – Look for news next week.
- Dean BPA – Look for news in two weeks.
- Thank you to all faculty participating in those really important Search Committee processes to bring leaders to our campus.
- Cluster Hire Roadshow – Feedback has been gathered from affinity groups and the Chairs Council. There’s a meeting with the Faculty and Staff Association, soon. The Cover and Application to be distributed next week. Departments can formally apply at the end of next week. The decision on those lines is planned shortly thereafter. (V. Harper)

7. Committee Reports and Requests

(Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC are posted on the Academic Senate Standing Committee webpage, [here](#).)

- a. Executive Committee (M. Danforth) (deferred)
- b. ASI Report (S. Magaña) – ASI Board elections have closed. The Executive Board is complete. Applications will open for the remaining positions.
- c. Academic Affairs Committee (J. Tarjan) (handout)
- d. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (E. Correa) (deferred)
- e. Faculty Affairs Committee (M. Rees) (deferred)
- f. Budget & Planning Committee (C. Lam) (deferred)
- g. Staff Report (S. Miller) – Nothing to report.

8. Resolutions

Old Business

RES 212226 General Studies Review Committee Implementation - J. Tarjan introduced on behalf of AAC. It’s a companion to the resolution already passed (RES 212220 General Studies Review Committee Formation). The vote resulted in approval.

RES 212227 Levels in the Performance Review Process - It sets a timeline for the Chair to complete a separate review and allow a couple days for reflection and comment. It’s a parallel process and timeline. (M. Rees) J.

Tarjan had the first chair review. He was able to see the committee's review before writing a chair's review. It informed his chair's review. Given the parallel timeline, it defeats the purpose of chair review. If the unit committee is privy to and includes all the information that they should, it often obviates the necessity for a chair review. He does not feel it should be the same timeline. Perhaps that can be addressed later. (J. Tarjan) The vote resulted in majority approval. The resolution passed.

RES 212228 Re-Entry Students Policy - J. Tarjan introduced on behalf of AAC. The committee did not receive any feedback. No discussion. Vote resulted in majority approval. The resolution passed.

RES 212229 Change of Department Name from Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HDCAFS) - J. Tarjan introduced on behalf of AAC. No suggestions taken. This is analogous to another resolution whereby faculty suggested a name change to speak to students and employers. It more accurately reflects what the department does. (J. Tarjan) The vote resulted in approval.

RES 212230 University Program Review Committee (UPRC) Changes – C. Lam introduced on behalf of AAC and BPC. The committees recommended changes to the procedures and template. Concerns were expressed about the departments that are chronically late. There is a way to get around this intention of conducting program review. The URPC Task Force and BPC have consulted on this. (C. Lam) What compensation is there for the person who writes the review? (M. Rees) Every department has a different culture. They can negotiate how to compensate. (C. Lam) The Senate addressed compensation in an earlier resolution. However, it was not signed by the President. (A. Hegde) The Political Science department has not submitted a review because of issues. M. Martinez is not in support of the resolution. (M. Martinez) Chair Hegde turned the gavel to Vice-Chair Danforth so he could take the floor as Senator. The work of the UPRC is truly appreciated. Everyone on the committee truly cares about the process. Every year, their annual report says the same thing; Fix the process. Speaking as someone who has done six program reviews, it's a lot of work. It's a cumbersome process. To do it without reassigned time or any kind of compensation

makes it doubly challenging. A. Hegde has talked to individuals who run departments who have not done a program review, to figure out why. The answers vary. One of the recommendations in the resolution is that at least three individuals get together to write it. It reflects the importance of the review and improvement in the program to improve student learning. Assessment is a big part of the process. When a program review committee goes ahead to evaluate the program without the self-study, it's missing the most important part of the program review. There is no one except someone from the department who really knows the program and the effects on student learning, etc. We need to address the culture of the self-study. It has improved over the years through encouragement and not punitive measures. As currently written, departments may not do the review because the UPRC will do it and there aren't any consequences. In one sense it is a cultural penalty. A. Hegde will work with the UPRC to encourage departments who have not done a program review to do it. We need to do efforts other than to make it punitive. If we put the last sentence [italicized] in as presented, the culture will not change. There are many new faculty who care about their programs. It's a chance to brag. An Economics Department program review is used in a UPRC workshop. It's a point of pride. There are a lot of good suggestions to change our culture. It's a great process; One gets to know what your colleagues are doing. If a program doesn't do a review, put the onus on the chair. There are a lot of reasons why a program doesn't do the self-reflection. A. Hegde moved to amend the resolution by striking the italicized sentence. (A. Hegde) J. Deal seconded the motion. (J. Deal) Suggestion to change sentence to a one-year time frame or elect to make a recommendation to the Provost to on how to proceed. (D. Solano) A. Hegde is in favor of the suggestion and deletes his motion. UPRC may recommend certain steps to the Provost. (A. Hegde) It's important that the possible steps may include UPRC initiated review. The point is to make clear to the programs who are not compliant, having not done the work, that one of the possible alternatives is that this provost, and future provosts, will have is to conduct a URPC initiated review. (V. Harper) An amendment to the amendment: "An additional extension may be granted if appropriate or without a self-study prepared by the program, the

UPRC in consultation with the program faculty and the school Dean, would make a recommendation to the Provost on how to proceed, including proceeding with external review of the program.” Ultimately, rather than the UPRC electing on its own how to do this, UPRC would make a recommendation to the Provost, who would then decide if it was appropriate or not. The Provost would have the knowledge of the department, etc. (A. Hegde) The UPRC does reach out to the program chair to help them complete their self-study. Sometimes the Deans work with directly with the programs toward completion. Other times it’s more of a partnership between the Dean and the UPRC. One of the sources of the idea came from J. Sun, who met with another university, referring to yet another university that was struggling with their programs review. They got support externally to help with evaluation of the program without the self-study. It would be last resort. Ideally, the program does need to do the self-reflection. (D. Jackson) The motion is to change the highlighted sentence: “would make a recommendation to the Provost on how to proceed, which may include a UPRC-initiated review.” The motion approved. (M. Danforth) The gavel was returned to the Senate Chair. Thank you to D. Jackson. We can work together to change the culture. The vote resulted in majority approval. The resolution carried. Thank you to AAC, BPC and the UPRC Task Force and J. Sun. (A. Hegde)

New Business

RES 212231 Name Change for the B.S. In Engineering Sciences

Degree – J. Tarjan introduced on behalf of AAC. The current name is confusing to students and employers. J. Tarjan moved to waive First Reading. J. Dean seconded. This is in congruence with other programs. It’s a common practice. Majority approved to waive First Reading. No discussion. The vote resulted in unanimous approval.

RES 212232 GECCo Structure, Course Approvals, and Reporting – J.

Tarjan introduced on behalf of AAC, BPC, and FAC. The purpose is to further qualify the responsibility of the committee. The structure of the GE program is the purview of the Senate. The implementation is the purview of GECCo in terms of the course approvals, modifications to meet General Education requirements, learning outcomes,

assessment, and ongoing training to faculty. The reporting and suggestions go through the AAC. It parallels what happens at the system level. There is concern on the timeliness of notification on the progress of course reviews. There is a resolve dealing with posting that information and the GE Faculty Director has the resources to do that. The resolution addresses the type and direction of the reporting. (J. Tarjan) Was A. Gebauer aware of the changes? (A. Hegde) Yes, the AAC took nearly all of his suggestions. (J. Tarjan)

RES 212233 New Undergraduate Academic Integrity Policy – J. Tarjan introduced on behalf of AAC. Faculty expressed in forums and surveys that there is a need to more effectively address academic integrity. An Academic Integrity Working Group was formed. The policy from the Academic Integrity Working Group was modified to differentiate severity of academic violations and consequences, and to narrow the policy to undergraduate students. A sentence was added about penalties for repeated violations. By EO 1098, the sanctions are the purview of the Academic Integrity Officer. However, the resolution requests consultation be made with, and the recommendations come from, the group of tenured faculty who give advice to the Student Conduct Officer. Things that are not addressed which the Senate may want to consider: A separate policy to address graduate students, how these expectations are communicated to students through orientation and other ways, and how we can keep faculty members who are involved in these cases informed of the progress and ultimate outcome in accordance to system policy. (J. Tarjan) The Working Group did not discuss the issue of Artificial Intelligence (AI) websites that take a source and then paraphrase it. It should be addressed under inappropriate use of technology or plagiarism which uses some sort of AI or website assistance. (M. Danforth) Last year, J. Drnek of the Office of Students Rights and Responsibilities gave a report to the Senate. There were many Senators unhappy with the progress and outcome of student violations to academic integrity. As a result, rather than being siloed, we decided to form a working group of members from Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, faculty, staff and

administrators. The group has been working diligently for a year. Changes have already been made. There is a department name change, and E. Poole-Callahan is the Assistant Dean of Students and in charge of academic integrity violations. There is a change in the software to track violations. We understand that this policy is one part of the entire picture. There needs to be a culture change among students. Violating academic integrity is not acceptable. Students in the Working Group said that their degree is demeaned by people who cheat. There are many who believe that the Academic Policy should be stricter. This is one step, and we'll get there. Thank you to the Working Group and please continue to work on it. (A. Hegde) A recommendation is that we institute an Academic Integrity Pledge. (M. Rees) Faculty may feel it's not worth it to report a minor violation, even if there isn't proof. Students may have had multiple violations. It's important for faculty to report all student violations so other faculty will know who is a problem. We need to keep our standards high. (A. Lauer) There is an opportunity at the Student Convocation for students to repeat the Academic Integrity Pledge and faculty can put the pledge as a background when giving exams, etc. Send suggestions to the Academic Integrity Working Group. (A. Hegde) Through a number of conversations with E. Callahan, J. Tarjan thinks that many concerns are being addressed systemically. (J. Tarjan) E. Callahan expressed pride in the work of the group. Even if it's a minor case, report it. It's an opportunity to review it and see if there is a pattern of conduct. The goal is to be educational in our approach, but we do need to hold our students accountable and change the culture that we all will carry academic integrity to earning a degree. Additionally, there's an internal sanction guide which will mirror the policy on minor, moderate, and major violations. The maximum sanction is suspension or expulsion. Student Affairs has partnered with the Library to host Academic Integrity Workshops and assess students' learning and development of learning skills. E. Callahan affirmed that she is a partner in changing the culture and welcomes ideas and consultation from faculty. (E. Callahan)

RES 212234 CSUB Faculty Retention and Tenure Density Priority –

C. Lam introduced on behalf of BPC. The committee is tasked with making annual recommendations based on the budget and other data findings through the Academic Senate. BPC came up with RES 212234 and RES 212235 based on observations. CSUB's tenure density is quite low, compared to other campuses. The discussion was how do we raise it. The efforts of the administration to increase faculty diversity and tenure density is appreciated. The recommendation is for the administration to increase diversity and have a goal to increase the rate of the tenured/tenure-track faculty density by 1 percent a year to at least 60 percent, or the 75th percentile in the CSU system. CSUB tenure density sits at 51 percent which is the 26th percentile across the data from all the CSUs. (C. Lam) Why not aim for the 61.8 percent tenure density CSUB had in 2011? (D. Solano) There has been a general downward trend across the system. It's difficult to retain faculty in the Central Valley and we want to make the increase in tenure density achievable (C. Lam)

RES 212235 Maintenance and Space Utilization Priority - C. Lam

introduced the second recommendation on behalf of BPC. The emphasis is the improvement in student learning as a priority and instructor/teacher working conditions. Every faculty should have the appropriate space to conduct any activity related to their function. Utilization issues have to do with communications; why rooms are used for a particular purpose. People need to have a better understanding of what's going on. (C. Lam) Faculty need to have proper office space regardless of the mode they are teaching in. There needs to be privacy in delicate conversations. (M. Danforth) Clarify what is office space. (D. Solano) The guideline from BOT is that individual faculty get their own space. (A. Hegde) There is prescribed language, but it does not address shared space. She is in support of the resolution, tying the need for funding from the CO to student learning to deferred maintenance and office space. (A. Grombly) Faculty office defined as 110 square feet. (J. Tarjan)

RES 212236 Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time – M. Rees introduced on behalf of FAC. Some assigned time notifications come late in the academic year when students are already registered for Fall. This resolution is an attempt to address this issue. Aim for notification by March 15. The resolution reinforces the need for the chair's signature on requests. (M. Rees) Should the notification deadline be tied to the calendar, rather than a specific date, thus reducing the number of times it's modified in response to changes. (M. Danforth) The need for department chair signature is problematic if the chair is not available and it puts a chill on faculty of not having the chair's approval. (A. Grombly) The resolution calls for the acknowledgement, not the approval, of the chair (M. Rees) According to the Handbook 312.3, chair evaluation is due by April 1st. It's hard to know who the new chair is going to be at that time. (B. Frakes) The current application reads as if one has to have the chair's approval. It needs to be clearly specified that it's an acknowledgement of the chair. Mid-March or earlier is reasonable. It fair to the students. (J. Kraybill)

C. Lam motioned to extend the meeting by five minutes. J. Deal seconded.

RES 212237 Exceptional Service Application and Screening – M. Rees introduced on behalf of FAC. WTUs are awarded as specified by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) Article 20.37. Currently the selection committee consists of three EC members. The resolution is for two EC members and three members appointed by the EC to broaden representation from the campus community. The application form has been redesigned to help with the evaluation criteria and categories from the CBA and which ones the applicants are addressing in their application. There is a clear place for the chair to acknowledge the application and WTUs. (M. Rees) Casting a wider net for a committee to be more campus wide is a good idea. (J. Kraybill) This is a great approach and the FAC is to be commended for their work. (M. Martinez)

RES 212238 Eligibility for Faculty Awards - M. Rees introduced on behalf of FAC. There is a need for clarity whether a faculty member can win the same faculty award more than once or whether they can win multiple awards. FAC offers a policy for discussion. See change to Handbook 318.3 as underlined text. Faculty may be nominated for the same award after a five year waiting

period. Faculty can be nominated for another award at any time. (M. Rees) D. Solano recommends more than five years for the same award. (D. Solano)

9. Open Forum Items

Topic: Counseling Walk-In Hours during Final Exams Week – Opportunities to talk with a counselor. (J. Millar)

Topic: Effective date of RES 212217 – It passed whereby the Wednesday before Thanksgiving is a day off. D. Boschini reminded that calendar 2022-2023 has already been submitted. It won't go into effect until 2023-2024.

Topic: Two faculty members came to him to report that the room where they were going to teach in was taped off due to activities related to Facilities and the faculty members were not notified. Three classes had to be cancelled ad hoc. Is there a way that such Facilities work could be shared, especially related to teaching duties? We need means and policies to communicate such scheduling of work. (B. Street)

Topic: Applications for Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) – It's important to advance activities that advance students' opportunities and experiences. Is there any funding for IRA? (A. Rodriguez) AVP I. Pesco oversees IRA. There were legal issues at the system level to prevent the distribution of funds. She invited faculty to write to her. The applications will be considered. (A. Hegde) The Provost will add this topic to his one-on-one agenda with VP BAS T. Davis. (V. Harper)

10. Adjournment

A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:38 a.m.