ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda
Tuesday, November 13, 2018
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Room 100

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   Catalogue Curriculum Proposal – V. Harper (handout) (Time Certain 10:05)
   AMP – V. Harper (handout)
   Block Schedule – V. Harper
   Trustee visit on December 12

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   October 30, 2018

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
      ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
      iii. BPC (B. Street)
      iv. FAC (M. Rush)
   b. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
   c. Results of Faculty Survey (see previous handout) Action Items:
   d. Administrator Reviews
      i. Committee composition
      ii. Conflict of interest - prevention
      iii. Procedures: chair, process, consistency
   e. Searches
      i. Dean of Undergraduate & Graduate Studies
      ii. Director of Academic Operation
      iii. Interim AVP Enrollment Management
      iv. GE Faculty Director
   f. Starting new programs - possible referral to AAC
   g. Workload - What constitutes workload?
      i. Data: current student, faculty, SFR, etc.
      ii. Administrative (when assigned time is awarded)
      iii. Schools have different workloads based on different criteria
      iv. What constitutes a one WTU release?
v. Is release time consistent?
vi. Timeline for grant writing and approval
h. Budget Forum – December 5, 3:30-4:30, Stockdale Room
i. Election to fill recent vacancy
   i. Academic Senate A & H
j. Appointments
   i. Academic Petitions Committee
   ii. Canvas Pilot Planning Committee
   iii. IACUC and HSIRB recommendations for appointments (see previous handout)
k. Request for 2019-2021 Faculty Trustee nominations (see previous handout)
l. 50th Anniversary Planning
m. Committee Structure – 40 committees - (committee proliferation)
n. Staff member selection process to various service opportunities
o. Hiring Procedures

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. University Council – New committee position Library Representative requested by the President. (previous hand out)
b. Faculty Awards – Emeritus and other faculty awards - the validity of the content put forward and were changes made. The Wang awards and sabbatical awards (possible referral and possible Handbook changes)
c. Time Block Schedule (possible referral)
d. Medical Withdrawal (handout)
e. Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation – Referral Review (handout)
f. Service Animal Emotional Support animal Policy
g. Graduate Commencement
h. Wang Award nomination process debriefing
   i. Academic Calendar

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING NOVEMBER 29, 2018 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   President Zelezny present a brief report. (Time Certain: 10:05-10:20)
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   Old Business
   RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy Second Reading
   RES 181905 Ombudsperson Role in Resolution Dispute* Second Reading

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

   * Changes to the University Handbook
Office of Academic Operations & Support: Request for Senate Inquiry Regarding the Regularly Updated Catalog

Background
Beginning with the 2009-2011 catalog, a ‘Biennial’ catalog and a ‘Regularly Updated’ has been posted on the website. At the start of a new biennial catalog the previous ‘Regularly Updated’ catalog is finalized and retired. While on-going catalog updates are permitted, and posted in the Regularly Updated catalog, this process poses several repercussions, some of which are listed below:

Problem of a Regularly Updated Catalog
- Catalog discrepancies between Published Catalog and Regularly Updated Catalog
- Degree Audits continue to be built on the most updated version of a program’s requirements within a catalog publication cycle of two years
- Discrepancies in Approved Programs submitted for CSU Apply
- Degree Audit constantly being out of sync with the Catalog becomes an ineffective tool for:
  o Advising
  o Processing Grad Checks
  o Degree Evaluation and Degree Awarding

Impact of Q2S
The Q2S process was one of the most remarkable collaborative efforts in the history of CSUB. Faculty, students and administrators worked together to devise an entirely new curriculum and catalog. However, Q2S led to some “bad organizational habits.” Particularly, there are catalog and curricular activities currently being performed by Academic Operations and Support that should to shifted back to the authority of the Faculty.

The Offices of Academic Operations and Support and Academic Programs requests that the Senate Executive Committee consider solutions for the Regularly Updated Catalog.
B. The Standing Committees, their membership, and responsibilities shall be as follows:

1. Academic Affairs (AAC)
   a. The Academic Affairs Committee shall consist of the following voting members: seven faculty, and one student representing ASI. In addition, (a) representative(s) from the Office of Academic Affairs with responsibilities that include, but are not limited to, PeopleSoft, academic standing, academic master plan, course management activities, articulation agreements, general student program inquiries, graduate program coordination, and academic policies shall serve ex officio and non-voting.

b. The Academic Affairs Committee functions shall be to review and report to the Academic Senate its recommendations regarding:
   i. All new academic policies, procedures, programs, and curricula having interschool or all-university impact;
   ii. Proposed changes to the University Catalog that have inter-school or all university impact;
   iii. The Academic Plan; and
   iv. Proposed changes in the implementation of the General Education Program.

c. In addition, the Academic Affairs Committee shall serve as the University Curriculum Committee for interschool programs that have required courses for majors and/or minors (i.e., not electives) in more than one school; and shall

d. Recommend to the Academic Senate action to be taken when there is disagreement among faculty involved in proposed changes to the Catalog and/or to academic policies, procedures, programs and curricula having inter-school or all-university impact.
### ACADEMIC PLAN

Existing and Projected Degree Programs

2019-2020 through 2028-2029

California State University, Bakersfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL OR DIVISION AND DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE</th>
<th>EXISTING DEGREE TYPE</th>
<th>EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION YEAR OF PROJECTED PROGRAM (PLANNED FUTURE DEGREE)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC YEAR FOR SCHEDULED PROGRAM REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts and Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2016-2017; 2018-2022-2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>BA, MA</td>
<td>2016-2017; 2018-2019; 2022-2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>BA, MA</td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>BA, MA</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latina/o and Latin American Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business and Public Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OR DIVISION AND DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE</td>
<td>EXISTING DEGREE TYPE</td>
<td>EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION YEAR OF PROJECTED PROGRAM (PLANNED FUTURE DEGREE)</td>
<td>ACADEMIC YEAR FOR SCHEDULED PROGRAM REVIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Administration</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>BA, MPA</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Business (pilot)</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Management</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Economics and Analytics</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics and Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas

* Suspended program

ACADEMIC PLAN
Existing and Projected Degree Programs
2018-19 through 2028-29
California State University, Bakersfield
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing and Projected Degree Programs</th>
<th>Academic Year for Scheduled Program Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL OR DIVISION AND DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>EXISTING DEGREE TYPE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Sciences and Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Adolescent and Family Studies</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Suspended program

Note: Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas
### ACADEMIC PLAN

Existing and Projected Degree Programs
2018-19 through 2028-29
California State University, Bakersfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL OR DIVISION AND DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE</th>
<th>EXISTING DEGREE TYPE</th>
<th>EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION YEAR OF PROJECTED PROGRAM (PLANNED FUTURE DEGREE)</th>
<th>ACADEMIC YEAR FOR SCHEDULED PROGRAM REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary and Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2021-2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Suspended program

Note: Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, October 30, 2018
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Room 100

Members: D. Boschini (Chair), A. Hegde (Vice Chair), J. Millar, J. Tarjan, M. Rush, E. Correa, B. Street, M. Danforth, J. Zorn

1. CALL TO ORDER
   D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   Tutoring Center Hours and Funding (J. Zorn) - The new tutoring director didn’t see her full budget so the email about cuts to tutoring went out prematurely. P. Miser is working with R. Thompson.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   M. Danforth requested that the discussion on Grad Check include processing issues. E. Correa moved to approve the Agenda as amended. M. Rush seconded. Agenda approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
         Instructor Initiated Drop Policy - The focus was on taking the recommendations into the resolution for the Second Reading, November 8.
         Interdisciplinary Studies Program Proposal - AAC still working with BPC on the questions. D. Boschini said she, M. Danforth, and B. Street have been getting messages about the Interdisciplinary Studies Proposal process, particularly about having more input. The senders have been directed to communicate with AAC and BPC. Some of the concerns are intertwined with other concerns on campus. The proposal is unique. Department policy outlines what is supposed to be done; the steps and the materials to submit. D. Knepp is invited and can opt to include the other members of the Interdisciplinary Studies Program to attend the next meeting. The document isn’t being changed. The supplements show whether the budget and process is lacking. There is a perception that this is just a formality of getting approval. New faculty were brought here to be part of the department. The parties involved need to be told it’s not a formality to approve a new department, rather that it requires
explanation that as part of our shared governance process. The committees will put forth the resolution, provide the original proposal, and include documents as supporting evidence.

*Campus Pilot* – The committee looked at materials from last year. The Canvas Pilot Committee has since moved forward. F. Gorham and C. Hu will visit AS&SS in November to update the committee on their actions.

*Distributed Learning Committee* (DLC) – the charge was to look at committee and decide whether DLC was created to make policy. If yes, it needs to be formalized. If not, it’s to be disbanded. The purpose of DLC was the launching of online instruction. It morphed into a committee that has regular on-going work where they review courses, review instructors who want to teach online, to prepare the instructor to be able to use Blackboard. Then, there is an online certification process. The DLC has continued to do work related to policies. The issue was whether we want to continue that level of oversight. Face-to-face instructors don’t have that kind of oversight on how to operate their classes. What is the interplay between DLC and the TLC and instructional technology staff? For example, ADA compliance in Blackboard would be in TLC. In the technology realm, what LMS does it support? There are people who use BB for their face-to-face class who don’t go through this level of scrutiny. There is a disconnect between what is appropriate: staff for technical classroom delivery and what is the committee’s oversight. There isn’t anything about the DLC in the Handbook. There is a gap between what the Handbook says about on-line education, and committees. E. Correa moved to retract the referral from AS&SS and refer it to FAC. M. Rush seconded. All in favor.

*Service Animal and Emotional Support Animals* - C. Catota will be visiting on legal matters. It was suggested that other campus policies also be reviewed.

ii. **BPC (B. Street)**

*Interdisciplinary Studies Proposal* - Individual meeting with M. Danforth planned to put questions together and then submit them to D. Knepp.

*University Hour* - L. Zuzarte joined the discussion on the referral. The committee requested that she look at three to four institutions who have adopted the practice, what days, and how they fit in the block schedule.

*$1M priority* – K. Krishnan will provide the fall 2018 data on faculty with the new hires, at next BPC meeting.

iii. **FAC (M. Rush)** FAC asked that EC do the tasks on Ombuds person rather than the Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR). The EC probably has more combined knowledge and judgement dealing with sensitive positions than any particular standing committee. D. Boschini clarified that the decision is to send the nominations of an Ombudsperson to CPR rather than the EC, but the FAC wants to switch it now. Thus, FAC would have to compose a job description and run the call for interest in that appointment. EC/FAC would also form a search committee, augment it, etc. M. Rush will discuss the switch with FAC.
b. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
   i. Budget Forum – date, location, live streaming – B. Street and T. Davis discussed possible dates. The goal of the Budget Forum is to discuss with faculty the Budget Book, and Questica (although the program still isn’t working). Budget Book is ready and will be posted on Budget Central website. It’s a living document. The committee discussed concerns that forums are occurring and the information doesn’t completely fit from one to another (not sure about this comment, unclear). D. Boschini said the reason we have a Budget Forum is to see what’s going well and what needs the light shined on, so that moves us forward. If we’re not ready, that needs to be part of the conversation. The whole idea is to have shared governance; having the same information to make decisions. RES 171813 Faculty Participation in Budgetary Matters was created with an understanding that we would have a Budget Forum in fall, and one in the spring. The President is welcome to be at the Budget Forum. T. Davis will present. Faculty needs to know that we have been waiting to get into Questica. It is useful to review the Budget Forum and the Strategic Planning Open Forum occur close together to show the impact of one on the other. The University Strategic Planning Budget Advisory Committee meets on December 18.

c. Administrator Reviews (Faculty Survey Action Item) (deferred)
   i. Committee composition
   ii. Conflict of interest - prevention
   iii. Procedures: chair, process, consistency

d. Searches – The Provost needs AS to put nominations for the search committees for whatever the handbook asks for faculty to elect.
   i. Associate Dean of Undergraduate & Graduate Studies – The Provost said it would be similar to a Dean Search Committee.
   ii. Director of Academic Operation - The search committee has to be set-up before the Provost determines whether it’s an internal or external search.
   iii. Interim AVP Enrollment Management – the Provost hasn’t worked on that because J. Mimms is in position through November 30. The Provost said if there are issues that come up, bring them to her (Provost).
   iv. GE Faculty Director – the Provost requested that the GE Committee start a search since Lori Paris is an interim appointment through May 2019. Discussion ensued. Last year there was confusion about whether GECCo or the Senate should do the search. Are we still doing the two parallel searches, or are we saying that GECCo can handle it? The transition document stated that GECCo would take over once there was a GECCo. Last year we needed to get moving on it because the GE Faculty Director resigned. D. Boschini wants EC to review the transition document to be able to support one plan or the other. The Provost stated that all three [interim] positions end at the end of the academic year. Her decision will be in Spring term. In the meantime, there is a request for the current GE Faculty Director job description.
e. Starting new programs - possible referral to AAC (deferred)  
f. Grad Check Deadline and Grad Check process when denied –The Grad website was blank, and then the deadline date for Grad Check was posted after the deadline. J. Zorn hasn’t gotten an answer yet on the reason it happened again. Discussion ensued. How far in advance should EM post the deadline? Did the absence of posting the grad check dates impact the students’ financial situation? The problem is changing the date and it’s not consistent. We need to know every year which week in the semester Registration begins. New leadership has an opportunity to find out when is the deadline, how far in advance to post the deadline, and then reach communication deadlines to the students. The Academic Requirement Report is still buggy. Some departments manually enter data instead of relying on Academic Requirements. J. Zorn has spent time on it already. V. Harper will direct the right person to M. Danforth to have the conversation. CSUB has a grad check fee and not a commencement fee.  
g. Request for 2019-2021 Faculty Trustee nominations (previous handout) (deferred)  
h. Graduation Initiative 2025 – follow-up to Updates added to the routine of the DCLC and/or the GI Task Force (deferred)  

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS  
   a. University Council – New committee position Library Representative requested by the President (hand out) (deferred)  
   b. Faculty Awards – Emeritus and other faculty awards - the validity of the content put forward and were changes made. The Wang awards and sabbatical awards (possible referral and possible Handbook changes) (deferred)  
   c. Time Block Schedule (possible referral) (deferred)  
   d. IACUC and HSIRB recommendations for appointments (handout) (deferred)  
   e. Academic Calendar 2019-2020 (deferred)  
   f. Catalog copy approval – V. Harper at November 13th meeting  

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS  
   a. Workload - What constitutes workload? (deferred)  
      i. Data: current student, faculty, SFR, etc.  
      ii. Administrative (when assigned time is awarded)  
      iii. Schools have different workloads based on different criteria  
      iv. What constitutes a one WTU release?  
      v. Is release time consistent?  
      vi. Timeline for grant writing and approval  
   b. Types of concerns that should be directed to the Academic Senate (deferred)  
   c. Election - Nominations to fill recent vacancy  
      i. Academic Senate A&H representative - Call ends October 31, 5:00pm  
         (1) Full-time faculty member to complete M. Dhada’s term May 2018-2020  
   d. Appointments – Interest Responses and Recommendations  
      i. Academic Petitions Committee
(1) A&H Faculty Member for a three-year term, May 2018-May 2021. No candidates. This committee effects students and needs to get on track. D. Boschini will send a message directly to the A & H Chairs.

ii. Canvas Pilot Planning Committee
(1) A & H – Teresa Fernandez-Ulloa appointed
(1) BPA – EC to get School Election Chair’s help to locate knowledge of best practices in software migration process, especially conducting a gap analysis.
(1) NSME – Andreas Gebauer appointed.
(1) SSE – Patrick O’Neil appointed.

iii. UPRC - EC selection of
(1) Tenured Faculty Representative to a two-year term – Danielle Solano appointed.

iv. Transportation Committee – appointed by the Academic Senate
(1) Faculty Member for a two-year term 2018-2020 – Jeff Moffit appointed.

e. 50th Anniversary Planning (deferred)
f. Committee Structure – 40 committees - (committee proliferation) (deferred)
g. Staff member selection process to various service opportunities
h. Hiring Procedures (deferred)

8. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING NOVEMBER 8, 2018** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   - Announcements
   - UA Presentation – V. Martin
   - Consent Agenda
   - New Business
   - Old Business
   - RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy - Second Reading
   - RES 181904 Ombudsperson - Second Reading
   - RES 181905 Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution * - Second Reading

9. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

   * Changes to the University Handbook
Earlier this term, the Advising Leadership Team (ALT) began meeting after being reorganized by the Provost as part of the Campus Conversation on Advising. One of the first items that occupied the ALT’s agenda related to the existing catalog policy relating to retroactive medical withdrawal. The ALT sought to revise the current form relating to retroactive medical withdrawal, upon further discussion the ALT concluded that this item is in the purview of the faculty and the Academic Senate. Therefore, the Advising Leadership Team (ALT) respectfully asks that the Academic Senate review catalog language as it relates to medical withdrawals. We ask that the Senate review the below rationale and recommendation.

Rationale
Currently, the retroactive medical withdrawal form requires that the student, whom is having a medical crisis, to acquire faculty signatures from each course faculty member. Often, the student need to repeat a narrative of trauma, illness, or pain to each faculty member. Advisors have noted how difficult and painful this process can be for the student.

Recommendation
The ALT believes that the catalog and respective form should only require the signature of the advisor (Faculty or Professional) and the Associate Dean.

Sincerely,
Members of the Advising Leadership Team

Mark Evans
Vernon Harper
Tanya Boone-Holladay
Vikash Lakhani
Todd McBride
Liora Gubkin-Malicdem
Yvette Morones
Lisa Zuzuarte
Lori Paris
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate recommend that the President approve the attached revised “Policy on the Formation and Modification of Academic Departments: Principles and Procedures.”

RESOLVED: that this policy be posted on the website of Academic Planning and be incorporated into the Academic Planning Manual.

Rationale: The revisions to this policy were recommended by Budget and Planning and reviewed by Academic Affairs, and Faculty Affairs as well as by the Executive Committee. The revisions were adopted to clarify the role of the Senate in decisions to form new academic departments. Placing the policy in the Academic Planning Manual and posting it on the Academic Planning Website locates it within academic planning procedures and makes it available to all engaged in academic planning including formation of new academic units.

Distribution List:
President Mitchell
Provost Coley

Approved by the Academic Senate on October 24, 2013
Sent to the President for approval on November 4, 2013
Approved by the President on November 14, 2013
PRINCIPLES:

1. Requests to change the structure of a department should usually emerge from the concerns of the faculty and/or the dean directly involved. However, other individuals of the university may suggest that the faculty examine the effectiveness of the present departmental structure.

2. A new department may be formed as an entirely new entity, as a result of dividing an existing department, or as a result of combining two or more existing departments.

3. If the change affects more than one school, then more than one dean will be involved, so any references to a dean in this policy statement imply more than one dean if the situation so indicates.

4. Collegiality is the fundamental principle upon which the governance of the university rests. At any point in this process, any of the parties involved may consult informally with anyone in the campus community whose contribution seems desirable.

PROCEDURES

1. If someone suggests a change in departmental structure, the relevant faculty, the appropriate academic dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs should engage in considerable informal discussion. These people should solicit advice from other potentially interested parties, possibly including faculty in other departments or schools as well as the Academic Senate.

2. When informal discussions appear to have elicited all of the relevant issues and concerns, the faculty who wish to form the new department should write a proposal that addresses the following points:
   (a) How and why the change will better serve institutional needs;
   (b) How the change will affect the governance and delivery of curriculum and degree programs (Academic Affairs);
(c) How the change will affect recruitment, appointment, review, promotion and tenure of faculty, as well as faculty assignments and workload (Faculty Affairs);

(d) How the change will affect the need for financial support, including operating expenses, equipment, facilities and staffing (Budget and Planning);

(e) What impact the plan will have on Information Resources (Library books and subscriptions, computing equipment and support) and what is the source for additional funding; and

(f) A plan for effecting the change.

3. The proposal must pass through the following levels of review in the order indicated. The individual(s) at each level shall review the proposal, consult with others as seems appropriate, and then either forward it to the next level with a positive recommendation or return it to the previous level with a written explanation of the reasons for withholding approval:

(a) The appropriate academic dean, who shall inform any potentially interested faculty and invite their consultation;

(b) The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall inform the Council of Deans and invite their consultation;

(c) The Academic Senate, through the Executive Committee, shall forward this proposal to Standing Committees or to the Full Senate at its reasoned discretion which shall follow its usual procedures involving committee recommendations before taking final action; and

(d) The President, who shall inform the Cabinet and invite their consultation before delivering his/her final decision regarding the proposal.

4. If the proposal fails to receive approval at any level, those involved may choose to revise and resubmit it.

APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE APPROVED BY PRESIDENT
ARCINIEGA APRIL 10, 1997 MAY 5, 1997
TITLE MODIFIED BY THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE 2012
PROCEDURES MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE OCTOBER 24, 2013
Approved by the President on November 14, 2013
FROM: Jacquelyn Kegley, Academic Senate Chair

TO: Jorge Talamantes, Chair Academic Affairs Committee
    Aaron Hegde, Chair Budget and Planning Committee
    Randy Schultz, Chair Faculty Affairs Committee

DATE: September 17, 2013

cc: Tawnya Walker, Academic Senate Administrative Support Coordinator

The Academic Senate has been asked to review the current policy on The Formation of New Departments: Principles and Procedures. Also, consider a possible revision to include an expedited section.

Please take up this matter with your committee and get back to me with your recommendation. If your recommendation requires Senate action, please prepare a resolution and the rationale for the resolution.
To: Dr. Jackie Kegley, Chair, Academic Senate  
CC: Executive Committee, Academic Senate  
From: Dr. S. Aaron Hegde, Chair, Budget and Planning Committee  
Re: Formation of New Departments Policy  

Dear Dr. Kegley,

The Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) met on Oct 3, 2013 to discuss the matter of the Formation of New Department Policies and Procedures. Upon deliberation, the committee would like to recommend the following actions:

1. There is no need for a separate expedited process for the formation of new departments. The existing structure allows for the process to be completed in a reasonable matter of time.
2. A few editorial changes be made to the existing document, approved by President Arciniega on May 5, 1997. Under Procedures 2., the BPC recommends that phrases following statements 2(b), 2(c), and 2(d), namely “Academic Affairs”, “Faculty Affairs”, and “Budget and Planning” respectively, be stricken from the document. Their presence only leads to confusion as they seem to imply the respective sub-committees of the Academic Senate that would be charged to consider those issues. However, as the process is listed, this would imply that the standing sub-committees would consider such matters even before they were sent to the Academic Senate, which is contrary to the usual procedures of the Academic Senate.
3. This policy be made available within the handbook.
THE FORMATION AND MODIFICATION OF ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS: PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

PRINCIPLES:
1. Requests to change the structure of a department should usually emerge from the concerns of the faculty and/or the dean directly involved. However, other individuals of the university may suggest that the faculty examine the effectiveness of the present departmental structure.

2. A new department may be formed as an entirely new entity, as a result of dividing an existing department, or as a result of combining two or more existing departments.

3. If the change affects more than one school, then more than one dean will be involved, so any references to a dean in this policy statement imply more than one dean if the situation so indicates.

4. Collegiality is the fundamental principle upon which the governance of the university rests. At any point in this process, any of the parties involved may consult informally with anyone in the campus community whose contribution seems desirable.

PROCEDURES
1. If someone suggests a change in departmental structure, the relevant faculty, the appropriate academic dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs should engage in considerable informal discussion. These people should solicit advice from other potentially interested parties, possibly including faculty in other departments or schools as well as the Academic Senate.

2. When informal discussions appear to have elicited all of the relevant issues and concerns, the faculty who wish to form the new department should write a proposal that addresses the following points:
   (a) How and why the change will better serve institutional needs;
   (b) How the change will affect the governance and delivery of curriculum and degree programs.
(c) How the change will affect recruitment, appointment, review, promotion and tenure of faculty, as well as faculty assignments and workload (Faculty Affairs);
(d) How the change will affect the need for financial support, including operating expenses, equipment, facilities and staffing (Budget and Planning);
(e) What impact the plan will have on Information Resources (Library books and subscriptions, computing equipment and support) and what is the source for additional funding; and
(f) A plan for effecting the change.

3. The proposal must pass through the following levels of review in the order indicated. The individual(s) at each level shall review the proposal, consult with others as seems appropriate, and then either forward it to the next level with a positive recommendation or return it to the previous level with a written explanation of the reasons for withholding approval:
(a) The appropriate academic dean, who shall inform any potentially interested faculty and invite their consultation;
(b) The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall inform the Council of Deans and invite their consultation;
(c) The Academic Senate, through the Executive Committee, shall forward this proposal to Standing Committees or to the Full Senate at its reasoned discretion which shall follow its usual procedures involving committee recommendations before taking final action; and
(d) The President, who shall inform the Cabinet and invite their consultation before delivering his/her final decision regarding the proposal.

4. If the proposal fails to receive approval at any level, those involved may choose to revise and resubmit it.
I. Purpose & Scope of Policy

It is the policy of California State University, Bakersfield to provide equal access and reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities to participate in any program, service, or opportunity provided by the campus; and, to comply with applicable laws related to service animals and emotional support animals for persons with disabilities, including any such person studying at, employed at, and/or visiting the CSU Bakersfield campus. This policy provides the rules and regulations concerning employees, students, affiliates, and visitors bringing service animals onto University property and emotional support animals into University Housing and/or the workplace.

II. Definitions

a. Assistance Animal: Any animal, including services animals, that is specifically designated by a qualified medical provider as affording an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling, provided there is a nexus between the individual’s disability and the assistance the animal provides.

b. Emotional Support Animal: An Emotional Support Animal is prescribed to an individual by a licensed health care practitioner to provide emotional support, companionship, and/or comfort to persons with disabilities who have a disability-related need for such support in their home or, or for employees or students with on-campus jobs, in his or her work area so long as the animal helps them complete their job better. An emotional support animal is not trained to assist a person with a disability with activities of daily living, but rather its role is to live with equal access, use and enjoyment of residence.

c. Handler: A person with a disability who is the owner and user of a service animal, assistance animal, or emotional support animal, or the owner or person bringing an animal onto university property.

d. Pet: A pet is any animal kept for ordinary use and companionship unrelated to disability. A pet is not considered a service animal or an emotional support animal, and therefore, it is not covered by this policy. Student Housing & Residence Life has a “No Pets” policy for students living in campus housing.

e. Service Animal: A dog or miniature horse specifically trained to do work or perform tasks for the benefit of and to accommodate the functional needs of an individual with a disability. This includes an animal that is in training to become a service animal. A service animal is not required to wear a special coat, collar, or harness and is not required to have certification or training papers.

f. University Property: These include the interior and exterior campus areas of the CSU Bakersfield campus. This definition includes buildings (including residence

---

1 Adopted from UC Hastings College of Law Emotional Support Animals Policy
2 As defined in CSU Executive Order 1108.
halls), structures (including parking structures), parking lots, and outdoor areas owned, leased or rented by the university or one of its auxiliaries.

III. Policy

a. Service Animals

CSU Bakersfield welcomes the presence of trained service animals assisting people with disabilities on its campus in areas open to the public, and consistent with the provisions of this policy and applicable law.

Members of the university community and visitors are prohibited from interfering in any way with a service animal, or duties it performs. Federal law does not require the individual to provide documentation that an animal has been trained as a service animal. The University may, however, ask two questions: 1) Is the animal required because of a disability; and, 2) What work, or task, has the animal been trained to perform?

In accordance with federal law, use of a service animal in university facilities and on university campuses, including attendance at a campus-sponsored concert or special events, may not be challenged except if the use of the animal poses a direct threat to the health or safety of other persons, or if the presence of the service animal will result in a fundamental alteration of the service, program, or activity involved.

b. Emotional Support Animal

Emotional Support Animals may be permitted in CSU Bakersfield housing on a case-by-case basis as determined upon recommendation by The Office of Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) and final approval from Student Housing & Residence Life or with the authorization of the Office of Human Resources as appropriate, for employees or students with on-campus job.

In accordance with the Fair Housing Act, a student may keep an emotional support animal in campus housing as a reasonable accommodation if:

- The student has a disability;
- The animal is necessary to afford the student with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling; and
- There is an identifiable relationship or nexus between the disability and the assistance the animal provides.

Accommodation must be reasonable and the Fair Housing Act does not require the University to permit animals that pose a direct threat to the health and safety of others; would cause substantial physical damage to the property of others; would pose an undue financial and administrative burden; or would fundamentally alter that nature of the University’s operations.
Emotional Support Animals are not permitted in food service areas including, but not limited to, the Student Union, Runner Café, and other campus dining vendors.

Procedures for approval of emotional support animals into student housing is described in Section IV, “Procedures”, of this policy.

c. Responsibilities of Handlers

For students in University housing, a service animal or emotional support animal must be personally supervised by the handler, and the handler must always retain full control of the animal while on university property. A service animal or emotional support animal must reside in the handler’s assigned bedroom area, behind a closed door. For employees and students with on-campus jobs, the animal must remain in the individual’s assigned work area with the employee present, or under the direct supervision of the handler.

Animals may not be left unattended at any time on university property, except for service, assistance, or emotional support animals left in the handler’s university residence by the handler. Assistance, service animals and emotional support animals may not be left overnight in university housing to be cared for by any individual other than the handler. If the handler is to be absent from his/her/their residence overnight or longer, the animal must accompany the handler. The handler is responsible for ensuring that the assistance animal, service animal or emotional support animal is contained, as appropriate, when the handler is not present during the day while attending classes or other activities outside of the residence. Such an animal left for longer than a reasonable period may be impounded by the university police. A handler who leaves his or her animal unattended for longer than a reasonable period will receive one warning, and if the behavior occurs a second time, the handler will be required to remove the animal from campus and prohibited from bringing the animal back onto university property.

Animals may not be tied or tethered to any university property, including but not limited to buildings, railings, bike racks, fire hydrants, fences, sign posts, benches and trees, and may not be allowed to run loose anywhere on campus.

Animals must not be allowed to disrupt or interfere with university activities including, but not limited to, teaching, research, service or administrative activities. If the animal is unruly or disruptive, or if the handler fails to maintain control of the animal, the handler must regain control immediately or remove the animal from the university property. If the improper behavior continues or happens more than once, the handler may be prohibited from bringing the animal onto university property to be determined on a case-by-case basis by the University Police Department, the Director of Safety and Risk, SSD, ADA/Section 504 Compliance Officer and Student Housing & Residence Life
Dogs must be licensed in accordance with county regulations and wear a vaccination tag.

The handler is responsible for cleaning up any waste created by the animal and for all costs related to damages created by the animal. This includes fees for clean-up and disposal of animal waste or replacement and repair of university or other individuals’ assets, including grounds, personal property and improvements. If the handler fails to clean up after the animal or the animal causes damage to property, the handler may be prohibited from bringing the animal onto university property.

The handler is responsible for the health and well-being of the animal, including grooming, cleanliness, and medical care.

Handlers are responsible for the evacuation of animals in an emergency and university will not be responsible for providing evacuation of any animals.

IV. Procedures

a. Employees Requesting Permission for Service Animals or Emotional Support Animals

i. Service Animals. Employees, affiliates and all others performing work for the university (including student workers) who bring service animals onto university property need not request the university’s permission to allow the presence of the service animal on university property but are requested to notify the Office of Human Resources of the need for a service animal’s presence in advance of reporting for work with the animal. The individual may be asked whether the animal is needed because of a disability, and what work or task the animal has been trained to perform. If the individual needs any other accommodations in the workplace, documentation of the disability and a request for accommodations must be made through Human Resources.

ii. Emotional Support Animals. Employees who wish to bring Emotional Support Animals onto university property as an accommodation for a disability must request the university’s permission. Permission will be granted only as an accommodation for a documented disability and upon proof that the emotional support animal helps the employee perform his or her job, and must be arranged through Human Resources in advance prior to bringing the animal onto university property.
b. Students Requesting Permission for Service Animals or Emotional Support Animals

i. Service Animals. Students who wish to bring service animals onto university property need not request the university’s permission to allow the presence of a service animal on university property. The student may be asked whether the animal is needed because of a disability, and what work or task the animal has been trained to perform. If the student needs any other accommodations while attending the university, documentation of the disability and a request for accommodations must be made to SSD.

ii. Service Animals in Housing:

1. Approval from Student Housing & Residence Life: Students must notify and get approval from Student Housing & Residence Life prior to bringing the animal into campus housing. Only in consultation with and recommendation from SSD, may Student Housing & Residence Life deny a specific service animal (not an entire species of animal) that actually poses a direct threat to the health and safety of others; would cause substantial physical damage to the property of others; would pose an undue financial and/or administrative burden; or would fundamentally alter the nature of Student Housing & Residence Life’s operations.

2. Notice to Campus Community: SSD and Student Housing & Residence Life may need to provide notice to certain members of the campus community living or working in close proximity to the animal. This information will be limited to notice about the animal’s presence as an accommodation for a student with disability and will not include information about the student’s disability or the specific reason the animal is required. Such notice will only be provided to the specific individuals who have a legitimate need to know for health and safety purposes.

3. Student Housing & Residence Life Addendum: Once a service animal is approved, the resident will be asked to complete and sign a Housing License Addendum that outlines the guidelines for animal care and behavior and establishes the owner’s responsibility for the animal and, as appropriate, an Assistance/Emotional Support Animal Roommate/Housemate Agreement. See Attachment A.

iii. Emotional Support Animals. Students who wish to bring Emotional Support Animals onto university property as an accommodation for a disability must request the university’s permission. Permission will be
granted only as an accommodation for a documented disability and must be arranged in advance prior to bringing the animal onto university property. For students with on-campus jobs, emotional support animals may be permitted in the student’s work area so long as the student also provides documentation from a licensed health care professional that the emotional support animal helps the student do his or her job better. The accommodation must be arranged with Human Resources in advance prior to bringing the animal onto university property.

Prior to bringing an Emotional Support Animal into student housing, students must these steps to obtain proper approval:

1. Register with SSD: In order to make the determination that preserves the student’s confidentiality, the student must register with SSD. SSD will then participate in an interactive process with the student to determine whether the request represents a reasonable accommodation for a documented disability and should be granted.

2. Approval from Student Housing & Residence Life: Students who are approved to keep an emotional support animal in their campus housing as a reasonable accommodation for a disability are requested to notify and receive approval from Student Housing & Residence Life, including providing any requisite documentation it requires, prior to bringing the animal into student housing. In accordance with the Fair Housing Act, a student may keep an emotional support animal in campus housing as a reasonable accommodation if: the student has a disability; the animal is necessary to afford the student with a disability an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling; and there is an identifiable relationship or nexus between the disability and the assistance the animal provides. Only in consultation with and recommendation from Services to Students with Disabilities Office, may Student Housing & Residence Life deny a specific emotional support animal (not an entire species of animal) that actually poses a direct threat to the health and safety of others; would cause substantial physical damage to the property of others; would pose an undue financial and/or administrative burden; or would fundamentally alter the nature of Student Housing & Residence Life’s operations.

3. Notice to Campus Community: SSD and Student Housing & Residence Life may need to provide notice to certain members of the campus community living or working in close proximity to the animal. This information will be limited to notice about the animal’s presence as an accommodation for a student with
disability and will not include information about the student’s
disability or the specific reason the animal is required. Such notice
will only be provided to the specific individuals who have a
legitimate need to know for health and safety purposes.

4. Student Housing & Residence Life Addendum: Once an emotional
animal is approved, the resident will be asked to complete and sign
a Housing License Addendum that outlines the guidelines for
animal care and behavior and establishes the owner’s responsibility
for the animal and, as appropriate, an Assistance/Emotional
Support Animal Roommate/Housemate Agreement. See
Attachment A.