

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda

Tuesday, August 24, 2021

10:00 a.m. – 11:25 a.m.

BPA Conference Room

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
December 9 Senate Meeting during Finals Week
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
May 18, 2021 Minutes
4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain 10:05)
5. CONTINUED ITEMS
 - a. AS Log (handout)
 - i. AAC (J. Tarjan)
 - ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
 - iii. FAC (M. Rees)
 - iv. BPC (C. Lam)
 - b. Provost Update (V. Harper)
 - i. Academic Integrity
 1. Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities and Academic Affairs
 2. Academic Integrity Pledge
 3. RES 192013 Response to Student Misconduct Task Force
 - Senate minutes February 18, March 4, May 13
 - EC minutes March 16, **March 23**, April 6, May 4, 11
 4. The things that came out of J. Drnek's proposed solutions at 5/13/21 Senate
 5. Testing Center
 - ii. Academic Affairs Reorganization
 - c. Searches (V. Harper)
 - i. AVP GRaSP
 - ii. AVP IRPA
 - iii. Dean BPA
 - iv. Dean NSME
 - v. Dean Antelope Valley
 - vi. Dean Library
 - vii. Associate Dean Undergraduate and Graduate Studies

- viii. Director Faculty Training and Learning Center (TLC)
 - d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
 - e. Teaching in Faculty's Assigned Class Times - FAC
 - f. Proposal for the Creation of Ethnic Studies Department – FAC
 - g. MA INST Moratorium – AAC
 - h. INST Proposal to add Phil 4550 to INST WGSS Concentration - AAC
 - i. Faculty Advising and Staff Advising Structure - AS&SS
 - j. Proposal to Employ High Impact Practice (HIP) Tracking - AAC, AS&SS
 - k. EEGO Course Offering - Summer Term - AAC
 - l. GECCo Reporting Structure (handout) – AAC, BPC, FAC
 - m. General Studies (GST) Department Formation - AAC, BPC, FAC
 - n. Accessibility – (handout) FAC
 - o. Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change - FAC
 - p. Criteria and Nomination Process for Faculty Awards – FAC
 - q. CSUB Patent Policy – FAC
 - r. Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time – FAC
 - s. URC Recommendations – additional Handbook changes – FAC
 - t. Sabbatical Application Process Improvement – FAC
 - u. Institutional Research in Response to WSCUC Report - BPC
 - v. Distinguished Professor Award – (handout) FAC
 - w. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
 - x. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)
 - y. Assigned Time application revision and timing (Hold pending further information) – FAC
6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain 10:45)
- a. Late RTP Application
 - b. GE Minors
 - c. RTP hard copy
 - d. Distance Education Classification – Academic Programs
 - e. Senate Calendar and Potential Timelines in Standing Committee(s)
 - f. Department Formation Criteria
 - g. Universitywide Exceptional Service Requirement for RTP
 - h. Exceptional Service Article 20.37 Application and Screening process
 - i. CSUB Policy on Use of sUAS – GRaSP update (hand out)
 - j. DEI Faculty Report (handout)
 - k. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth
 - i. Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change

- ii. School Elections Committee – Handbook Change 202.7
- iii. Standing Committee Bylaws change –
 - 1. Chair Election Statement of Interest
 - 2. Two-years on Senate requirement
 - 3. Structure of BPC
 - 4. Strike “at least”
- iv. Standing Committee Vice-Chair
- v. Committee proliferation
- l. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s)
- m. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC
- n. University Handbook Numbering Revisions
- o. UPRC Task Force

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING August 26, 2021 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)**

Approval of Minutes

Announcements

- President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
- Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth

Approval of Agenda (Time Certain 10:05)

Reports

Resolutions (Time Certain 10:35)

Consent Agenda

Standing Committee 2021-2022

RES 212201 Addendum to RES 202110 Academic Calendars Fall '21, Spring '22,
Summer '22

New Business

Old Business

Open Forum and Wellness Check (Time Certain 10:50)

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

9. **ADJOURNMENT (Time Certain 11:25 am)**

SUMMER SENATE

Minutes

Tuesday, May 18, 2021

10:00 a.m. – 11:25 a.m.

Videoconference

Members: A. Hegde, M. Danforth, E. Correa, J. Millar, M. Martinez, M. Rees, R. Gearhart,
C. Lam, B. Street, J. Tarjan, V. Harper

Absent: J. Millar

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK

A. Hegde acknowledge the following for their contribution and achievements:

- R. Gearhart did an excellent job handling Ethnic Studies and other challenges with grace.
- C. Lam did a great job as first-time committee chair, completing its business.
- B. Street's leadership on BPC, Budget Forum, and Strategic Planning is much appreciated.
- M. Rees went through difficult year. Department formation was an important issue. We are all in a better place because of her leadership of the FAC.
- M. Danforth for proofing and improving the minutes and communication
- B. Bywaters for recording and processing information flows
- M. Martinez and J. Millar will continue to bring important information from the ASCSU and their perspective.
- Provost Harper's membership on the EC allows great discussion to occur. Many issues were resolved in EC. From A. Hegde's view, the Provost's practice of shared governance is more apparent than any other CSU campus.

A. Hegde welcomed the return of E. Correa and J. Tarjan to the Executive Committee (EC).

Last year the Summer Senate met every week during the summer. In total, there were 39 EC meetings in 2020-2021. The Summer Senate will not be meeting this summer, barring any emergency.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M. Rees moved to approve the May 11, 2021 Minutes. R. Gearhart seconded.

Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

R. Gearhart moved to approve the agenda. B. Street seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS

a. Provost Update (V. Harper)

- i. Academic Integrity Spring Exams – The President tabled the resolution pending Fall '21 registration. It will be a pivotal time for the types of instruction. Enrollment will affect the conversation regarding campus testing center. The model of what we have as an institution has a number of pieces to it, such as research, how we're going to serve students and the types of instruction in the future, policy, and funding. A. Hegde said faculty has been very vocal about the Office of Students' Rights and Responsibilities (OSSR) and the need for a testing center. There is a need for serious discussion to occur over the Summer. To dismiss the need for a testing center would be problematic. B. Street appreciates the broader and long-term thinking. Academic integrity is not simply about cheating online, but the importance of increasing integrity of testing overall, especially final exams. Given the recent press release from the CO regarding the expectation of an increase in online teaching, it's going to be important that we have the mechanism in place as the student body grows and the need for campus support systems grow. Testing should be at the front of the conversations. J. Tarjan asked that the issues of the OSRR and testing center be decoupled. R. Gearhart expressed disappointment in OSSR's presentation. A. Hegde is meeting with the AVP Students Affairs and will inform him that the presentation fell short of faculty's expectation. Senate and EC minutes containing all the concerns were given to J. Drnek and then A. Hegde met with him to further his understanding. J. Drnek was given a list of items for his Senate presentation. A. Hegde meets regularly with the President. He will inform the President that there is a level of respect to give the Senate by administrators. Going forward, those invited to present need to send their documents in advance for Senators' preview and preparation. M. Rees thinks that the numbers OSRR reported is vastly underreported compared to other institutions. Faculty members are not turning-in all incidences of academic integrity violations. She was interested in hearing the AVP SA describe the process, awareness of the process, the level of faith in the process and whether reporting academic violations is important. A. Hegde has expressed the seriousness of academic integrity violations to the President. Her feedback was that just moving the OSRR does not address the problem. She's looking for the problem to be defined, the cause of the problem, and having solutions presented to her. A. Hegde said we have given Student Affairs a chance to come up with solutions. He will meet with J. Drnek over the summer and invite him to present solutions at the first or second Senate meeting in the Fall. J. Tarjan said that for a mid-sized organization, the cooperation between divisions is lacking. We need to

draft some mechanism to solve problems on academic integrity and several other issues instead of going up and down individual silos. A. Hegde asked that the EC send their ideas to help weigh-in on the discussion.

b. Searches

- i. BPA Dean – The Provost has been in discussion with the consultant. The search committee will move forward in the Fall. A. Hegde requested that administrators who are potentially internal candidates stay as far away from any aspect of the search, lest there be suspicion of impropriety. B. Street feels that the consequence of an internal candidate's involvement should be significant. Discussion ensued. M. Danforth noted that better training of ASCs is needed if they are tasked with screening the list of eligible voters and eligible candidates. (Example: removing FERP and sabbatical nominations.) There was a communication issue. Part of conversation with every Dean's Office should include that the ASC who is tasked with helping the election committee chair should not let the internal candidates know more about the other candidates. E. Correa agreed that there needs to be consequences to improper actions so it doesn't appear that politics and overreach were involved. Everyone has to be held to the same standard of accountability. A. Hegde shared that he's had conversation with the Provost that all administrators (not just deans) on campus need to be mindful of processes and the role of faculty. During the search for Provost, it was admirable that V. Harper stayed as far away as possible. A. Hegde will reach out to the Dean's Office ASCs. Any questions should be addressed to him or Vice Chair Danforth. R. Gearhart said that faculty on search committees are given a list of questions they can ask and can't ask. Faculty are often asked questions they can't answer, such as, What is the best school in Bakersfield? It's all about the appearance of upholding integrity. Appearances matter.
- ii. Associate Dean SS&E – Dean Rodriguez is in the final stages of making the appointment.
- iii. Dean Library – Commence in Fall.
- iv. AVP GRaSP – Committee composition per Handbook 309.5. Election in Fall.
- v. AVP IRPA – The Provost will be making the appointments to the search committee soon. The plan is to begin work in August and finish in October. The faculty member(s) asked to attend outside of contract will get a stipend.
- vi. NSME Dean Search Committee – T. McBride is willing to continue as Interim Dean. There was a faculty member on the search committee who is not tenured. It is in violation of the Handbook. It calls for reconstruction of the committee. A. Hegde said if the individual who is not tenured at the time of the committee formation, yet tenured in the Fall, still requires that we have to do another election. It's something that slipped through the cracks. The language in the Handbook was changed last year to FT tenured. J. Tarjan suggested that the call be more complete. There are many things

(sabbatical, FERP, tenured-track, tenured, FT, etc.) to consider. Create a list of things to check. A. Hegde said that no damage was done to the search. It's an opportunity to fix it. B. Street strongly supports policy, structure, and the importance of following them, so everyone knows what to expect. V. Harper said the way forward is to give the NSME Dean Search Committee an opportunity to explain what happened and then communicate the change to campus. V. Harper sees a lot of complexity there. He doesn't like the optics of removing an individual. For cleanliness and integrity of the process, we should probably do another election Fall '21. It will produce the most trust in the process. It will require that he explain it to the President, consultant, and the NSME Search Committee. The search would then start in Spring '22. A. Hegde agreed. J. Tarjan asked M. Danforth and C. Lam what would be best for the school. M. Danforth suggested a new search committee. It should not create a time issue. There is already a new job description and rubric for the Dean position being worked. The current search committee members must not reveal anything that was said to the new search committee. C. Lam agreed that starting a new search committee was best. He suggested that the new and old committees have one meeting to discuss some of the challenges found and to provide continuity. A. Hegde referred to the Handbook regarding interim administrative positions' limited term of 18 months. The EC can make proforma approval to extend it if the Interim NSME Dean T. McBride will stay on.

- vii. Dean AV – January '22 start. D. Anderson-Facile has agreed to continue as Interim Dean Antelope Valley. The EC can make proforma approval to extend her term.
- viii. Associate Dean Graduate and Undergraduate Studies – the Provost Office will be conducting the search.

- c. Time Capsule (tabled)
- d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation (tabled)
- e. University Week – Faculty Day Planning (tabled)
- f. Senate and Executive Committee modality and format 2021-2022 – poll (tabled)

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a. Standing Committee 2021-2022 – The candidate spreadsheet displayed the Senators' preference and committee diversity, followed by other faculty preferences and committee balance. The EC reviewed the list and made appointments. If there is a referral to rewrite the Senate Bylaws on the structure of the Standing Committees, J. Tarjan suggested that language "at least" be struck. "Ex-Officio" is by

virtue of the position held. As such, an administrator can't delegate the position. Discussion on the selection of the vice-chair will occur later. M. Danforth suggested to refer out in Fall if the Bylaws need to be clarified. A. Hegde agreed to discuss in Fall the practice and interpretation and then refer to committee to fix the ambiguity.

M. Danforth request to extend 10 minutes.

- b. Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities and Academic Affairs – See 5. a. i., above.
- c. UPRC Report 2020-2021 - AAC, BPC recommended the formation of an UPRC Reform Task Force. See item e., below.
- d. Accessibility – AAC (tabled)
- e. Elections and Appointments– M. Danforth
 - i. UPRC Reform Task Force – It's a Senate task force which will be making their recommendations to Academic Affairs and BPC. The candidates' statements were reviewed, and then the EC voted to appoint:
 - A&H – Jackie Kegley
 - BPA – John Deal
 - NSME – Dani Solano
 - SS&E – Janet Armentor
 - Ex-officio member appointed by the EC - Jinping SunAdministrator – EC sent their recommendation to the Provost
 - ii. School Elections Committees (see discussion under Searches)
 - iii. Committee proliferation (tabled)
- f. Processing of Withdrawal Requests Week 12 through End of Term (tabled)
- g. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC (tabled)
- h. Distinguished Professor Award – FAC (tabled))
- i. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
- j. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)
- k. Assigned Time application revision and timing (Hold pending further information) – FAC

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING AUGUST 26, 2021**

Approval of Minutes:

Announcements

- President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
- Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth

Approval of Agenda (Time Certain 10:05)

Reports

Resolutions (Time Certain 10:35)

Consent Agenda

Standing Committee 2021-2022

New Business

Old Business

Open Forum and Wellness Check (Time Certain 10:50)

Adjournment

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR
9. ADJOURNMENT (Time Certain 11:25 am)
 - A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:48.

DRAFT

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – AUGUST 24, 2021

Academic Affairs Committee: John Tarjan/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Dec 2, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
	2020-2021 20 UPRC Changes	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC Combine concerns from 2019-2020 #19 referral and 2020-2021 Addendum with the recommendations from URPC current Chair and Jinping Sun's report. Pending Task Force report Fall '21			
	2020-2021 22 EEGO Course Offering - Summer Term	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC Consider Summer Session as a single term with a cumulative student workload and what is the maximum number of units which enables student success.			
	2020-2021 23 MA INST Moratorium	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC Consider the rationale as presented in the attached letter from the Director of INST and the impact on students in the program.			
	INST Proposal to add Phil 4550 to INST WGSS Concentration	Carry-over to 2021-2022	AAC, acting as university curriculum committee, reviews the rationale for adding Phil 4550 and then sends memo to Senate. Waiting for updates.			
	2020-2021 29 GECCo Reporting Structure	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC, FAC Where GECCo fits into other committee & program structures and whether to change Handbook 202.1 or Handbook Appendix C Article 8.			
	2020-2021 30 General Studies (GST) Department Formation	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC, FAC Rationale behind dept. creation, existing support services, additional supports services needed			
	2020-2021 32 Proposal to Employ High Impact Practice (HIP) Tracking	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, AS&SS Use, identification, application, training, and campus body(s) to perform the above.			

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – AUGUST 24, 2021

Academic Support and Student Services: Elaine Correa/Chair, meets 10:00 via Zoom video conference

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Dec 2, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
	2020-2021 Referral 26 Testing Center	President waiting for Fall '21 data	AS&SS Establishing norms and structure around academic integrity. Several issues cited for consideration. RES 202123 Academic Testing Center	3/18/21	3/26/21	
	2020-2021 Referral 28 Faculty Advising and Staff Advising Structure	Carry over to 2021-2022	AS&SS Whether there is a need for a change to the advising structure Refer to AS&SS minutes 2021-05-06 for recommendations.			
	2020-2021 32 Proposal to Employ High Impact Practice (HIP) Tracking	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, AS&SS Use, identification, application, training, and campus body(s) to perform the above.			

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – AUGUST 24, 2021

Faculty Affairs Committee: Mandy Rees/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom video conference

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Dec 2, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
	2019-2020 Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate- Handbook Change	Carry-over 2 Ays	FAC Refer to RES 121329 Procedures for Honorary Doctorate Nominations and Selection REVISED			
	2020-2021 Referral 02 Criteria and Nomination Process for Faculty Awards	Carry over to 2021-2022	FAC Define meritorious, pressure from senior faculty, confidentiality of process			
	2020-2021 06 CSUB Patent Policy	President waiting for CSU policy	FAC Edits to the Draft Patent Policy and rationale, acceptance of Draft Patent Policy or denial of Draft Patent Policy RES 202117 CSUB Patent Policy	3/4/21	3/12/21	
	2020-2021 08 Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time	Carry over to 2021-2022	FAC Specifying the appropriate timing and notification to the department chair and how the coordination with AA and HR can improve.			
	2020-2021 Referral 14 Proposal for the Creation of Ethnic Studies Department	AAC & BPC approved. FAC carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC, FAC Consider rationale, resources, additional support, and how creation of new dept. affects current RTP process for impacted faculty.			
	2020-2021 Referral 16 URC Recommendations – Handbook Change	More resolutions to come. Tabled to 2021-2022	FAC Consider recommendations put forth by the URC and other issues FAC finds that need improvement. RES 202124 Early Tenure	4/15/21	4/23/21	4/23/21
	2020-2021 Referral 17 Sabbatical Application Process Improvement	Carry over to 2021-2022	FAC Identify what is different or extra between the 1) Faculty Information Bulletin 2) Application Cover Sheet, 3) Handbook with directions for the applicant and 4) directions for the evaluating committee and then make consistent between them.			
3/9/21	2020-2021 29 GECCo Reporting Structure	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC, FAC Where GECCo fits into other committee & program structures and whether to change Handbook 202.1 or Handbook Appendix C Article 8.			
4/6/21	2020-2021 30 General Studies (GST) Department Formation	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC, FAC Rationale behind dept. creation, existing support services, additional supports services needed			

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – AUGUST 24, 2021

Budget and Planning Committee: Charles Lam/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom video conference

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Dec 2, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
	2020-2021 03 Institutional Research in Response to WSCUC Report	Carry over to 2021-2022	BPC Feedback from CO, access and permissions to data, what faculty needs, what data department chairs' need.			
	2020-2021 20 UPRC Changes	Pending Task Force. Tabled to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC Combine concerns from 2019-2020 #19 referral and 2020-2021 Addendum with the recommendations from UPRC current Chair and Jinping Sun's report.			
	2020-2021 29 GECCo Reporting Structure	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC, FAC Where GECCo fits into other committee & program structures and whether to change Handbook 202.1 or Handbook Appendix C Article 8.			
	2020-2021 30 General Studies (GST) Department Formation	Carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC, FAC Rationale behind dept. creation, existing support services, additional supports services needed			

From: Bruce Hartsell <bhartsell@csub.edu>
Date: Thursday, October 29, 2020 at 1:46 PM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Subject: Accessible learning materials

Aaron,

Another exciting issue for the Senate to consider: Although laws require materials in all courses to be accessible, we have no mechanism to assure that syllabi properly address accessibility. It looks like we need school curriculum committees to review syllabi for all courses to assure that they address accessibility. I know that's a workload issue, but failing an audit of this kind of thing could be a bigger workload issue, so I hope the Senate will take this on.

In the discussion about this issue, the possibility was considered that syllabi approved by the curriculum committees can go out of date, so we may need a policy requiring periodic review of all syllabi, maybe setting up a rotation of departments with a set being reviewed each year on a five-year cycle.

Thanks,
Bruce

Bruce D. Hartsell, LCSW

Interim Associate Vice-president for Faculty Affairs

California State University Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, CA 93311

661 654-2154

Distinguished Professor

Here is what it refers to (via Anna Jacobsen)

As we look for ways to increase the visibility and support of our scholarship-active faculty, I think that it would be worth examining the creation of the title of "**Distinguished Professor**" on our campus. I am aware of this title being used for "internationally recognized faculty scholars" at CSU MB and LB and there are probably other campuses as well. At some institutions, it seems that these are "funded" positions through donors (often they are named distinguished professorships).

Not sure it is the right thing for our campus, but I think that it would be worth exploring.

This is not from a CSU, but I like the clarity of purpose and eligibility on this

webpage: <http://sphhp.buffalo.edu/home/information-for-faculty-staff/faculty-awards/ub-distinguished-professor.html>

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY BAKERSFIELD

Policy on the Use of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (sUAS)

I. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance on the appropriate use of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (sUAS) at the California State University Bakersfield (CSUB).

II. Statement of Policy

It is the policy of the California State University, Bakersfield, that all activities involving the use of sUAS shall be conducted in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local laws, statutes, and regulations, and in compliance with other relevant university policies and procedures.

III. Statement of Requirements

- A. This policy establishes guidelines for the appropriate use of sUAS (see Appendix 1 for aircraft definitions and use restrictions) at CSUB, and is applicable to all faculty, staff, university volunteers, visitors, and students.
- B. Authorized sUAS activities by CSUB fall into two broad categories: Public Use and Civil Use. Auxiliaries are not considered part of the State government and, therefore, any sUAS activity by an auxiliary organization would be categorized as a civil use.
- C. All sUAS owned by CSUB will be operated under the authorization of the FAA. This authorization will be as prescribed in Title 14 CFR Part 107 for civil aircrafts, or as prescribed by a Public Use **COA** for a public aircraft, and will be limited to a specific location and will outline the conditions, parameters, and limitations of flight operations.
- D. A UAS Review Board (UASRB) established by the President shall review and approve campus requests for authorization for the use sUAS at CSUB. The Board is composed of the following:
 - **RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION:** the Associate Vice President for Grants, Research & Sponsored Programs and Chief Research officer or designee (*chair, ex officio*),
 - **SECURITY:** the campus Police Chief or designee,
 - **SAFETY & RISK MANAGEMENT:** the Director of Safety & Risk Management, or designee,

- ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: a School Dean,
 - UAS RESEARCH EXPERTISE: two faculty members (and an alternate if the faculty representative has to recuse themselves) who are familiar with the use of UAS's for research purposes,
 - PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS: a representative from the Office of Public Affairs and Communications (PAC).
- E. The Board's duties are to (1) develop internal policies, processes, and procedures needed to obtain authorization for the use of sUAS by CSUB faculty, staff, students, volunteers, and visitors; (2) review and approve internal requests for authorization; and (3) monitor the use of sUAS by CSUB personnel to ensure that CSUB complies with all applicable local, state, and federal rules, regulations, statutes, and laws.
- F. Any CSUB personnel (CSUB faculty, staff, students, volunteers, or visitors) seeking authorization to operate a **civil** sUAS, as a remote pilot in command (PIC) under part 107, must first obtain a remote pilot certificate with an sUAS rating issued by the FAA.
- G. Prior to the deployment of a **public** sUAS by CSUB faculty, staff, students, volunteers, or visitors, operators must have a CSUB approved Flight Operations Plan and a Certificate of Authorization from the FAA (see Appendix II). In order to obtain a Flight Operations Plan, operators submit a Flight Operations Proposal to the Board. The approved Flight Operations Proposal serves as the Flight Operations Plan.
- H. UAS liability insurance is mandatory for all sUAS activity by CSUB personnel and all operations of UAS on CUSB owned property. The Office of Safety and Risk Management will certify that each operation has the appropriate insurance coverage.
- I. Every authorized aircraft in an sUAS operated on CSUB campus, or used for a CSUB supported activity, must be registered with the FAA Aircraft Registration Branch and with the Office of Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs (GRaSP). Registration with the FAA is a statutory requirement for all sUA: Title 49 §§ 44101 – 44104, and 14 CFR part 47 or part 48.
- J. Individuals that intend to use an sUAS for university activities and/or on university property, shall submit a written application to GRaSP at least thirty (30) days prior to the date of the first intended use. Any substantial change to the proposed activities (e.g., change in type of aircraft, location, or activities conducted) require additional notification. GRaSP will provide the University Police Department (UPD) and the Office of Safety and Risk Management with a copy of each registration application processed.
- K. In addition to Requirements F to J, persons wishing to operate sUAS on CSUB property must contact the University Police Department at least three days in advance of the desired flight time and provide the following: proof of any required FAA permit, proof of any required Caltrans requirements, proof of required insurance, and a detailed flight plan to include specific time and specific location. All

approved requests for sUAS flights will be for a specific time and a specific location to ensure that multiple sUAS are not sharing airspace.

- L. Flights approved on University property are restricted to uses that (1) meet the University's educational and research mission, and (2) serve the University's community engagement needs, as determined by University officials, including University Police. Media outlets wishing to use sUAS on campus may wish to contact the University Office of Public Affairs and Communications for assistance in obtaining approval.
- M. Operating an sUAS on CSUB campus, or as part of a CSUB supported activity, without appropriate authorization violates this policy and may result in administrative action, including disciplinary actions in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement applicable to the violator. Users of sUAS may be asked to stop the sUAS flight or leave University property if they do not comply with this policy or are otherwise engaging in conduct that is considered harmful or dangerous to the University or persons on University property. Such conduct may include but is not limited to violations of the regulations established by the Caltrans Division of Aeronautics (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/aeronaut/uas.html>) and the FAA and provided in this policy.
- N. This policy prohibits the unlawful photography and surveillance on property owned by CSUB. An sUAS or Model Aircraft may not be used to monitor or record activities where there is a *reasonable expectation of privacy*, unless approved by the Board in advance.
- O. Under FAA guidelines, Temporary Flight Restrictions (TFR) may be implemented on university property or at any university sponsored event, which prohibit any type of sUAS operations from taking place (e.g., university sporting events). As needed, the President may issue additional No Drone Zones on university property or at any university sponsored event, which prohibit any type of sUAS operations from taking place.
- P. Any individual or organization found to be operating a sUAS on university property or at a university sponsored event in violation of their FAA-approved status, or any federal, state, and local laws or regulations, or in violation of applicable university policies, may be directed by an Officer of the University Police Department, or other authorized university representatives, to cease operation of the sUAS immediately unless or until an approval of the flight operation or activity is obtained. Violations by university personnel or groups will be treated as appropriate (Section I). Violations by non-CSUB persons or groups will be treated as appropriate by the University Police Department.
- Q. The operation of sUAS by the University Police Department may be exempted from this policy based on the determination of emergency needs. The UPD will follow internal Department protocols during such operations.

IV. Statement of Procedures

CSUB personnel planning to use sUAS for teaching, research, or any other valid purpose will first submit an application for authorization to the Board. Authorization for research purposes should be sought prior to the submission of any proposal or the acceptance of any award for each project that necessitates the use of an sUAS. Deliberations and recommendations by the Review Board will consider and conform with all other applicable University policies and review procedures including, but not necessarily limited to, the Institutional Review Board (*e.g.*, for human subjects protection), the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (*e.g.* for the protection of research animal subjects), the Office of Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs (for export controls and trade sanctions), and the Extended University (*i.e.*, for overseeing activity abroad). The Review Board shall meet at least once in a semester and will consider all requests for authorization to ensure full compliance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations, and prior to requesting public declaration letters from the CSU Office of the General Counsel (OGC) for Public Use COA. Each Public Use COA application to the FAA will be accompanied by a public declaration. Deployment of a public use sUAS by CSUB personnel will only take place subsequent to FAA approval of a COA. All civil sUAS deployment will comply with Title 14 CFR part 107. Detailed information on processes and procedures for the appropriate use of sUAS at CSUB are provided in the *Procedures for the Use of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (sUAS) at the California State University Bakersfield (CSUB)*.

References

FAA *Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-95)*; Title 49 §§ 44101 – 44104

FAA *Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems; Final Rule*. 14 CFR Parts 21, 43, 61, et al., Federal Register Vol. 81, #124, June 28, 2016.

Office of the Chancellor - *Campus Guidelines for Applying for a Certificate of Authorization (COA) from the FAA*.

The Ohio State University, *Unmanned Aircraft Systems*.

<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/Service%20Center/Forms/Fiscal/UAS/Unmanned-Aircraft-Systems-Policy.pdf>

APPENDIX I: **Terms and Definitions**

- A. **Aircraft:** 49 U.S.C. § 40102(a)(6) defines an “aircraft” as “any contrivance invented, used, or designed to navigate or fly in the air.” The Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA’s) regulations (14 C.F.R. § 1.1) similarly define an “aircraft” as “a device that is used or intended to be used for flight in the air.”
- B. **Certificate of Waiver; Certificate of Authorization (COA):** The terms “certificate of waiver” and “certificate of authorization” mean a Federal Aviation Administration grant of approval for a specific flight operation. A Public Use COA is granted to a public agency or organization to operate a specific aircraft for a specific purpose in a specific location. A Public Use COA is only issued after the process of determining public status, government use, and an operational and technical review.
- C. **Model Aircraft:** A *small unmanned aircraft* that is flown for hobby or recreation purposes, per section 336(c) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, capable of sustained flight in the atmosphere, and flown within visual line of sight of the aircraft operator. FAA approval is not required for the operation of a model aircraft.
- D. **Public and Civil Aircrafts:** The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) classifies all aircraft as belonging to one of two categories: public or civil. A *public aircraft* is one owned and operated by the United States government or the government of a state, the District of Columbia, or a territory or possession of the U. S. or a political subdivision. Any aircraft that does not meet the definition of a public aircraft is considered a *civil aircraft*. Any UAS use requires FAA approval.
- E. **Public Declaration.** A public declaration letter is a document issued by the OGC certifying that: (1) an applicant for a COA is a part of the State government; (2) the UAS is a "public aircraft"; (3) the UAS will be used for a "governmental function"; and, (4) the UAS will not be used for "commercial purposes."
- F. **Reasonable Expectation of Privacy.** Locations where there is an objective expectation of privacy. Examples include but are not limited to restrooms, locker rooms, residence halls, health treatment and medical facilities, and camps or campus settings where minors are cared for or taught.
- G. **Section 333 Exemption.** An FAA exemption under Section 333 of The Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-95) which grants an individual or entity the ability to operate a UAS for civil and non-governmental purposes and activities, other than recreational or hobbyist activity.
- H. **Small Unmanned Aircraft (sUA).** – The term “small unmanned aircraft” means an unmanned aircraft weighing less than 55 pounds.
- I. **Unmanned Aircraft (UA):** Unmanned aircraft is an aircraft operated without the possibility of direct human intervention from within or on the aircraft. This proposed definition is consistent with the definition of “unmanned aircraft” specified in Public Law 112–95.
- J. **Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS):** The term “unmanned aircraft system” means an unmanned aircraft and associated elements (including communication links and the

components that control the unmanned aircraft) that are required for the pilot in command to operate safely and efficiently in the national airspace system. A UAS is the unmanned aircraft (UA) and all of the associated support equipment, control station, data links, telemetry, communications and navigation equipment, etc., necessary to operate the unmanned aircraft.

- K. *Remote ID* is the ability of a drone in flight to provide identification and location information that can be received by other parties.

APPENDIX II: FAA Requirements

The FAA requires public entities, such as the CSU, that wish to submit a public use COA application to provide a *public declaration letter* certifying that the entity and its proposed UAS operation are eligible to apply for a COA. In the public declaration letter, the CSU Office of General Counsel (OGC) is required to certify that: **(1)** the applicant is a part of the State government; **(2)** the UAS is a "public aircraft"; **(3)** the UAS will be used for a "governmental function"; and, **(4)** the UAS will not be used for "commercial purposes."

Acronyms:

AMA: Academy of Model Aeronautics
COA: Certificate of Authorization
EAR: Export Administration Regulations
FAA: Federal Aviation Administration
ITAR: International Traffic in Arms Regulations
OGC: Office of General Counsel
UAS: Unmanned Aircraft System
sUAS: Small Unmanned Aerial System
 UA: Unmanned Aircraft
UAV: Unmanned Aerial Vehicle

REFERENCES:

- FAA Unmanned Aircraft Systems Home Page, (<http://www.faa.gov/uas/>) May 6, 2015
- Advisory Circular 00-1.1A, Public Aircraft Operations, (http://www.faa.gov/regulations_policies/advisory_circulars/index.cfm/go/document.information/documentID/1023366) February 12, 2014
- Clarification of June 13, 2014 Interpretation on Research Using UAS (PDF), (http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/agc/pol_adjudication/agc200/interpretations/data/interps/2014/williams-afs-80%20clarification%20-%20%282014%29%20legal%20interpretation.pdf) July 3, 2014
- UAS Operations by Public Universities for Aeronautical Research (PDF), (http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/agc/pol_adjudication/agc200/interpret

[ations/data/interps/2014/williams-afs-80%20-%20%282014%29%20legal%20interpretation.pdf](#))
June 13, 2014

- Letter to COA Holders – Statutory Requirement to Register UAS (PDF), (http://www.faa.gov/uas/regulations_policies/media/Registration_letter.pdf) November 5, 2014
- Certificate of Authorization or Waiver (COA), ATO UAS description of the COA process, (http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/ato/service_units/systemops/aaim/organizations/uas/coa/) November 14, 2014
- Publicly Released COAs, (http://www.faa.gov/uas/public_operations/foia_responses/) February 25, 2015
- Federal Aviation Administration Unmanned Aircraft Systems fact page, (http://www.faa.gov/news/fact_sheets/news_story.cfm?newsId=14153) January 6, 2014
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Unmanned Aircraft Program (<http://uas.noaa.gov/>)
- FAA Model Aircraft rules, http://www.faa.gov/uas/media/model_aircraft_spec_rule.pdf
- Operations Over People, [Operations Over People General Overview \(faa.gov\)](#) April 21, 2021
- UAS Remote Identification, [UAS Remote Identification Overview \(faa.gov\)](#) April 21, 2021



Processes and Procedures for the Use of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (sUAS) under Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) Part 107

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has jurisdiction over all navigable airspace in the United States and is responsible for ensuring the safe and efficient oversight and management of the national airspace system (NAS). All aircraft, whether manned or unmanned, are subject to FAA rules and regulations, and violations carry severe federal penalties. The FAA rule established in 14 CFR part 107, integrates civil small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (sUAS) into the NAS and allows sUAS operations for many different non-hobby and non-recreational purposes without requiring airworthiness certification, exemption, or a Certificate of Waiver or Authorization (COA).

The **CSUB Unmanned Aircraft Systems Review Board (UASRB)** is charged with the responsibility of (1) developing internal policies, processes, and procedures needed to obtain authorization for the use of sUAS on University property, and for other university-related purposes off campus; (2) reviewing and approving of internal requests for the use of sUAS; and (3) monitoring the use of sUAS by CSUB personnel to ensure that CSUB complies with all applicable local, state, and federal rules, regulations, statutes, and laws.

Application Procedure

The UASRB has established the following simplified processes and procedures to guide CSUB personnel who propose to develop and/or use a sUAS at CSUB. The following step-by-step process is designed to enable users to access the relevant materials and submit required documents needed for permission to use a sUAS:

STEP BY STEP GUIDE TO OPERATING SMALL UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS ON CSUB CAMPUS UNDER 14 CFR PART 107

1. [Read the Summary of the Small UAS Rule \(Summary of Small Unmanned Aircraft Rule-Part 107\)](#), Subpart B: [Operation of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems Over People](#), & [Remote Identification of Unmanned Aircraft](#).

2. To become a certified UAS Pilot, enroll in the initial [Become a Drone Pilot \(faa.gov\)](#).
3. Drone equipment must be registered with the FAA. [Register your sUAS](#) .
4. Drone equipment must also be registered with CSUB Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs Office. Complete the [CSUB sUAS Registration Form \(allow 10 business days for processing\)](#).
5. Obtain Liability Insurance - Contact the Director of Safety & Risk Management for Instructions - [sUAS Liability Insurance](#).
6. Submit a Flight Request- [CSUB sUAS Flight Request Form \(please allow 10 business days for processing\)](#).
7. Download the [B4UFLY Smartphone App \(Alerts UAS operators of restrictions or requirements at the location where they want to fly\)](#).
8. Following each approved flight, Submit a Flight Report- [CSUB sUAS Post-Flight Reporting Form](#).

Maintenance and Storage of Equipment and Instrumentation

All sUAS must be registered with the Office of Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs.

The physical maintenance, storage and preparation of UASs operated and owned by CSUB will be the responsibility of the relevant unit or academic program area. Direct responsibility rests first with the remote pilot in command (PIC), and then with the faculty, staff, student researchers, or volunteers, named in the Flight Operations Plan.

Aside from any fixed, onboard systems (i.e., temperature loggers, GPS, barometers, navigation cameras), the maintenance (including calibration) of any sensor instrumentation is the responsibility of the PIC or faculty who filed the Flight Operations Plan.

Registration and Document Retention

All authorized aircraft in a UAS on CSUB campus must be registered with the Office Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs, and with the FAA Aircraft Registration Branch. Registration with the FAA is a statutory requirement (See Title 49 §§ 44101 – 44104, and 14 CFR part 47).

All sUAS on campus should be registered with the Office of Grants, Research, & Sponsored Programs. This applies to both existing UASs and any new UAS purchases being contemplated. All new UAS systems and system component acquisitions should be processed via requisitions

(P-card purchases are not appropriate) and registered with the Office of Grants, Research, & Sponsored Programs upon receipt.

Data Storage and Use

The Provost or designee may review and modify assignment of responsibilities for the maintenance and storage of sUAS and other related equipment, as needed. Any university-owned UAS and related support equipment will be stored in appropriate facilities designated in the approved Flight Operations Plan.

CSUB Policy on the Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) prohibits the unlawful photography and surveillance on public or private property. As such, the PIC for a project will perform due diligence to ensure proper use of the data as specified by this procedure and by local, state, and federal regulations. This includes data review by an individual designated by the remote PIC to eliminate sensitive, compromising, or otherwise inappropriate material (e.g. attributes that identify individuals such as, but not limited to, recognizable faces, license plate numbers on vehicles, etc.) before data are distributed for analysis, stored on a server with broader access, or made public in any way. When a UAS is operated in conjunction with a partner agency (e.g., County, State, Federal or NGO), and the agency has first access to the data, the agency will perform the prescribed due diligence.

Compliance with Applicable Regulations and Law

The UASRB and sUAS operator (PIC) are responsible for compliance with all relevant FAA regulations. The operator and all relevant campus entities (including Departments, Schools, Administrative units) should ensure that the proposed UAS operations

- Comply with applicable laws, government regulations, and University policies,
- Do not pose a threat to health, safety, privacy, or the environment,
- Include appropriate steps to manage and mitigate associated risks, and
- Serve the mission of the University and interests of the public at large.

Report of Accidents

All accidents that result in vehicle repair, property damage or injury must be documented in operations logs for each UAS. Accidents involving injury and/or property damage (excluding the UAS) must be reported to the UASRB within 24 hours of the incident.

The remote pilot of a small UAS is required to report an accident to the FAA within 10 days if the accident results (a) in serious injury to any person or in any loss of consciousness, AND/OR (b) damage to any property, other than the UAS, if the cost is greater than \$500 to repair or replace the property (whichever is lower).

Contact for *Office of Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs*: Gwen Parnell, Research Compliance Analyst, gparnell@csub.edu (661) 654-6712



CSU Bakersfield

**Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Exploratory Faculty Group Report
Summer 2021**

Report approved on August 11, 2021 by Exploratory Faculty Group

Authors: Angel Vázquez-Ramos, Joseph Florez (Co-Chair), David Olson, Pratigya Sigdya, Kanwalinderjit Gagneja, Saeed Jafarzadeh, Juterh Nmah, Sarana Roberts, Isabel Sumaya (Co-Chair), Kristine Holloway, Deborah Boschini, Leslie Williams, and Claudia Catota

Distribution: Dr. Vernon Harper, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs

Table of Contents

Background	3
Method	3
DEI Mission.....	3
DEI Framework for a Program	4
Faculty Fellows Job Description.....	4
Required Qualifications.....	4
Responsibilitites	4
Compensation	4
Proposals.....	4
Goals and Objectives of the Program	4
Teaching.....	4
Scholarship and Creative Activities.....	5
Service.....	6
Addendum A: Example Proposal Topics.....	7
Recommendations	8

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Exploratory Faculty Group Report

Background

The Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Faculty Exploratory Group met during the summer and were charged by the Provost to explore the viability, and potential approaches, for a DEI Faculty Fellows program at CSUB. The group included faculty representatives from each school, a representative from the library, two representatives from the Office of the Provost and a representative from the Office of the President. The exploratory group included: Angel Vázquez-Ramos (AH), Joseph Florez (AH, Co-Chair), David Olson (BPA), Pratigya Sigdya (BPA), Kanwalinderjit Gagneja (NSME), Saeed Jafarzadeh (NSME), Juterh Nmah (SSE), Sarana Roberts (SSE), Isabel Sumaya (SSE, Co-Chair), Kristine Holloway (Library), Deborah Boschini (Office of the Provost), Leslie Williams (Office of the Provost), and Claudia Catota (Office of the President). The group began their work after the initial meeting with the Provost at the end of June and were given the deadline of the end of summer to complete its work. Here, we provide a general framework for a DEI Faculty Fellows Program at CSUB as well as recommendations for the success of the program.

Method

The group first began with a general discussion on the need for a DEI Faculty Fellows program at CSUB. Although there was agreement that faculty could benefit from a university supported program because there is none currently in place, some were apprehensive about making recommendations without the benefit of faculty feedback that would inform the development of a program. From this discussion, the group determined it was not feasible to collect meaningful data outright from faculty during the summer with the limited time it had and a possible low response rate it might encounter. The group thought a good alternative for informative data would be from the recent Climate Survey conducted during this past spring by the independent management consulting firm, ModernThink LLC., commissioned by CSUB's Division of Equity, Inclusion and Compliance. Unfortunately, these data were not accessible to the group. In the end, the group decided it could still provide initial recommendations and a framework for a DEI Faculty Fellows program. In fact, some felt data were not necessary to successfully meet the task.

To begin the framework, national and other CSU DEI faculty programs were researched for best practices. It was soon determined that there is no standard DEI program. Some programs solely focused on DEI in the context of hiring practices while other programs focused on faculty after their hire. Also, in some cases, programs had faculty as the participants in their programs dedicated to addressing DEI issues through research, teaching, and service projects while others used their faculty fellows to facilitate and oversee the implementation of the institution's DEI strategic vision. It was the decision of the group that our framework would focus on faculty fellows as facilitators. We were influenced by best practices and incorporated those into the framework. Because we wanted to embed DEI in all we do, we developed our framework around enhancing DEI in teaching, scholarship and creative work and service.

Mission Statement - CSUB Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Faculty Fellows

The mission of the CSUB Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Faculty Fellows is to nurture and promote a learning and work environment that values diversity by supporting and advocating the inclusion of all voices and perspectives in facilitating equitable programs and policy that enrich the areas of teaching, scholarly or creative work, and service.

Framework for CSUB DEI Faculty Fellows

Fellows will be selected from each school and/or department (librarians, counselors, or coaches) for a period of up to two academic years based on submitted proposals which focus on one or more of the goals and objectives outlined below in the areas related to teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service.

Job Description of Faculty Fellows

Required Qualifications:

- Full-time instructor status or equivalent positions as librarians, counselors, and/or coaches
- Interest in issues related to diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice as evidenced in submitted proposal
- Ability to facilitate projects from inception to completion both independently and with others

Responsibilities:

Each Fellow will carry out the work outlined in their proposals and disseminate their outcomes through, for example, a university presentation, academic conference, journal publication, or through equivalent appropriate creative expression. Fellows will be DEI liaisons for their respective school and/or department during their appointment.

Compensation:

In return for meeting these responsibilities, each Fellow will receive the equivalent of one course release per semester during a full academic year of service.

Proposals:

Applicants will submit proposals that focus on facilitating at least one of the DEI target areas (teaching, scholarly/creative activity, service) and may address interrelated DEI themes such as: (A) race and ethnicity, (B) gender and sexuality, (C) disability and access, (D) high impact programs, (E) search, hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion, (F) forum and outreach, and (G) worldview, religion, and beliefs.

Goals and Objectives of the Program

Teaching

Goal I. Promote educational and creative experiences in the classroom and laboratory that facilitate greater diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Description/Rationale. Encourage deeper exploration of an understanding of one's own uniqueness, that of others, and how each of these can contribute to a better world through curricular and pedagogical development.

Objective a. Support the development of curricular and interdisciplinary innovation in the classroom, laboratory, and other creative spaces/outlets.

Objective b. Encourage high impact practices/programs (mentorships, internships, study abroad, study away, service learning).

Objective c. Enhance cross-discipline learning and enrichment activities (Runner Reader, sport/theater/music, etc.).

Assessment of Expected Outcome (s). Initiate processes for student evaluation; develop quantitative and/or qualitative assessment metrics (pre-/post-test, satisfaction assessments, reflection, etc.), and presentation of results/extended abstract.

Goal 2. Facilitate opportunities for personal and professional growth and enrichment to deepen understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Description/Rationale. Increase support for faculty who are interested in designing curricular and scholarly practices that strengthen inclusive environments and/or build collaborations to enhance DEI.

Objective a. Coordinate training opportunities with the Division of Equity, Inclusion, and Compliance, FTLC, and other administrative bodies on diversity, equity, and inclusion in hiring, retention, and promotion and throughout the career of each faculty.

Objective b. Facilitate professional development and training (faculty-to-faculty mini courses/seminars, guest speakers/lecturers) within and across disciplines and the wider community.

Objective c. Implement and coordinate DEI journal/publication for CSUB.

Assessment of Expected Outcome (s). Initiate processes for project evaluation; develop quantitative and/or qualitative assessment metrics (pre-/post-test, satisfaction assessments, reflection, etc.), and presentation of results.

Scholarly/Creative Activity

Goal 1. Propel research in diversity, equity, and inclusion in original scholarly outputs and the performing arts at CSUB and through other educational entities.

Objective a. Establish annual funding for research and artistic projects that are DEI focused.

Objective b. Prioritize DEI projects that include students.

Objective c. Organize seminars/training sessions with on-campus resources such as IRB or FTLC on how to conduct research/artistic endeavors with diverse populations.

Objective d. Identify gaps in DEI research at CSUB and attempt to fill those gaps by proposing criteria that researchers can use when creating research proposals.

Assessment of Expected Outcome (s). Initiate processes for project evaluation; develop quantitative and/or qualitative assessment metrics (pre-/post-test, satisfaction assessments, reflection, etc.), and presentation of results.

Goal 2. Further students' DEI issues and concerns through their direct or indirect involvement in research or creative outputs at CSUB.

Description/Rationale. Ensure that students have an opportunity to experience and participate in faculty-led research processes on DEI topics. Such engagement will also help the university identify gaps in its knowledge of student experiences and DEI engagement.

Objective a. Deepen faculty/student collaboration on DEI issues.

Objective b. Identify DEI issues that affect student experience on campus.

Objective c. Determine efficacy of existing and proposed programs targeting DEI.

Objective d. Analyze barriers to student retention based on DEI.

Assessment of Expected Outcome (s). Initiate processes for project evaluation; develop quantitative and/or qualitative assessment metrics (pre-/post-test, satisfaction assessments, reflection, etc.), and presentation of results.

Service

Goal 1. Enhance policies, procedures, and processes for committee selection to maximize accessibility, opportunity, and include diversity, equity, and inclusion language for all faculty.

Description/Rationale. Focus on equitable processes for faculty to participate in committees and more diverse representation of members on committees.

Objective a. Assess existing procedures and processes of committee recruitment and identify areas of improvement that would lead to a more equitable and diverse selection process.

Objective b. Recommend and/or implement more inclusive policies likely to lead to diverse committees.

Assessment of Expected Outcome (s). Initiate processes for project evaluation; develop quantitative and/or qualitative assessment metrics (pre-/post-test, satisfaction assessments, reflection, etc.), and presentation of results.

Goal 2. Enhance and highlight community outreach and impact, outside of courses, in support of the CSUB service area.

Description/Rationale. Create a community on and off campus that works together to meet DEI goals. To promote CSUB's DEI agenda and gain community support and partnership. To inform faculty and staff of the work occurring campus-wide, that focuses on issues of diversity and inclusion.

Objective a. Create avenues to share what faculty are doing in committees and subcommittees to promote diversity and equity at the community, program, department, school, and/or university level.

Objective b. Promote DEI-informed events and projects through flyers, online announcements, and social media to campus and wider Bakersfield community.

Assessment of Expected Outcome (s). Initiate processes for project evaluation; develop quantitative and/or qualitative assessment metrics (pre-/post-test, satisfaction assessments, reflection, etc.), and presentation of results.

Goal 3. Ensure faculty are intentional in diversity, equity, and inclusion in student advising and mentoring.

Description/Rationale. To help select and/or provide pertinent training/professional development for CSUB's faculty.

Objective a. Identify training opportunities within and outside of the CSU System.

Objective b. Organize and implement events.

Objective c. Disseminate related literature.

Assessment of Expected Outcome (s). Initiate processes for project evaluation; develop quantitative and/or qualitative assessment metrics (pre-/post-test, satisfaction assessments, reflection, etc.), and presentation of results.

Addendum A: Example Proposal Topics

- Develop, implement, and assess a unit or department DEI plan and/or DEI climate
- Collaborate with HBCU's or other minority-based institutions
- Redesign an existing course to include DEI issues
- Create and implement a DEI training module
- Design and carry out a DEI inspired creative endeavor
- Create and deliver a DEI centered study away course
- Develop a DEI faculty forum for research, teaching, and/or service activities
- Conduct a research project related to DEI related issues
- Create and implement a community-based DEI outreach

Recommendations

- Establish a DEI Faculty Advisory Group to oversee the program and continue work of DEI Faculty Exploratory Group.
- Establish DEI Faculty support staff.
- Provide ample time for promotion, roll out of program, and application period.
- First Fellows selected for a Fall 2022 Program.
- Provide Fellows the opportunity to apply for specified funding related to the advancement or completion of their projects.
- Provide appropriate training for Fellows to successfully meet stated outcomes.
- Seek funding from Foundation and other external sources for support of the program.
- Once program is established, promote program in recruitment materials for new faculty hires.
- Collaborate with the CSUB Walter Stiern Library Repository to document and maintain history of program and outcomes.
- Coordinate with other CSU DEI Faculty Fellows Programs to establish working relationships and projects.