



Academic Senate: Executive Committee

AGENDA

TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 2026

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 AM

Location: BPA Conference Room 134 and virtual.

Zoom Link: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/88091986667?pwd=GOSakqXvulfaZihtNxTsAFBYwWqAJs.1&jst=1>

Members: M. Danforth (Chair), D. Solano (Vice-Chair), D. Thien (Provost; excused), C. Lam (ASCSU Senator), N. Michieka (ASCSU Senator), T. Tsantsoulas (AAC Chair; excused), L. Kirstein (AS&SS Chair), A. Grombly (BPC Chair), Z. Zenko (FAC Chair), and K. Van-Grinsven (Senate Analyst).

Guest: President Harper.

1. Call to Order
2. Announcements and Information
 - A. President Harper (**Time Certain: 10:10 am**)
 - B. Exceptional Service Award question
 - C. Spring 2026 Guests
 - i. Senate Guests
 - a. March 26 – D. Cantrell, Enrollment report
 - b. April 30 – Spring Reports
 - i. FTLC, GECCo, UPRC, URC (if needed)
 - ii. Written report as well as oral (?)
 - c. May 7 – Senate Organizational Meeting
 - i. Faculty Award recommendations from FHAC
 - d. Early Fall 2026
 - i. GRaSP, FAR (oral reports/presentations)
 - e. Unscheduled:
 - i. Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR)
 - ii. WSCUC Logistics – E. Adams (*provide updates to Senate*)
3. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:05 am**)
4. Approval of Minutes
 - A. March 10, 2026 (handout)

B. March 17, 2026 (handout)

5. **Continued Items (Time Certain: 10:40 am)**

A. AS Referral Log (see BOX folder; handout)

- i. AAC (T. Tsantsoulas)
- ii. AS&SS (L. Kirstein)
- iii. BPC (A. Grombly)
- iv. FAC (Z. Zenko)

B. Provost Report (D. Thien)

- i. Updates/ Status:
 - a. Academic Administrator Searches
 - b. Academic Administrator Reviews
- ii. Additional Items

C. RES 252624 – Senate Bylaws Revisions- Sections III and V. Expressions of the Senate – EC (draft in progress)

D. Calendar Committee – A. Grombly, BPC Chair (handout)

E. Planning for April Town Hall to discuss Instructional Budget Model

- i. Friday, April 24, 2026; 9 – 10:30 am; HUM 1109 and virtual

F. Development of a Senate Recording Retention Policy for recordings that are intended to develop Minutes – EC (HOLD; draft in progress)

G. Project Proposal: Handbook and Bylaws Summer Working Group – EC (handout)

H. ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Representative term (HOLD for Fall)

I. Policies on approval of Course Coding Changes (CS Numbers) (HOLD; pending data)

J. Faculty advising and CSUB Advising Council (HOLD)

K. ASI Resolution: SB 104 ASI and Shared Governance (HOLD; pending ASI's revisions)

6. **New Discussion Items (Time Certain: 11:00 am)**

A. Elections and Appointments- D. Solano

- i. In Progress: At-Large Elected Positions
- ii. Develop formal procedures for appointments for the CSU Fong and Fetterly Award (HOLD; pending FHAC discussion)

B. Research Misconduct Policy (handout)

C. New Program Proposal- Master of Science in Applied Analytics – AAC and BPC (handout)

D. Faculty Legislative Liaison (handout)

E. State Legislation

- i. ASCSU Legislative Positions – C. Lam
- ii. [AB-2693](#) Independent Doctoral Programs
- iii. [AB-2606](#) Oil and Gas Demonstration Zones
- iv. [AB-2301](#) Community colleges: Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program
- v. [AB-1852](#) Kern Medical Education Authority

F. Staff Representative on Senate (handout)

- G. Chair/Director of the Year (handout)
- H. Academic Tuition/ Scholarship Waiver (handout)
- I. Items from Advising Council (handout)
- J. Summer Retreat agenda and logistics
 - i. Date selected after the incoming subcommittee chairs are elected at the Organizational Meeting on May 7
 - ii. Agenda Items:
 - a. Carry-over business
 - b. Interfolio

7. Agenda Items for Senate (Time Certain: 11:15 am)

Academic Senate Meeting – Spring 2026
 Thursday, March 26, 2026
 Agenda
 10:00 AM – 11:30 AM

Location: Dezember Leadership and Development Center, Room 409-411

Zoom Link: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/84669370314?pwd=gmLoywwMxQR4k7G0hUhv25vs0N8xr8.1>

Senate Members: Chair M. Danforth, Vice-Chair D. Solano, CSU Senator C. Lam, CSU Senator N. Michieka, AH Senator T. Tsantsoulas, AH Senator M. Naser, BPA Senator D. Wu, BPA Senator S. Sarma, NSME Senator L. Kirstein, NSME Senator A. Stokes, SSE Senator Z. Zenko, SSE Senator S. Roberts (alt. for Spring 2026 K. Henderson), AV Senator K. Holloway (virtual), At-Large Senator H. He, At-Large Senator A. Grombly, At-Large Senator A. Hays, At-Large Senator A. Lauer, At-Large Senator T. Salisbury, At-Large Senator R. Dugan, Lecturer Electorate Senator D. Horn, Senator H. Gonzalez – Staff Representative, Senator E. Reed – ASI Executive Vice-President, VP AA & Provost D. Thien, Senator J. Dong – Dean Representative, and Senate Analyst K. Van Grinsven (excused).

Guests: President Harper and D. Cantrell.

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Tejon Tribal Land Acknowledgement
 - b. [Robert’s Rules of Order](#)
 - c. [Interruption Statement](#)
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - a. March 12, 2026 (handout)
- III. Announcements and Information
 - a. President’s Report – V. Harper **(Time Certain: 10:10 AM)**

- b. Enrollment Report – VP for SASEM D. Cantrell (**Time Certain: 10:20 AM**) (handout)
- c. Elections and Appointments – D. Solano (handout)
- d. Upcoming Events:
 - i. April 8 – President’s Open Forum
 - 1. 9 am; Student Union MPR
 - ii. April 24 – Town Hall: Instructional Budget Model
 - 1. 9-10:30 am; HUM 1109 and virtual.

IV. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:05 AM**)

V. Reports

- a. ASI Report – Senator Reed
- b. Provost’s Report – D. Thien (**Time Certain: 10:35 AM**) (handout)
- c. ASCSU Report – Senators Lam and Michieka (deferred)
- d. Staff Report – Senator Gonzalez (handout)
- e. Committee Reports:
 - i. Executive Committee – Vice-Chair Solano (handout)
 - ii. Standing Committees:
 - 1. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) – Senator Hayes (handout)
 - 2. Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS) – Senator Kirstein (handout)
 - 3. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) – Senator Grombly (handout)
 - 4. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – Senator Zenko (handout)
- f. CFA Report – T. Salisbury, CFA Bakersfield

VI. Resolutions (**Time Certain: 10:40 AM**)

- a. Consent Agenda: No items.
- b. Old Business:
 - i. RES 252635 – New Sociology Minor in Migration, Population and Globalization – AAC and BPC (handout) *Ready for 2nd reading? Any updates from 1st reading?
 - ii. RES 252636 – New Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science – AAC and BPC (handout) *Ready for 2nd reading? Any updates from 1st reading?
 - iii. RES 252632 - Required Unit RTP Criteria Elements and Guidance on Unit RTP Criteria Revision – Handbook Changes – FAC (handout)
 - iv. RES 252633 - Clarifying Faculty Workload, RSCA Expectations, and Service Responsibilities – FAC (handout)
 - v. RES 252634- Establishing a Preferred Non-Contractual Academic Honorific Title “Senior Lecturer”– Handbook Change – FAC (handout)
 - vi. RES 252637- Academic Standing Policy Update: Summer Disqualification Removal – AAC, AS&SS (handout) *Ready for 2nd reading? Any updates from 1st reading?

- vii. RES 252627 – Policy on Use of Informational Banner Space in Canvas – AAC, AS&SS (HOLD) *Any updates?
 - viii. RES 252622 – Academic Advising Structure Is an Academic Endeavor – AAC, AS&SS (HOLD) * Any updates?
- c. New Business:
- i. RES 252628 – Inventory of Automated Decision-Making Software for the Classroom – AS&SS (handout)
 - ii. RES 252629 – Academic, Curricular, and Student Support Software Governance – AS&SS (handout)
 - iii. RES 252643 – Policies & Procedures for Establishing New Schools – EC (handout)
 - iv. RES 252644 – Guidance on WPAF Contents and Timelines for Review – Handbook Change- FAC (handout)
 - v. RES 252645 – Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty – Handbook Change - FAC (handout)
 - vi. RES 252639 – Program Name Change from a Bachelor of Arts in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to a Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) – AAC, BPC (handout) *Not Ready, BPC/AAC still reviewing?
 - vii. RES 252640 – Department Name Change from Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS) to Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) – AAC, BPC (handout) *Not Ready, BPC/AAC still reviewing?
 - viii. RES 252638 – New Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering – AAC, BPC (handout) *Not Ready, BPC still reviewing.
 - ix. RES 252641 – Readmission Requirements Following Academic Disqualification - AAC, AS&SS (handout) - *Not Ready; Need review by AS&SS.
 - x. RES 252642 – Post-Enrollment Requirement Checking (PERC) Timing Alignment for Prerequisite Verification and Enrollment Stability- AAC, AS&SS (handout) - *Not Ready; Need review by AS&SS.

VII. Open Forum **(Time Certain: 11:15 AM)**

VIII. Adjournment

8. Adjournment



ACADEMIC SENATE
CSU BAKERSFIELD

Date: March 18, 2026
To: Deborah Thien, Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs
From: Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair
c: Debbie Boschini, AVP for Faculty Affairs
Academic Senate Executive Committee
Katherine Van Grinsve, Academic Senate Analyst
Subject: Re: Handbook and Bylaws Summer Working Group – Project Proposal

The Academic Senate Executive Committee is proposing the creation of the Handbook and Bylaws Summer 2026 Working Group, who will be tasked with reviewing and updating the University Handbook and Bylaws so both governing documents are up to date regarding recent campus re-organization and restructuring and all approved resolutions.

Proposed Membership:

	Name	Department
AVP for Faculty Affairs	Debbie Boschini	Office of the Provost
Academic Senate Chair	Melissa Danforth	CEE/CS
Summer Senate Representative	Danielle Solano	Chemistry & Biochemistry
<i>Faculty Affairs Committee Chairs (Past and/or Present)</i>		
2025-2026 FAC Chair	Zachary Zenko	Kinesiology
	TBD	
<i>Two (2) At-Large Faculty Representatives (appointed by EC)</i>		
	TBD	
	TBD	

Proposed Budget: \$11, 250 of additional Summer Senate MOUs needed

DR. MELISSA DANFORTH, CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy. • Mail Stop: 20 BDC • Bakersfield, CA 93311

Breakdown:

- There are seven (7) members total
 - Five (5) members are **not** under Summer MOUs
 - Two (2) members do not require Summer MOUs
 - The Senate Chair is already under a Summer MOU
 - The AVP for Faculty Affairs is under contract for 12 months.
- Estimated 22.5 hours of work per person x \$100 per hour = \$2,250 per Academic Year member
- \$2,250 per Academic Year member x Five (5) Academic Year members = \$11,250

Estimate of hours of work:

- Estimated time for individual work:
105 hours (minimum) / 7 people = 15 hours per person (minimum approx.)
- Estimate of time needed for group meetings:
 - At least 5 meetings at 1.5 hour each meeting = 7.5 hours (minimum approx.)

Further Breakdown of the project scope and hours of work needed:

- A. Changes to Bylaws and Handbook that were approved by previous resolution but never posted (e.g. clarifying the edition of Robert's Rules of Order). (approx. 15-20 hours)
 - a. ***Note:** Attach revision log.
 - b. Appendix D changes
- B. Updating Schools to Colleges (approx. 5-6 hours)
- C. Updating all references to quarters (approx. 7-8 hours)
 - a. Q2S Lingered Issues: Deadline issue for stating one's intent to seek promotion to full professor
- D. Standing Committees Composition: (approx. 4-5 hours)
 1. Clarify Handbook language about staff positions being non-MPP staff
 2. AS&SS Composition: Associate Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies is not actually listed in the bylaws as an ex-officio member of AS&SS.
 3. Update language for administrator positions to allow for designee
 4. Review and update the Standing Committees ex-officio positions due to the re-organization of university
 5. AAC Composition: Clarify the catalog and PeopleSoft positions with the SASEM re-organization.
- E. Review committees listed (Handbook 107) (approx. 15 hours)
 - a. Finding listed committees that do not exist and/or that have changed their names. For example, the Budget Advisory Committee, University Strategic Planning Committee, University Information Resources Council, etc.
 - b. Public Affairs Committee: Committee in handbook but not bylaws (Handbook 107.1. Standing Committees of the Academic Senate). Discussion on if we want to create the committee or not.

- c. Curriculum Assessment Council (Handbook 201.6)
 - i. Director of Assessment: Review position (Handbook 105.2 and 305.6.1)
- d. Council of Academic Deans: Review Composition and name (Handbook 105.2)
- F. If not addressed by the end of Spring 2026; Referral 2025-2026 22 President's Cabinet Structure and Officers of the University. (approx. 10 hours)
 - a. Update sections 103.2.3 and 104 of the University Handbook to be consistent with the current structure of the President's Cabinet, President's direct reports, and other officers of the University.
 - b. Update position titles in 309.9 Interim Academic Administrator Appointments (Handbook 309.9)
- G. Update TEAC Description: Currently lists old college names (H&SS, SOE, and NSM) (Handbook 201.5) (1 hour)
- H. Re-Structuring: (approx. 10 hours)
 - a. Update all references to the AVP of Enrollment Management- distinguish the VP of Strategic Enrollment Management from the new AVP of Enrollment Management
 - b. Update reference to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs- association with Academic Advising and review other duties (Handbook 104.2.1)
 - c. Appendix D Student Grievances; still lists Associate Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies (possible referral?)
 - d. Need to identify any similar issues due to the restructuring.
- I. Bylaws Section IV.A.4 Annual reports from committees- limit to specific committees? (approx. 2-4 hours)
- J. Section 103.1 Statewide Organization Structure still states 23 CSU campuses- remove number? (approx. 1 hour)
- K. Update the Committee on Academic Requirements and Standards (CARS) to the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) - referenced in various places in Handbook (approx. 4-5 hour)
- L. Updated all references to "Services for Students with Disabilities" to the new name, "Center for Accessibility and Essential Needs." Review 303.1.5 Course Syllabi, Appendix K - Instructional Materials, etc. (waiting on J. Watkins; approx. 4 hours)
- M. Updates to Handbook Appendices B and C to address inconsistencies (approx. 5 -10 hours)
- N. Student Ombudsperson (Appendix D changes, add definition of Student Ombudsperson (approx. 4 hours)
 - a. More information is needed from E. Poole-Callahan, Dean of Students and Maria Palaiologou (current Student Ombudsperson)

Total hours of work needed: approximately a minimum of 105 hours.

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Isabel Sumaya
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 7:46 AM
To: Melissa Danforth
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: RE: Research Misconduct Policy Senate Res & Email Communication
Attachments: Overview of 2025-26 PHS RM Policy Updates.docx; CSUB Policy on Research Misconduct Original + Track Changes 2026.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Melissa:

My apologies. This one slipped off my to do list. Attached is a summary of the needed updates and the original policy with the track changes.

Thank you so much!

Isabel

Isabel C. Sumaya, Ph.D.
Associate Vice President, Grants Research and Sponsored Programs
Research Ethics Review Coordinator (RERC), IACUC
Director, NIH U-RISE Program

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway, 24 DDH
Bakersfield, Ca. 93311-1099
isumaya@csub.edu

From: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 9:50 AM
To: Isabel Sumaya <isumaya@csub.edu>
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: RE: Research Misconduct Policy Senate Res & Email Communication

Hi Isabel,

Katie and I were working on the Senate agenda and realized we hadn't heard back from GRaSP on this issue.

Do you have an updated policy with track changes that Senate can review? We're running short on time to complete items this term, as we have only 3 regular Senate meetings remaining, plus the organizational meeting in May.

Summary of Updates

The key changes of the PHS misconduct policy for 2025-26 updates include:

1. **Documentation Requirements:** Institutions must provide detailed reports at every stage of the investigation, including transcripts of interviews, to ensure transparency and fairness.
2. **Procedural Flexibility:** Institutions now have greater discretion in structuring inquiries and investigations, but they must maintain complete institutional records.
3. **Expanded Definitions:** The regulation includes over 25 clear definitions, refining terms like "intentionally," "knowingly," and "recklessly" to align with current research practices.
4. **Timelines:** The investigative window has been extended from 120 to 180 days, reflecting the complexities of modern research misconduct cases.

These changes aim to enhance the integrity of federally funded research and provide clearer guidelines for handling misconduct allegations.

****Effective Date:** The revised regulation will take effect on **January 1, 2026**, with institutions required to apply it to any allegations received on or after this date.

Overview

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Office of Research Integrity (ORI) has issued a revised version of the Public Health Service (PHS) Policies on Research Misconduct ([42 CFR Part 93](#)), which will go into effect on January 1, 2026. These changes are the most substantial updates since the regulation was first adopted in 2005 and reflect a broader effort to promote clarity, consistency, and due process in research misconduct proceedings.

What Is 42 CFR Part 93?

42 CFR Part 93 sets the federal standard for addressing research misconduct in PHS-supported research. The regulation defines research misconduct as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism (FFP) in proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting research. It also outlines:

- The procedural steps for assessing allegations;
- The rights and responsibilities of institutions and individuals;
- The roles of the Research Integrity Officer (RIO), institutional officials, and ORI;
- Timelines and expectations for conducting inquiries and investigations;
- The standards for reporting findings and preserving records.

This regulation, initially issued in 2005, has been central to ensuring the integrity of federally funded biomedical and behavioral research.

Why Are These Changes Happening Now?

Summary of Updates

Since its implementation, the research landscape has evolved. With increasing collaboration, data-sharing, and digitization, institutions now face more complex misconduct investigations. Additionally, past feedback from the research community revealed that the 2005 guidance left some ambiguity in how to apply the regulations, especially for smaller institutions or those with limited prior experience.

The revised 2024 version of 42 CFR Part 93, slated to take effect in 2026, addresses these gaps by:

- Expanding and clarifying key definitions;
- Extending allowable timelines for procedural steps;
- Strengthening confidentiality and retaliation protections;
- Formalizing expectations for documentation, admissions, and multi-institution coordination.

The overarching goal is to improve the process of responding to misconduct allegations by bringing more structure, clarity, and equity.

What's New in the template that was provided for us to use to make updates:

- **Clarity and Tone** – Much more readable and structured for practical use. Uses plain language and avoids excessive regulatory jargon. Optional sections are minimized and framed more clearly.
- **Document Organization** – Reorganized into clear sections.
- **Expanded Definitions** – Provides over 25 clear, well-defined terms, including “administrative record,” “intentionally,” “recklessly,” “institutional record,” and nuanced takes on “good faith” and “plagiarism” (now explicitly excludes self-plagiarism and authorship disputes).
- **Timelines and Process Requirements** – Inquiry = 90 days, Investigation = 180 days. These timelines align with modern case complexity and allow more realistic procedural windows.
- **Sequestration and Evidence Handling** – A more rigorous, proactive approach, requiring sequestration as soon as possible upon credible allegations and mandating an inventory of what was sequestered and when, with clear references to chain-of-custody expectations.
- **Respondent and Complainant Rights** – Stronger protections and clearer roles.
- **Emphasis on Recordkeeping** – Expands on expectations. Institutions must create and maintain an institutional record with indexes of all evidence reviewed, documentation of decisions not to investigate, descriptions of sequestered but unused evidence, and all transcripts, communications, and ORI notifications.
- **Provides Structured Guidance for Multi-Respondent and Multi-Institution Cases**
- **Handling Respondent Admissions** – Requires a written, signed admission detailing what misconduct occurred, how it was committed (e.g., knowingly, intentionally), and how it diverged from accepted practice. Institutions must notify ORI and receive approval before closing the case.

Institutional Responsibilities Under the New Guidance

The revised guidance underscores critical responsibilities for institutions receiving PHS funding. Institutions must:

- Maintain a publicly accessible policy consistent with 42 CFR Part 93;

Summary of Updates

- Provide safeguards for both complainants and respondents against retaliation;
- Ensure secure sequestration and preservation of research records;
- Appoint impartial committees or officials with relevant expertise to handle allegations;
- Document every stage of the misconduct proceeding in an organized institutional record;
- Notify ORI at specific intervals, especially when investigations are warranted or closed via respondent admissions.

Institutions are also expected to manage conflicts of interest at all levels of the misconduct process and submit investigation records to ORI, including transcripts, sequestered materials, final reports, and any appeals.



Policy on the Disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct

[This document contains substantial word-for-word excerpts of materials from sources cited in References (Section II)]

I. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that all research and/or scholarly activity conducted under the auspices of California State University Bakersfield (CSUB) (including the CSUB Auxiliary for Sponsored Programs Administration and the CSUB Foundation), adhere to the highest attainable ethical and moral standards, and comply with federal and other government (local and state) regulations, and guidelines required by external sponsors, governing the disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct.

II. References

1. Federal government regulations (42 CFR Part 93 (PHS: Public Health Service) and 45 CFR 689 (NSF: National Science Foundation)) and the California State University Office of the Chancellor (EO890 §3.3.4 and §3.4.1) require that each campus conducting research, instruction, and/or other sponsored work under grants, and other agreements with the Federal government must comply with the specific guidelines required by the external sponsor of a project with regard to the disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct and related matters, as applicable.
2. Other government (local and state) regulations and/or sponsor guidelines may require that each campus conducting research, instruction, and/or other sponsored work under grants, and other agreements with non-Federal governments and/or other external sponsors must comply with the specific guidelines required by the external sponsor of a project with regard to the disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct and related matters, as applicable.

3. Research misconduct policies at the City University of New York (2015), Boston University (2012), and California State University, Fresno, were used as references in the formulation of this policy.

III. Terms and Definitions

1. Accepted practices of the relevant research community. This term means those practices established by 42 CFR Part 93 and by PHS funding components, as well as commonly accepted professional codes or norms within the overarching community of researchers and institutions that apply for and receive PHS awards.

2. Administrative record. The administrative record comprises: the institutional record; any information provided by the respondent to ORI, including but not limited to the transcript of any virtual or in-person meetings under § 93.403(b) between the respondent and ORI, and correspondence between the respondent and ORI; any additional information provided to ORI while the case is pending before ORI; and any analysis or additional information generated or obtained by ORI. Any analysis or additional information generated or obtained by ORI will also be made available to the respondent.

3. Allegation means a disclosure of possible Research Misconduct through any means of communication and brought directly to the attention of an institutional or HHS official. The disclosure may be by written or oral statement or other communication.

4. Assessment. Assessment means a consideration of whether an allegation of research misconduct appears to fall within the definition of research misconduct; appears to involve PHS-supported biomedical or behavioral research, biomedical or behavioral research training, or activities related to that research or research training; and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified. The assessment only involves the review of readily accessible information relevant to the allegation

5. Auxiliary for Sponsored Program Administration means the CSUB Auxiliary for Sponsored Program Administration.

6. Complainant means a person who in good faith makes an Allegation of Research Misconduct.

7. Evidence. Evidence means anything offered or obtained during a research misconduct proceeding that tends to prove or disprove the existence of an alleged fact. Evidence includes documents, whether in hard copy or electronic form, information, tangible items, and testimony. means any document, tangible item, or testimony offered or obtained during a Research Misconduct Proceeding that tends to prove or disprove the existence of an alleged fact.

[8.5. Fabrication](#) means making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

[9.6. Falsification](#) means manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.

[10.7. Good faith.](#) *(a) Good faith* as applied to a complainant or witness, means having a [reasonable](#) belief in the truth of one's allegation or testimony that a reasonable person in the complainant's or witness's position could have, based on the information known to the complainant or witness at the time. An allegation or cooperation with a research misconduct proceeding is not in good faith if made with knowing or reckless disregard for information that would negate the allegation or testimony. *(b) Good faith* as applied to [an institution or](#) committee member means cooperating with the research misconduct proceeding by carrying out the duties assigned impartially for the purpose of helping an institution meet its responsibilities under this policy [\(or 42 CFR Part 93 for PHS funded projects\)](#). A committee member does not act in good faith if her/his acts or omissions on the committee are dishonest or influenced by personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved in the research misconduct proceeding.

[11.8. Inquiry](#) means preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding to determine whether an Allegation has substance and if an Investigation is warranted [or that meets the criteria and follows the procedures of 93.307 through 93.309 for PHS funded projects](#). An Investigation must be undertaken if an Inquiry determines an Allegation has substance.

[12. Inquiry Committee](#) means the committee consisting of two or more members of the faculty, together with such technical, administrative, or other staff as may be deemed appropriate, who are appointed by the Provost to conduct the Inquiry of an Allegation.

[913. Institution.](#) Institution means any person who applies for or receives PHS support for any activity or program that involves the conduct of biomedical or behavioral research, biomedical or behavioral research training, or activities related to that research or training. This includes, but is not limited to, colleges and universities, PHS intramural biomedical or behavioral research laboratories, research and development centers, national user facilities, industrial laboratories or other research institutes, research institutions, and independent researchers.

[14. Institutional Deciding Official.](#) Institutional Deciding Official means the institutional official who makes final determinations on allegations of research misconduct and any institutional actions. The same individual cannot serve as the Institutional Deciding Official and the Research Integrity Officer

15. Institutional member. Institutional member and members means an individual (or individuals) who is employed by, is an agent of, or is affiliated by contract or agreement with an institution. Institutional members may include, but are not limited to, officials, tenured and untenured faculty, teaching and support staff, researchers, research coordinators, technicians, postdoctoral and other fellows, students, volunteers, subject matter experts, consultants, or attorneys, or employees or agents of contractors, subcontractors, or sub-awardees.

16. Institutional record. The institutional record comprises: (a) The records that the institution compiled or generated during the research misconduct proceeding, except records the institution did not consider or rely on. These records include but are not limited to (1) documentation of the assessment as required by § 93.306(c); (2) if an inquiry is conducted, the inquiry report and all records (other than drafts of the report) considered or relied on during the inquiry, including, but not limited to, research records and the transcripts of any transcribed interviews conducted during the inquiry, information the respondent provided to the institution, and the documentation of any decision not to investigate as required by § 93.309(c); (3) if an investigation is conducted, the investigation report and all records (other than drafts of the report) considered or relied on during the investigation, including, but not limited to, research records, the transcripts of each interview conducted pursuant to § 93.310(g), and information the respondent provided to the institution; (4) decision(s) by the Institutional Deciding Official, such as the written decision from the Institutional Deciding Official under § 93.314; (5) the complete record of any institutional appeal consistent with § 93.315; (b) a single index listing all the research records and evidence that the institution compiled during the research misconduct proceeding, except records the institution did not consider or rely on; and (c) a general description of the records that were sequestered but not considered or relied on.

17. Intentionally. To act intentionally means to act with the aim of carrying out the act.30 Investigation. Investigation means the formal development of a factual record and the examination of that record that meets the criteria and follows the procedures of §§ 93.310 through 93.317.31 .

~~Inquiry Committee means the committee consisting of two or more members of the faculty, together with such technical, administrative, or other staff as may be deemed appropriate, who are appointed by the Provost to conduct the Inquiry of an Allegation.~~

18. 10. Investigation means the formal development, examination, and evaluation of a factual record to determine whether Research Misconduct has taken place, to assess its extent and consequences, and to evaluate appropriate action.

19. 11. Investigation Committee means the committee consisting of at least three members of University staff and tenured faculty at any School actively involved in research in the same field as the Respondent or a related field who are appointed by the Provost to investigate charges of Research Misconduct against faculty, staff, post-doctoral associates, and/or students.

20. Knowingly. To act knowingly means to act with awareness of the act.

~~1221.~~ *Legal Affairs Designee* means the individual at the University designated by the President to deal with legal issues at the University in conjunction with the CSU Office of the General Counsel.

~~22. 13.~~ *Plagiarism* means the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. (a) Plagiarism includes the unattributed verbatim or nearly verbatim copying of sentences and paragraphs from another's work that materially misleads the reader regarding the contributions of the author. It does not include the limited use of identical or nearly identical phrases that describe a commonly used methodology. (b) Plagiarism does not include self-plagiarism or authorship or credit disputes, including disputes among former collaborators who participated jointly in the development or conduct of a research project. Self-plagiarism and authorship disputes do not meet the definition of research misconduct.

~~23. 14.~~ *Policy* means this Policy regarding the Disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct.

~~2415.~~ *Preponderance of the Evidence* *Preponderance of the evidence means proof by evidence that, compared with evidence opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more likely true than not.* ~~means proof by information that, compared with that opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more probably true than not.~~

25. PHS support. PHS support means PHS funding, or applications or proposals for PHS funding, for biomedical or behavioral research, biomedical or behavioral research training, or activities related to that research or training, that may be provided through funding for PHS intramural research; PHS grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts; subawards, contracts, or subcontracts under those PHS funding instruments; or salary or other payments under PHS grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts.

26. Recklessly. To act recklessly means to propose, perform, or review research, or report research results, with indifference to a known risk of fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism.

~~27 16.~~ *Research Integrity Officer ("RIO")* means the official designated by the Provost to be responsible for receiving Allegations of Research Misconduct, determining whether such Allegations warrant Inquiries, supporting the Inquiry Committee, receiving the Inquiry reports, recommending to the Provost whether or not Investigations are warranted, and assisting in the investigations by the Investigation Committee. The RIO must be an administrator or tenured faculty member at the University with experience in research and will be provided appropriate training to carry out his or her responsibilities under this Policy. For PHS funded projects the Institutional official responsible for administering the institution's written policies and

[procedures for addressing allegations of research misconduct in compliance with 42 CFR Part 93.](#)

[28.17.](#) *Research Misconduct* means Fabrication, Falsification, or Plagiarism in proposing or performing research, reviewing research, or in reporting research results when these acts involve a person who, at the time of the alleged misconduct, was employed by, was an agent of, or was affiliated by contract or agreement with CSUB. Research Misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion. A finding of Research Misconduct made under this Policy requires that: (a) there be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; (b) the misconduct be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and (c) the Allegation be proven by a Preponderance of the Evidence.

[29.18.](#) *Research Misconduct Proceeding* means any action related to alleged Research Misconduct taken under this Policy, including but not limited to, determinations of whether or not an Inquiry is warranted, Inquiries, Investigations, and regulatory agency or research sponsor oversight reviews, hearings, and administrative appeals. [For PHS funded projects, Research misconduct proceeding means any actions related to alleged research misconduct taken under 42 CFR Part 93, including allegation assessments, inquiries, investigations, ORI oversight reviews, and appeals under subpart E of 42 CFR Part 93.39.](#)

[30.19.](#) *Research Record* ~~means the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from a research inquiry, including, but not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, journal articles, and any documents and materials provided in the course of a Research Misconduct Proceeding.~~ [Research record means the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry. Data or results may be in physical or electronic form. Examples of items, materials, or information that may be considered part of the research record include, but are not limited to, research proposals, raw data, processed data, clinical research records, laboratory records, study records, laboratory notebooks, progress reports, manuscripts, abstracts, theses, records of oral presentations, online content, lab meeting reports, and journal articles.](#)

[31.20.](#) *Respondent* means the person against whom an Allegation of Research Misconduct is directed or who is the subject of a Research Misconduct Proceeding.

[32.21.](#) *Retaliation* means an adverse action taken against a Complainant, witness, or other participant in a Research Misconduct Proceeding in response to (a) a good faith Allegation of Research Misconduct, or (b) good faith cooperation with a Research Misconduct Proceeding.

[33.22.](#) *School* means an educational unit of the University, including all research centers and institutes.

[Small institution.](#) [Small institution means an institution that may be too small to conduct an inquiry or investigation into an allegation of research misconduct as required by 42 CFR Part 93](#)

without actual or apparent conflicts of interest.

34. Suspension and Debarment Official. Suspension and Debarment Official or SDO means the HHS official authorized to impose suspension and debarment, which are the actions that Federal agencies take to disqualify persons deemed not presently responsible from doing business with the Federal Government.

35. 23. University means the California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB), including the CSUB Auxiliary for Sponsored Program Administration, and the CSUB Foundation.

IV. Statement of Policy

It is the policy of the California State University, Bakersfield, that all research and/or scholarly activity conducted by members of the University community adhere to the highest attainable ethical and moral standards, and comply with federal and other government regulations, and guidelines required by external sponsors, governing the disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct.

V. Statement of Requirements

- A. **Accountability:** The administration, faculty, students, and staff of the University share responsibility for promoting and preserving the integrity of research and scholarly activity, and for holding members of the University community accountable to this policy. Such accountability requires that there be appropriate University procedures by which allegations of misconduct in research and scholarly activity may be fairly and thoroughly examined to expose and correct misconduct, and to protect the researcher, scholar, and other members of the University community against false charges. It also requires that such procedures contain appropriate measures to protect from reprisal those individuals who, in good faith, wish to bring forward evidence of improper conduct, ensuring that all allegations of research misconduct will be reviewed fairly and accurately, and ensuring that scholarship and research performed under the auspices of CSUB meet the standards of academic integrity and truth expected by the academic community. For PHS funded projects, the institution will respond to each allegation of research misconduct under 42 CFR Part 93 in a thorough, competent, objective, and fair manner. The Institution will take all reasonable and practical steps to ensure the cooperation of respondents and other institutional members with research misconduct proceedings, including, but not limited to, their providing information, research records, and other evidence. The institution agrees to cooperate with ORI during any research misconduct proceeding or compliance review, including addressing deficiencies or additional allegations in the institutional record if directed by ORI and to assist in administering and enforcing any HHS administrative actions imposed on

[institutional members. The institution may also take steps to manage published data or acknowledge that data may be unreliable.](#)

B. **Applicability:** This Policy establishes the procedures to be followed by the University in responding to any Allegation that University faculty, staff, post-doctoral associates, and/or students, whether paid by the University or through other funding sources, may have engaged in Research Misconduct. It will be used, at the discretion of the Provost, to respond to any Allegation of Research Misconduct. It applies to all research and scholarly activity conducted by University faculty, staff, post-doctoral associates, and/or students, regardless of the academic discipline of the researcher or the sponsorship or source of support for the research. This Policy does not supersede or establish an alternative to any existing University or governmental regulations, procedures, or policies regarding fiscal improprieties, conflicts of interest, ethical treatment of human or animal subjects, or criminal matters, all of which remain in effect.

This policy, and the procedures established pursuant to it, do not apply to (a) authorship or credit disputes; (b) conduct which deviates from institutional or governmental standards to protect the safety and well-being of human subjects, animals, or the laboratory work environment; (c) scholarship or research performed by a student for academic credit while not working on a project funded by an external research sponsor and not otherwise engaged to perform services for the University; or (d) misuse of funds dedicated to support research or scholarship.

C. **Public Health Service (PHS) Requirements:** When the procedures established through this policy are being used to carry out CSUB's responsibilities under the PHS regulations, they apply only in the following situations:

- (1) PHS-supported biomedical or behavioral research, research training or activities related to that research or research training, such as the operation of tissue and data banks and the dissemination of research information;
- (2) applications or proposals for PHS support for biomedical or behavioral research, research training or activities related to that research or research training; or
- (3) plagiarism of research records produced in the course of PHS-supported research, research training, or activities related to that research or research training. This includes any research proposed, performed, reviewed, or reported, or any research record generated from that research, regardless of whether an application or proposal for PHS funds resulted in a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other form of PHS support.

- Further, these procedures apply only to Research Misconduct alleged to have occurred within six (6) years of the date CSUB receives an allegation, except to the extent the respondent continues or renews any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred

before the six-year limitation (for example, through citation, republication or reuse of the research record), or if it is determined that the alleged misconduct could have a substantial adverse effect on the health or safety of the public. [For PHS funded projects, the six-year time limitation does not apply if the respondent continues or renews any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred before the six-year period through the use of, republication of, or citation to the portion\(s\) of the research record alleged to have been fabricated, falsified, or plagiarized, for the potential benefit of the respondent \(“subsequent use exception”\). For alleged research misconduct that appears subject to this subsequent use exception, but CSUB determines is not subject to the exception, the institution will document its determination that the subsequent use exception does not apply and will retain this documentation for the later of seven years after completion of the institutional proceeding or the completion of any HHS proceeding.](#)

- [The six-year time limitation also does not apply if ORI or CSUB, following consultation with ORI, determines that the alleged research misconduct, if it occurred, would possibly have a substantial adverse effect on the health or safety of the public.](#)
- [These policies and procedures do not supersede or establish an alternative to the PHS regulation or any existing regulations for handling research misconduct involving non-PHS supported research. They do not replace the PHS regulation, and in case of any conflict between this document and 42 CFR Part 93, the PHS regulation will prevail. They are intended to enable CSUB to comply with the requirements of the PHS regulation.](#)

D. Responsibility to Report Misconduct: All members of the CSUB community have the responsibility to report observed, suspected, or apparent research misconduct to the RIO. Any other University official who receives an allegation of research misconduct must report it immediately to the RIO. Reports may be made to the RIO by telephone, electronic means, writing in hard-copy, or in-person meeting.

Individuals from outside the University (including other scientists, journal editors, or research subjects) should also report to the RIO any allegations of research misconduct involving persons employed by or affiliated with CSUB.

E. Prohibition of Retaliation for Reporting in Good Faith: Allegations should not be made capriciously, but evidence of misconduct should not be ignored. An individual with information indicating misconduct in scholarship or research should be able to report in good faith such allegations without retribution. This policy prohibits retaliation by the University or one of its members against a complainant because of his or her good faith reporting of an allegation or involvement in an inquiry or investigation. Members of the CSUB community should immediately report any alleged or apparent retaliation to the RIO. Conversely, an individual who makes an allegation that is not in good faith may be referred to the Provost for administrative action.

F. Confidentiality: Because of the potential jeopardy to the reputation of the individual(s) against whom allegations of misconduct have been made, the reporting of allegations and the following procedures for investigating them should be handled with care to

avoid unnecessary disclosure of the identity of respondents, complainants, and research subjects to the maximum extent consistent with the obligations of the University to the academic and scientific community and to any sponsors and external institutions that have provided support for the research.

- G. **Disclosure of Complainant's Identity:** The RIO may disclose the identity of the complainant to the respondent *if* such disclosure is necessary in order for the respondent to be able to defend him- or herself against the charges. Therefore, if a potential complainant wishes to have confidential discussions and consultations about concerns of possible misconduct with an assurance of complete confidentiality, he/she is encouraged to speak with the University Ombudsperson, who does not act as an agent for the University and who can provide confidential informal advice to the potential complainant about options for reporting. All contacts, records and communication with Ombudsperson are confidential within State laws and CSU policies. See [Ombudsperson | California State University, Bakersfield](http://www.csu.edu/counselingcenter/ombudsman/)
<http://www.csu.edu/counselingcenter/ombudsman/>.
- H. **Cooperation with Research Misconduct Proceedings:** Members of the CSUB community will cooperate with the RIO and other institutional officials in the review of allegations and in the conduct of Inquiries and Investigations. Institutional members, including respondents, have an obligation to provide evidence relevant to Research Misconduct Allegations to the RIO or other institutional officials.
- I. **Interim Administrative Actions and Notifications:** Throughout the research misconduct proceeding, the RIO will review the situation to determine if there is any threat of harm to public health, funds and equipment, or the integrity of the research process. In the event of such a threat, the RIO will, in consultation with the Provost, other institutional officials, and the appropriate funding agency, take appropriate interim action to protect against any such threat. Interim action might include additional monitoring of the research process and the handling of funds and equipment, reassignment of personnel or of the responsibility for the handling of funds and equipment, additional review of research data and results or delaying publication. The RIO in consultation with the Provost shall, at any time during a research misconduct proceeding, notify the appropriate funding agency immediately if he/she has reason to believe that any of the following conditions exists:
- Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animal subjects;
 - Funding agency resources or interests are threatened;
 - Research activities should be suspended;
 - There is a reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law;
 - Funding agency action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding;

- The research misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely and agency action may be necessary to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved; or

- The research community or public should be informed.

J. **Restoration of the Respondent's Reputation:** If at the end of an investigation, misconduct has not been found, any necessary efforts will be made by the RIO or the Provost, as appropriate, to restore the reputations of individual(s) alleged to have engaged in misconduct.

K. **Determination of Personnel Action:** If at the end of an investigation, misconduct has been found, the Provost in consultation with the University's Legal Affairs Designee, will make a determination of appropriate personnel action to be taken. Appropriate personnel action, including discipline, is governed by California law, university policies, and applicable collective bargaining agreements.

VI. Statement of Procedures

In implementing the processes and procedures established pursuant to this policy, the University and each review committee shall maintain a clear distinction between Inquiry and Investigation: An Inquiry is intended to be a preliminary process leading to a decision that there are, or are not, sufficient grounds to conduct an Investigation. An Investigation is the process that may result in a finding of misconduct.

Consistent with the provisions of this Policy, CSUB's procedure for responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct will consist of at least three distinct phases:

1. **Allegation.** When an Allegation is received, the RIO assesses whether the allegation falls under the definition of Research Misconduct and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified. If these criteria are met, the Provost will establish and charge an Inquiry Committee. The RIO will oversee the sequestration of original documents and materials if necessary to protect the integrity of the proceedings.

2. **Inquiry.** The Inquiry Committee determines whether the Allegation of misconduct provides a sufficient basis to warrant conducting an Investigation. The outcome of an Inquiry is not a finding of guilt, but is a finding that the grounds to proceed to an investigation are either present or absent. The Inquiry Committee will submit a written report of its findings to the RIO, as specified in the University's *Procedure for the Disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct*.

3. **Investigation.** An Investigation is a more exhaustive review of the Allegation: the outcome of an Investigation may be a finding by the University that a researcher is guilty of misconduct and that sanctions are in order, or that a researcher is not guilty of misconduct. If the outcome of an Inquiry is a determination that there is a basis for an Investigation, the Provost will establish and charge an Investigation Committee. Sponsors of research and editors of journals and others may have to be notified about the investigation.

Upon completion of the investigation, the Investigation Committee will submit a written report of its findings to the Provost, as specified in the University's *Procedure for the Disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct*.

The Provost, in consultation with the RIO and other University officials, will take appropriate action to respond to and dispose of the Allegation of Research Misconduct, in accordance with applicable collective bargaining agreements, CSU and governmental regulations, and other external funding agency agreements. Records of all Research Misconduct Proceedings shall be maintained by the RIO for at least seven years.

Detailed information on the procedure for responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct is available in a separate document, *Procedure for the Disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct*, and on the GRaSP website.

APAN_MS_F: MASTER OF SCIENCE IN APPLIED ANALYTICS

In Workflow

1. 235 - ECON Curriculum Review (rgearhart1@csub.edu)
2. BSBA-MBA Curriculum Committee (lparis@csub.edu,mway@csub.edu,ssarma@csub.edu)
3. BPA Curriculum Committee (mhur@csub.edu)
4. BPA Dean Office (dcours@csub.edu,lparis@csub.edu)
5. Academic Programs (eadams6@csub.edu)
6. Senate Approval (mdanforth@csub.edu,kvan-grinsven@csub.edu,AcademicSenateOffice@csub.edu,AcademicSenateChair@csub.edu)
7. President (vharper@csub.edu,kvan-grinsven@csub.edu,aescalante@csub.edu)
8. Academic Operations (amendoza145@csub.edu,czuniga-prado@csub.edu,org-curriculum@csub.edu)
9. PeopleSoft (PeopleSoft@csub.edu)

Approval Path

1. Thu, 12 Mar 2026 19:05:42 GMT
Richard Gearhart (rgearhart1): Approved for 235 - ECON Curriculum Review
2. Thu, 12 Mar 2026 22:30:17 GMT
Angelica Mendoza (amendoza145): Approved for BSBA-MBA Curriculum Committee
3. Thu, 12 Mar 2026 22:30:38 GMT
Angelica Mendoza (amendoza145): Approved for BPA Curriculum Committee
4. Thu, 12 Mar 2026 22:30:47 GMT
Angelica Mendoza (amendoza145): Approved for BPA Dean Office

New Program Proposal

Date Submitted: Thu, 12 Mar 2026 17:32:49 GMT

Viewing: APAN_MS_F : Master of Science in Applied Analytics

Last edit: Thu, 12 Mar 2026 17:32:47 GMT

Changes proposed by: Aaron Hegde (000018642)

Contact

User ID

000018642

Proposer Name

S. Aaron Hegde

Proposer E-mail

shegde@csub.edu

Proposer Department

Economics

Program Information

Program Type

Master of Science

Effective Catalog

2026-2027

Effective Term

Fall 2026

College

Business and Public Admin

Department

Economics

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 1:54 PM
To: Senate Executive Committee Group
Subject: Faculty legislative liaison
Attachments: AS-3609-23.pdf

Hi all,

The statewide chairs mailing list had a recent thread about faculty legislative liaisons in response to the attached ASCSU resolution encouraging campuses to create such positions.

CalPoly was gracious enough to pass along their resolution to create the position, which has further evidence from HEERA and AAUP: <https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1984&context=senateresolutions>

Something to consider. The Handbook has one line mentioning the Public Affairs Committee of the Senate, which has long been dormant. We can discuss if we want to revive that committee with this additional charge, or if we want to have a single Senator fill that role.

Melissa

--

Dr. Melissa Danforth (she/they)
Chair, CSUB Academic Senate
PI, CSUB's S-STEM Scholarship Program
Professor of Computer Science
Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering/Computer Science
California State University, Bakersfield
Website: <https://www.cs.csub.edu/~melissa/>

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-3609-23/FGA (Rev)
March 16-17, 2023

ENCOURAGING CAMPUS FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) suggests that campus Senates create a position of Campus Faculty Legislative Liaison; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recommends that this position be held by a Campus Senator who will meet with the campus Government and Local Relations legislative staff and report and communicate with the campus Senate Executive Committee and the campus Senate who may adopt other formal responsibilities for the position; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recommends that CSU Campus Senates and Presidents support faculty in lobbying efforts to strengthen individual and collective CSU efforts with a Campus Faculty Legislative Liaison, or Senate Chair/designee, who will meet twice annually (in a virtual format unless the CSU Chancellor's Office will fund a trip to a common location) with the ASCSU Legislative Specialists, the ASCSU Fiscal & Governmental Affairs (FGA) Committee Chair and other Campus Faculty Legislative Liaisons; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU requests the head of the CSU Chancellor's Office (CO) Advocacy and State Relations office, and campus Government and Community Relations staff join those meetings; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU requests the California Faculty Association (CFA) Legislative Director and/or the CFA Legislative Analyst, and CFA ASCSU Liaison join those meetings; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU advises CSU Presidents that they encourage cooperation between the ASCSU Faculty Legislative Specialists and the Campus Faculty Legislative Liaisons (see <https://www.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/government/Advocacy-and-State-Relations/Pages/campus-legislative-liaisons.aspx>); and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recommend that CSU Senates request funding from their President for this essential faculty service work; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU Executive, Assistant and Associate Vice Chancellors, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU campus Senate Executive Committees, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, California Faculty Association (CFA), California State Student Association

(CSSA), and the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA).

RATIONALE: *In order to coordinate efforts and communication, we offer this resolution to bring together existing advocacy to form a unified advocacy to the legislature. Advocacy efforts for the CSU are built on the work of The Office of Advocacy and State Relations (ASR) advocates for the interests of the California State University with the state's government. ASR does so with the help of the Chancellor's Office, the CSU's 23 campuses, alumni, and other supporters." Presently, the advocacy efforts by the ASCSU Fiscal and Government Affairs Committee, and more specifically the work of the ASCSU Legislative Specialists, are not coordinated with CSU Senates beyond ASCSU statewide senator reporting. Each year the ASCSU Senate votes on legislative advocacy priorities with some cross-consultation with California Faculty Association (CFA) leadership. While Campus Legislative Liaisons exist, there is no coordination with the campus Senates. The creation of parallel Campus Faculty Legislative Liaisons will strengthen overall CSU advocacy efforts and, especially the advocacy efforts of the ASCSU by mobilizing campus Senates and increasing individual and collective faculty to contact their representatives in support of ASCSU legislative advocacy priorities.*

Approved Unanimously – May 19-20, 2023

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Zachary Zenko
Sent: Monday, March 2, 2026 4:52 PM
To: Senate Executive Committee Group
Subject: Suggestion: Coach/Director of the Year

Senate Executive Committee Friends,

I wanted to share a thought with you that perhaps is worthy of consideration and referral to the next FAC.

We have some outstanding department chairs and program directors. I think it would be good to have a Chair/Director-of-the-Year award, perhaps requiring nomination from the faculty and then selection by each dean, and ultimately the FHAC. Maybe the four selected (one from each dean) would be recognized, with three of them as the honorable mentions. I'm sure the future Executive Committee, FAC, and Academic Senate in some combination will iron out the exact process if this is considered.

My main goal here is to recommend that we create a process for recognizing outstanding chairs and directors.

Thank you for your consideration, and see you soon,
Zack

ZACHARY ZENKO, PH.D., FACSM, PAPHS

He/Him/His
Associate Professor
Graduate Program Director, [MS in Kinesiology](#)
Department of Kinesiology
(661) 654-2799
Office: EDUC 149
[Zoom Link](#)

Spring 2026 Office Hours

Tuesdays from 11:45 am to 12:45 pm
Wednesdays from 9:45 am to 11:45 am and 1:15 pm to 2:15 pm
Thursdays from 11:45 am to 12:45 pm
or by appointment

California State University, Bakersfield

Mail Stop: 22 EDUC
9001 Stockdale Hwy
Bakersfield, CA 93311

[Essentials of Exercise and Sport Psychology: An Open Access Textbook](#)

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 10:52 AM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: FW: senate resolution

Hi Katie,

Tony talked to me about this too last week. Probably too late for this year's Senate to tackle, but a good topic to put on the Summer Senate retreat agenda.

Melissa

From: Amber Stokes <astokes2@csb.edu>
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 at 10:49 AM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>
Subject: Fwd: senate resolution

Hi, Melissa. I received a request for a resolution (see email below). Let me know if you need anything further from me.

Amber

AMBER N. STOKES, PhD
Professor of Biology
Graduate Program Director
Department of Biology
(661) 654-2886

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 61 SCI
Bakersfield, CA 93311
USA

<https://sites.google.com/view/stokeslabcsb/home>

"Science and everyday life cannot and should not be separated." - Rosalind Franklin



Begin forwarded message:

From: Anthony Rathburn <arathburn@csub.edu>
Subject: senate resolution
Date: March 3, 2026 at 9:11:45 PM PST
To: Amber Stokes <astokes2@csub.edu>

Hi Amber:

I trust that your semester is going well.

I am writing because of an issue that is preventing us from offering grant funds to cover grad student tuition. According to Manuel in GRaSP, NSF rules indicate that unless the University offers at least one tuition scholarship/waiver, we cannot include tuition funds in any proposal. Other CSUs can wrtieit tuition funds into NSF proposals as can other universities in the country. This means that we cannot compete with these institutions for grad students. It also means that with scholarship/salary restrictions, we can't cover tuition and other expenses even though NSF is willing to provide the funds.

I have met with a number of people about this, including Jane Dong. It seems that the only solution is to have at least one academic tuition waiver scholarship for the university that is provided regularly. Of course, athletics gets all of the tuition waivers now. From what I understand, tuition waivers are at the discretion of the President. I have not talked with him about this, but as a senator, I would like to ask you to introduce a resolution to the Senate to ask the President to create an academic tuition waiver scholarship for the University. This waiver could be competitive or rotated between colleges, but would be a regular, yearly scholarship. In this way, we could write NSF proposals that include tuition funds for grad students and attract students from a wider circle.

I would be happy to chat with you about this, if you wish.

Cheers,
Tony

Anthony Rathburn
Professor and Chair
Co-Director of the California Well Sample Repository
Dept. of Geological Sciences, Sci Bldg II, mail stop 66 SCI
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, CA 93311-1022
arathburn@csub.edu

This email, and any attachments, thereto, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Danielle Solano
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 2:09 PM
To: Tiffany Tsantsoulas; Melissa Danforth; Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: Re: Items for EC from Advising Council

The only thing I would add is that we still don't have an email list for faculty advisors.

--Dani

Danielle Solano, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
California State University, Bakersfield

Office: SCI II 268
Phone: (661) 654-2785
Email: dsolano@csub.edu

***Schedule an appointment with me on [Runner Connect](#) or [Acuity Scheduling](#)

 [Book time to meet with me](#)

From: Tiffany Tsantsoulas <ttsantsoulas@csub.edu>
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 2:07 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>; Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Cc: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>
Subject: Re: Items for EC from Advising Council

Nothing to add!

--

DR. TIFFANY TSANTSOULAS

She/Her/Hers
Director of Interdisciplinary Studies
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies
661-654-2408

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy
Bakersfield, CA 93311

From: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Date: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 at 5:15 PM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>

Cc: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>, Tiffany Tsantsoulas <ttsantsoulas@csub.edu>

Subject: Items for EC from Advising Council

Hi Katie,

Here are some items for EC from today's Advising Council meeting.

Handbook items:

- Student ombuds description: Request that we seek input from Dean of Students on the descriptive paragraph.
- Grievance appendix still references the Associate Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies. This is causing issues with current grievances, since position no longer exists.

General items:

- Timeline of schedule build (chairs, associate deans), classroom assignments, course-based advising (Advising Weeks in calendar), and registration was discussed. Still some pressure points to talk through.
- Canvas shell being developed with resources and training videos for faculty advisors. Still working on how to distribute to faculty advisors. Request to place blank outlines there.

I'm CCing Dani and Tiffany, who were also at the meeting, to see if they have anything to add.

Thanks,
Melissa

--

Dr. Melissa Danforth (she/they)
Chair, CSUB Academic Senate
PI, CSUB's S-STEM Scholarship Program
Professor of Computer Science
Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering/Computer Science
California State University, Bakersfield
Website: <https://www.cs.csub.edu/~melissa/>