

## ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

### Agenda

Tuesday, November 2, 2021

10:00 a.m. – 11:25 a.m.

Video Conference

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain 10:05)
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
October 19, 2021 Minutes
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. AB 1460 Funds
    - ii. WSL Masking Proposal (handout)
    - iii. Tenure Density (handout)
    - iv. Grants and Sponsored Research Faculty Advisory Council
  - c. Searches (V. Harper)
    - i. AVP GRaSP –The committee meet Falls '21 and Spring '22.
    - ii. AVP IRPA – The committee meetings began last month.
    - iii. Dean BPA – The committee began last month.
    - iv. Dean NSME - The committee has been launched
    - v. Dean Antelope Valley –
      - Provost's Appointments
      - The committee meets Fall '21 and Spring '22
    - vi. Dean Library – New call for reconstituted committee ends today
    - vii. Associate Dean Undergraduate and Graduate Studies – the committee meets Falls '21 and Spring '22.
  - d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
  - e. AB 928
  - f. AAC Referrals: Copy Catalog and Special Concerns – J. Tarjan
  - g. Proposal to Migrate FYS into the Library (handout)

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain 10:45)
- a. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth
    - i. ATI Working Group (handout)
      - 1. Appointments
      - 2. Sub-committee – Instructional Materials
    - ii. Wang Awards – FHAC Recommendation
    - iii. Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change
    - iv. School Elevation Exploratory Committee (SEEC) – Two EC members
    - v. President’s Sustainability Committee
    - vi. School Elections Committee – Handbook Change 202.7
    - vii. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
    - viii. Standing Committee Bylaws change – (Section IV)
      - 1. Chair Election Statement of Interest (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
      - 2. Two-years on Senate requirement
      - 3. Structure of BPC
      - 4. Strike “at least” (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
    - ix. Committee proliferation
  - b. Summer Compensation
  - c. GECCo Authority (handout)
  - d. Exam Modality for Flex Classes
  - e. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (handout)
  - f. Reconsider Time Blocks
  - g. Investment Divestiture
  - h. Senate Calendar and Potential Timelines in Standing Committee(s)
  - i. Academic Integrity
    - i. Academic Integrity Pledge
  - j. Sabbatical Process Improvement - FAC
  - k. RTP Completeness – Handbook Change (handout) - FAC
  - l. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s)
  - m. Philosophy on Teaching Modalities
  - n. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC
  - o. Distinguished Professor Award – (handout) FAC
  - p. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
  - q. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)
  - r. Assigned Time application revision and timing (Hold pending further information) – FAC

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING November 4, 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

New Business

Old Business

Open Forum (Time Certain 11:15)

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

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

## ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

### Minutes

Tuesday, October 19, 2021

10:00 a.m. – 11:25 a.m.

Video Conference

**Members:** A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair), J. Millar, M. Martinez, E. Correa, C. Lam, M. Rees, J. Tarjan, V. Harper

**Absent:** M. Martinez (excused)

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK

- Foundation Board – The faculty representative, A. Jacobsen, asked for Senate updates to be shared with the Board at their November 5 meeting. She identified that some faculty have gone back to face-to-face teaching, the Senate passed the Bachelors in Public Health program, and the Masters of Science in Computer Science program. Perhaps add to that, the Ethnic Studies formation is in progress. (A. Hegde) We want to have transparency about where things are. (E. Correa)
- Budget Forum – C. Lam did a great job. The recording is available on the Budget Central webpage, [here](#). (A. Hegde) Consider whether we want to go on record, as we have done before, with our interest in improving the tenure track (TT) numbers and reducing the student/faculty ratio. While the President said CSUB would use growth monies for that, the deeper issue is the explosion of non-teaching staff of all types. We used to be where we should be for a non-urban campus. Currently, it's far away from where it should be. Those positions keep being added when instruction is the focus of our campus. (J. Tarjan) We can discuss reaffirming RES 192017 Balancing the Restoration of Faculty Ranks with MPP and Staff Hiring and a commitment to that. Perhaps look at the cost of instruction. It's 47% of the net operating budget. We want a good portion of that for instruction. (A. Hegde) AB 1725 mandated the community colleges which receive monies from the State to have 50% expenditures in the district on instruction. The community would be perplexed that less than 50% of CSUB's budget is for instruction. (J. Tarjan) The Foundation Board may be interested in the enrollment growth in comparison to hiring. (E. Correa) It's in the Budget Book (C. Lam) BPC could look at the data and touch points and put out a report with analysis of enrollment growth and then the EC can have a broader conversation. (A. Hegde) As noted by the President, we did

not get an allocation for an off-campus center to provide the same quality of service for Antelope Valley. The Foundation Board may be interested in that. (J. Tarjan)

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A. Hegde added Academic Master Plan (AMP) Bakersfield 2022-23 through 2031-32 to NEW DISCUSSION. J. Tarjan requested adding two items: Chair access to virtual WPAFs and the schedule for independent unit chair RTP review and missing materials. M. Rees requested adding, access to Task Stream.

E. Correa moved to approve the agenda as amended. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

E. Correa moved to approve the October 5, 2021 Minutes. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS

a. AS Log (handout)

- i. AAC (J. Tarjan) A number of items were acted upon as the inter school curriculum committee.

Referral # 9 Proposal to Employ High Impact (HIP) Practice Tracking – the committee is close to being ready to meet with AS&SS. (J. Tarjan)

Referral # 8 General Studies (GST) Department Formation was withdrawn from AAC, BPC, and FAC by the EC. The new referral sent to AAC focuses on foundational concerns. (A. Hegde)

- ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)

Referral # 9 Proposal to Employ High Impact (HIP) Practice Tracking - Vice Chair A. Lauer and Interim Assoc. Dean for Undergraduate and Graduate Studies L. Vega put faculty concerns into a document for AAC's review and joint committee discussion and whether to submit a recommendation or a resolution.

- iii. FAC (M. Rees)

Referral # 14 Proposal for the Creation of an Ethnic Studies (ES) Department - the committee received some questions from the prospective ES faculty in response FAC's memo and are processing it.

Referral 03 Electronic RTP as Application Standard – the survey on RTP storage in Box resulted in complaints about lack of organization of the files. The workshop is starting to fix that. The committee is reluctant to pay for Interfolio software while they are getting used to using Box. (M. Rees) Perhaps another workshop in coordination with AVP FA could be scheduled for December to help those scheduled for Spring RTP. (A. Hegde)

- iv. BPC (C. Lam) The committee spent their time talking about the Budget Book.

b. Provost Update (V. Harper)

- i. Budget Forum – V. Harper thanked C. Lam and A. Hegde for a very good forum and to all who attended for their participation. The campus has come a long way toward receiving answers to questions, while some questions remain.
- ii. Vaccination Status Deadline – It’s imperative that full-time and part-time faculty interact with the Point-and-Click system before October 27. The requirement applies to all Fall ’21 and Spring ’22 faculty. If faculty hasn’t uploaded their vaccination record, or exception or not getting tested every week as part of their exemption, they will be disciplined. The first step is suspension. 20% of faculty haven’t interacted with the system. They have been contacted directly by the Provost or the AVP FA and some of those conversations were not productive. The list of individuals is confidential. The Provost requested that faculty members reach out to their colleagues through a global email to their department, so they know the requirement was bargained and how serious this is. His concern is the reaction when those who aren’t interacting receive a memo that includes “termination”. (V. Harper)
  - Q: There are glitches in the system where the process doesn’t go through. SS&E administrators were asked to share the issues. Will they be rectified? (E. Correa)
  - A: As long as faculty are interacting with the system, they’re in compliance. (V. Harper)
  - Request: Have Deans send a message to their department chairs emphasizing that employment action may be taken on Spring instructors if they do not interact with the portal. (J. Tarjan)
  - Suggestion: There needs to be a small help desk for Point-and-Click. Give outreach info in the landing page. (M. Danforth)
  - Comment: It will be difficult for department chairs to plan for Spring if suddenly they lose teaching staff or support staff and they’re not ready for it. (C. Lam)
  - Response: The first step is suspension. The workflow has been discussed with the Deans. They are prepared. (V. Harper)
- iii. Hiring Expansion – V. Harper meets with the Deans today. He shared the unique document, *Expansion Line Allocation Guidance*, with EC. The President authorized two tenure track nurses relative to the \$6 million procured from the legislature. Nine positions are restored. Three expansion lines: one for AB 1460. Two to be allocated. He is collecting data to see where the positions should be allocated as a cross reference to what the Deans have noted for hires. The purpose of the guidance is to make sure everyone understands the process. Expect to see your dean at the next chairs’ meeting to discuss which unit to advocate for expansion.
- iv. Video recording deletion – A meeting is planned with CFA President, CIO and the Provost to discuss the deletion of Zoom files after 180 days.
- v. Policy Portal – csub.edu/policies Ultimately, it will give guidance on all Academic Affairs (AA). There are many policies working their way through the system. The EC will have the opportunity to have input on policy before it becomes permanent. The policy portal should help close the gap on the lack of

- information on indirect cost recovery, computer refreshes, professional development, etc. EC gave their feedback to the Provost.
- vi. Ethnic Studies Funding - \$672,000 has been allocated on a recurring basis to AB 1460, not to an Ethnic Studies Department.
  - vii. WSL Masking Proposal (deferred)
  - viii. Tenure Density (handout)
  - ix. Grants and Sponsored Research (GRaSP) Faculty Advisory Council
- c. Searches (V. Harper)
- i. AVP GRaSP –The committee has been launched.
  - ii. AVP IRPA – The committee has been launched.
  - iii. Dean BPA – The committee starts this week. The response from HR is that there is no policy about committee member attendance.
  - iv. Dean NSME - The committee has been launched
  - v. Dean Antelope Valley – see 6.a. The committee meets Fall '21 and Spring '22
  - vi. Dean Library – see 6.a. The committee meets Spring '22
  - vii. Associate Dean Undergraduate and Graduate Studies – the committee meets Falls '21 and Spring '22.
- d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – See 2.
- e. AB 928 –The intent of the legislation is that all three systems-Community College, CSUs, and UCs- have the same general education (GE) path. The concern is that maybe oral communication would be lost because the UC system doesn't require it. The CSU Senate Chairs discussed it. The Vice-Chancellor asked the Senate Chairs not do anything while negotiations are being worked through. (A. Hegde) They will get faculty input through the Inter-segmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS). It's the EC of the three-system senates. The intent is to set-up a portal for input. J. Tarjan has asked the ICAS Chair to have it be campus-based requests so that CSUB can provide comment, rather than be discipline based requests. (J. Tarjan)
- f. AAC Referrals: Copy Catalog and Special Concerns – J. Tarjan (deferred)
- g. Library New MPP position – The Interim Dean Library sent a request to have a current staff position converted to an MPP position, Associate Dean. (A. Hegde) Is there an additional cost and how would that work? (E. Correa) Associate Dean would cost more. It would have to be absorbed as part of position control. A new MPP would have to be approved by the President. The AS is a necessary step in the process. Yet, an approval by Senate does not guarantee its implementation. (V. Harper) J. Tarjan doesn't think any librarians have been added, yet we went from the Director of the Library to Dean of the Library, and then Dean of Library with the department Chair, and now we have to deal with an Associate Dean. As soon as we provide that much reassigned time to administrative support etcetera to the schools, maybe we can move forward with the Library. The library's role has diminished over time. The things they do are important, but they are done a different way. It's questionable how much actual direct work is done. There are a lot of administrative positions that are redundant on campus and this position would be right at the top of the list, should it be authorized. (J. Tarjan) Recall that there was a request from EEGO for an Associate Dean position that was not approved

because EEGO is not an academic unit where there is a need for Dean, Associate Dean, and department Chairs. Do we send to sub-committee or EC return it due to lack of support? Then, it would be up to the Provost and the requesting Interim Dean whether they want to move it to the President, informing her that the Senate doesn't support this. (A. Hegde) What was the process for EEGO? (M. Danforth) It went to BPC and BPC said "no" and that was the end of it. (A. Hegde) The Library also has a proposal forwarded to take over part of General Education (GE) and hiring faculty for that position. This is unprecedented. (J. Tarjan) Discussion ensued. Voted: don't send to committee. A. Hegde will send a memo to the Provost with a copy to the Interim Dean Library saying that the EC did not feel that the proposal should move forward at this time; EC is not in favor and doesn't support it. (A. Hegde)

- h. General Studies Department proposal revision – Referral #08 withdrawn from AAC, BPC and FAC upon recommendation of AAC Chair, and then a new referral sent to AAC. The issues were discussed in EC meeting, September 19, 2021.
- i. Proposal to Migrate FYS into the Library (deferred)

#### 6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS

##### a. Search Committee Composition

Dean Antelope Valley (AV) Search Committee - Librarian in AV volunteered for the Dean AV Search Committee.

Dean Library Search Committee – an existing member is on sabbatical.

Handbook 309.5 is slightly ambiguous in how it defines General Faculty and how it applies to eligibility. The issues are

- Currently, the Dean AV and Dean Library search committee were formed from four full-time tenured faculty members: (1) from each school. The Handbook states that for individual schools, Library, and Antelope Valley, (4) full-time faculty members drawn and elected from the effected constituency.
- The clause, tenured faculty members, does not indicate "General Faculty", which would include librarians.
- The Search Committee Dean Library was constituted before the latest update to Handbook 309.5. Search committees has been held longer than eighteen months, essentially two academic years. Should we look at when a search committee needs to be reconstituted? (M. Danforth)

The Search Committee Library needs to be reconstituted, primarily due to the expiration of its term of service before launching. (A. Hegde) In terms of structure of the committees, it's unclear who are the AV and Library constituency. (M. Danforth) The Library serves the entire university. We're correct in doing it university-wide. The Antelope Valley campus is populated by faculty from the main campus or hired to teach at AV. Its constituency is university-wide. (A. Hegde) Discussion ensued.



- The consensus for the Library is that it serves the university, so the current search committee structure consists of four full-time tenured faculty from any school or library. If librarians aren't elected, librarians can be appointed to represent the Library. (A. Hegde) Reconstitute the Dean of the Library Search as a call for four full-time tenured faculty members from any school or the Library. It goes out to all faculty in the schools and all librarians. Send memo to announce result, K. Holloway to serve the BPA position on Dean AV Search Committee. (M. Danforth) Referral to FAC to look at section 309.5 (A. Hegde)
- b. Academic Master Plan (AMP) Bakersfield 2022-23 through 2031-32 referred to AAC and BPC
  - c. Access to Task Stream – There are concerns that its use and access be consistent to what was first presented as a “filing cabinet” for departments for their program review and WSCUC. The WSCUC assessment was put on the web and made public when it was understood to be private. Guidelines needed to clarify what Task Stream is used for and who has access to it. If others are pulling documents which were intended to be private, the documents may be taken down or put in differently. (M. Rees) Task Stream was originally presented as a place to store materials for WSCUC and ABET accreditation only. The original purpose may have been lost over time where individuals have asked for specialized Task Stream workspaces. (M. Danforth) There are a lot of people who have access to Task Stream. It appears that all they have to do is ask IRPA for access. There should be some vetting process as to who and why they need it and then approval from the people who are adding the material(s). (A. Hegde) To prevent potential FERPA violations, there needs to be an IRPA policy as to what should be on Task Stream. (M. Danforth) Referred to AAC, AS&SS, and BPC. (A. Hegde)
  - d. Chair access to virtual WPAFs – The RTP process does not have a timeline for chair review. There is a presumption that the chair review is an independent review from the unit committee. While it's uncommon, one would want to see what the unit committee said and if they didn't cover some things in the file, like a reprimand or recurring issues. As a solution, consider having a sequence where chair has a week to do their review and then it goes back to the candidate should there be a need for rebut, etc., then it goes to the Dean. Since files are stored electronically, it is difficult for the chair to gain access. (J. Tarjan) Refer to Handbook 305.5.3 Completeness of the RTP File. If the review committee believes there are missing materials, what do they do? (A. Hegde) The issues are 1) Clarify the wording to better communicate the meaning of the current language, such that materials have to be inserted and go through all levels of review 2) The timeline for review and where does the chair letter, if there is one, fit in? Now it's side by side with the unit committee. Should

- the order be unit committee, chair, and then dean? (M. Danforth) Per policy, even if someone wants to add more materials it's not possible. (E. Correa) It's unclear. The Handbook says one thing on the schedule, and it says all required things. At one point, it says one doesn't have to move forward and then it says if one wants to move forward, put materials in. An administrator has advised faculty that one could take things out of the PAF and stick it in the WPAF. That action isn't true to the interpretation of the policy. Clarification needed. (J. Tarjan) A draft referral will return to EC for their approval before giving it to FAC. (A. Hegde)
- e. GECCo Authority (deferred)
  - f. Exam Modality for Flex Classes (deferred)
  - g. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (deferred)
  - h. Summer Compensation (deferred)
  - i. Testing Center Exploratory Committee – Refer to Provost Harper's memo in the agenda. AS&SS may want to form a sub-committee. Include the recommended people from the Provost. (A. Hegde) The purpose is to hear the visions of Faculty, AVP of Enrollment Management (EM) and Testing Center Director and have logistical consultation. (V. Harper) Consider the feasibility and what it will look like. Referred to AS&SS. This is huge progress. (A. Hegde) E. Correa thanked the Provost.
  - j. Investment Divestiture (deferred)
  - k. Senate Calendar and Potential Timelines in Standing Committee(s) (deferred)
  - l. Academic Integrity – See Testing Center Exploratory Committee, item 6.i.
    - i. Academic Integrity Pledge (deferred)
  - m. Sabbatical Process Improvement – FAC (deferred)
  - n. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth (deferred)
    - i. ATI Working Group
      - 1. Appointments
      - 2. Sub-committee – Instructional Materials
    - ii. Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change
    - iii. School Elevation Exploratory Committee (SEEC) – Two EC members
    - iv. President's Sustainability Committee
    - v. School Elections Committee – Handbook Change 202.7
    - vi. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
    - vii. Standing Committee Bylaws change – (Section IV)
      - 1. Chair Election Statement of Interest (J. Tarjan's suggestion)
      - 2. Two-years on Senate requirement
      - 3. Structure of BPC
      - 4. Strike "at least" (J. Tarjan's suggestion)
    - viii. Committee proliferation

- o. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) (deferred)
- p. Philosophy on Teaching Modalities (deferred)
- q. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC (deferred)
- r. Distinguished Professor Award – FAC (deferred)
- s. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
- t. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)
- u. Assigned Time application revision and timing (Hold pending further information) – FAC

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING October 21, 2021**

Approval of Minutes

Announcements

- Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth

Approval of Agenda (Time Certain 10:05)

Reports

Resolutions (Time Certain 10:35)

Consent Agenda

New Business

Old Business

Open Forum (Time Certain 11:15)

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

Student attendance and drop observations: 30% of J. Tarjan’s class has dropped. 50% attendance in one of A. Hegde’s classes.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:31.

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – NOVEMBER 2, 2021

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

**Dates:** Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Nov 18, 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
8/24/21	2021-2022 02 Department Formation Criteria Revision		AAC, BPC, FAC The need to clarify and extend the current department formation procedures.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 05 EEGO Summer Term Unit Limits		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		AAC Consider the rationale as presented in the attached letter from the Director of INST and the impact on students in the program. RES 212204 MA INST Moratorium	10/7/21	10/15/21	
8/31/21	2021-2022 07 GECCo Reporting Structure		AAC, BPC, FAC Where GECCo fits into other committee & program structures and whether to change Handbook 202.1 or Handbook Appendix C Article 8.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 08 Proposal for the Formation of a General Studies (GST) Department	Withdrawn 10/19/21	AAC, BPC, FAC Rationale behind dept. creation, existing support services, additional supports services needed			
8/31/21	2021-2022 09 Proposal to Employ High Impact Practice (HIP) Tracking		AAC, AS&SS Whether: to use existing code in PeopleSoft, apply AAC&U's definition, there's a campus body that could identify HIPs and can de & deliver HIPs, need for training guide for analysis & reporting.			
10/5/21	2021-2022 21 Proposal for Ethnic Studies ETHS 1508 and Change to ETHS Curriculum	Complete	AAC in its capacity as the interschool curriculum committee, approved the ETHS 1508 course proposal for Introduction to Chicana/Chicano/Chicanx Studies and approved the proposed changes to the Ethnic & Area Studies concentration.			
10/5/21	2021-2022 24 BA Sociology Concentration Revision – Racial and Ethnic Dynamics		AAC Review rationale and impact.			
10/19/21	2021-2022 25 General Studies (GST) Department Formation		AAC Lack of home for GST, whether GST more suited as a program, mechanism for GST faculty review, GST report to EC annually			
10/19/21	2021-2022 26 AMP 2022-23 through 2031-32		AAC BPC			
10/19/21	2021-2022 29 Task Stream Usage and Access		AAC, AS&SS BPC Whether policy needed from academic, student, and planning perspectives.			

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

**Dates:** Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Nov 18, 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

This page for future AAC referrals.

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – NOVEMBER 2, 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, Nov 18, 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	Complete	AS&SS RES 202123 Academic Testing Center approved by Senate 3/18/21. Not by President pending Fall '21 enrollment, need, resources.			
9/28/21	2021-2022 Referral 10 Faculty Advising Structure		AS&SS Whether there is a need for a change to the advising structure Refer to AS&SS minutes 2021-05-06 for recommendations. See report from Faculty Fellow & AVP AP.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 09 Proposal to Employ High Impact Practice (HIP) Tracking		AAC, AS&SS Whether: to use existing code in PeopleSoft, apply AAC&U's definition, there's a campus body that could identify HIPs and can dev & deliver HIPs, need for training guide for analysis & reporting			
10/19/21	2021-2022 28 Academic Testing Center Exploratory Sub-Committee		AS&SS Reference RES 202123. Form sub-committee & include AVP EM, Director Testing Center, ASI & provide path			
10/19/21	2021-2022 29 Task Stream Usage and Access		AAC, AS&SS BPC Whether policy needed from academic, student, and planning perspectives.			

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – NOVEMBER 2, 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, Nov 18, 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
8/24/21	2021-2022 01 Extension of RES 192020 RTP Guidelines for 2020 to 2021		FAC The same factors that restricted or prevented faculty from doing certain activities related to RTP still exist.			
8/24/21	2021-2022 02 Department Formation Criteria Revision		AAC, BPC, FAC The need to clarify and extend the current department formation procedures.			
8/24/21	2021-2022 03 Electronic RTP as Application Standard		FAC Whether use of vendor with electronic RTP application platform is viable for CSUB			
8/24/21	2021-2022 04 Exceptional Service Article 20.37 Application and Screening Process		FAC Research CSU campus' rubrics & applications and establish improvement and consistency to application & screening.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 07 GECCo Reporting Structure		AAC, BPC, FAC Where GECCo fits into other committee & program structures and whether to change Handbook 202.1 or Handbook Appendix C Article 8.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 08 General Studies (GST) Department Formation	Withdrawn 10/19/21	AAC, BPC, FAC Rationale behind dept. creation, existing support services, additional supports services needed			
8/31/21	2021-2022 Referral 12 Criteria and Nomination Process for Faculty Awards		FAC Define meritorious, pressure from senior faculty, confidentiality of process			
	2020-2021 06 CSUB Patent Policy	Complete	FAC RES 202117 CSUB Patent Policy approved by Senate. Not by President pending CO policy update.			
	2019-2020 Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate – Handbook Change	Carry-over from 2 AYS	FAC refer to RES 121329 Procedures for Honorary Doctorate Nominations and Selection REVISED			
8/31/21	2021-2022 13 Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time		FAC Specifying the appropriate timing and notification to the department chair and how the coordination with AA and HR can improve.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 Referral 14 Proposal for the Creation of Ethnic Studies Department	AAC & BPC approved. FAC carry over to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC, FAC Consider how creation of new dept. affects current RTP process for impacted faculty, and the unit's response to FAC's recommendations of May 6, 2021.			

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – NOVEMBER 2, 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, Nov 18, 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 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.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 17 Handbook 305.2.4 Early Award of Tenure and 305.3.4 Early Promotion of Probationary and Tenured Faculty		FAC The language regarding performance differs. Make them consistent. Departments need to have early tenure criteria or revise it. RES 212202 Early Award of Tenure	9/23/21	10/1/21	10/4/21
8/31/21	2021-2022 19 DEI Faculty Fellows Exploratory Group Report		BPC, FAC Review institutional and faculty issues and comment whether there are actionable items.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 20 Accessibility of Instructional Materials		FAC Identify owner and maintainer of textbook master list, specify policies for adopting a textbook.			
9/21/21	2021-2022 23 Faculty Hall of Fame Selection Process Change		FAC Whether selection process should move to FHAC; whether time conflict with Faculty Awards, data transfer			
10/19/21	2021-2022 27 Composition of Search and Screening Committees – Handbook Change		AAC Handbook 309.5: clarify candidate eligibility, add “General Faculty”, reconstitute committee > 18 months.			



ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – NOVEMBER 2, 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, Nov 18, 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
8/24/21	2021-2022 02 Department Formation Criteria Revision		AAC, BPC, FAC The need to clarify and extend the current department formation procedures.			
9/29/21	2021-2022 16 Institutional Research in Response to WSCUC Report		BPC Feedback from CO, access and permissions to data, what faculty needs, what data department chairs' need. See M. Malhotra's report			
	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.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 07 GECCo Reporting Structure		AAC, BPC, FAC Where GECCo fits into other committee & program structures and whether to change Handbook 202.1 or Handbook Appendix C Article 8.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 08 General Studies (GST) Department Formation	Withdrawn 10/19/21	AAC, BPC, FAC Rationale behind dept. creation, existing support services, additional supports services needed			
8/31/21	2021-2022 18 CSUB Policy on Use of sUAS – GraSP Update		BPC Consider whether documents submitted by GraSP are informational or need action. RES 212205 CSUB Policy on Use of sUAS – GRaSP Update	10/7/21	10/15/21	
8/31/21	2021-2022 19 DEI Faculty Fellows Exploratory Group Report		BPC, FAC Review institutional and faculty issues and comment whether there are actionable items.			
9/21/21	2021-2022 22 Summer 2022 Schedule EEGO		BPC Whether unequal days between two summer sessions, eliminate break, reinstate two five-week terms in future. RES 212206 Winter Intersession 2021-2022 Calendar Update	10/7/21	10/15/21	
10/19/21	2021-2022 26 AMP 2022-23 through 2031-32		AAC, BPC			
10/19/21	2021-2022 29 Task Stream Usage and Access		AAC, AS&SS BPC Whether policy needed from academic, student, and planning perspectives.			

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – NOVEMBER 2, 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, Nov 18, 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

This page for future BPC referrals.

## Tenure Density Trends Table

Campus	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Bakersfield	57.9%	62.2%	63.1%	63.4%	61.9%	64.3%	63.0%	66.8%	64.0%	61.8%	61.0%	58.5%	56.0%	54.0%	55.4%	51.9%	53.3%	51.2%	51.8%
Channel Islands	55.4%	47.7%	40.2%	39.0%	41.4%	42.7%	44.5%	43.4%	42.2%	40.1%	37.0%	37.7%	38.6%	39.1%	39.8%	42.9%	43.4%	44.2%	47.3%
Chico	74.4%	75.3%	73.7%	69.6%	67.5%	66.0%	68.6%	71.0%	70.2%	68.2%	66.2%	61.9%	59.0%	59.8%	60.7%	61.2%	61.5%	59.6%	60.4%
Dominguez Hills	56.0%	55.5%	60.1%	63.6%	61.1%	56.5%	56.0%	58.9%	55.6%	48.4%	46.6%	43.5%	43.6%	44.1%	44.2%	42.8%	45.2%	44.0%	46.6%
East Bay	61.9%	64.7%	67.1%	63.1%	64.7%	62.2%	60.9%	65.7%	68.9%	62.3%	60.4%	57.8%	57.7%	55.6%	57.1%	57.0%	59.6%	58.2%	59.0%
Fresno	63.3%	64.3%	64.8%	61.4%	59.0%	59.6%	61.6%	67.0%	65.9%	65.2%	59.9%	58.3%	57.6%	56.0%	56.3%	55.7%	56.8%	57.2%	55.1%
Fullerton	56.1%	59.3%	54.4%	52.6%	53.4%	53.6%	56.5%	63.1%	60.1%	56.5%	54.5%	54.3%	52.7%	53.9%	54.8%	53.7%	54.9%	54.9%	55.8%
Humboldt	71.8%	74.7%	73.8%	70.1%	70.3%	72.1%	70.3%	68.6%	64.8%	61.6%	59.3%	59.2%	55.8%	55.7%	57.2%	59.7%	59.4%	61.4%	62.8%
Long Beach	60.2%	62.5%	63.2%	59.2%	57.5%	58.0%	56.8%	61.1%	61.2%	57.4%	58.7%	56.6%	54.1%	52.5%	52.9%	53.5%	53.0%	51.7%	50.8%
Los Angeles	69.3%	73.8%	71.9%	68.0%	64.2%	62.1%	62.1%	71.2%	68.9%	65.4%	64.0%	59.7%	53.8%	50.0%	47.2%	46.3%	45.7%	47.4%	51.3%
Maritime Academy	81.9%	77.1%	71.6%	67.7%	66.4%	63.6%	63.6%	68.1%	70.1%	67.5%	68.7%	65.8%	64.8%	65.1%	65.4%	65.4%	64.9%	70.3%	68.3%
Monterey Bay	45.5%	47.9%	50.8%	45.0%	49.6%	49.8%	52.4%	54.6%	49.0%	49.6%	45.5%	42.4%	38.6%	44.3%	44.2%	50.7%	50.4%	52.2%	55.2%
Northridge	59.6%	61.2%	62.7%	60.6%	60.1%	59.8%	59.3%	60.0%	59.1%	60.3%	60.5%	57.2%	55.1%	55.5%	55.2%	54.8%	56.4%	55.3%	57.2%
Pomona	70.0%	69.6%	69.8%	66.9%	65.6%	63.2%	67.7%	67.0%	65.8%	62.6%	62.6%	59.9%	58.2%	56.4%	57.6%	56.1%	54.6%	52.0%	54.1%
Sacramento	67.3%	70.7%	73.2%	70.5%	66.4%	65.8%	68.4%	70.2%	73.0%	67.9%	65.9%	62.5%	61.5%	59.5%	57.5%	58.8%	59.6%	58.4%	57.8%
San Bernardino	64.9%	66.0%	65.8%	63.1%	60.8%	61.2%	60.4%	65.9%	64.0%	64.2%	60.9%	60.4%	60.2%	56.0%	58.2%	56.6%	56.2%	55.0%	59.9%
San Diego	63.9%	68.2%	67.5%	64.3%	64.3%	63.1%	63.0%	68.7%	67.9%	68.8%	68.5%	65.0%	62.2%	61.3%	61.6%	60.3%	60.4%	60.2%	59.7%
San Francisco	66.2%	69.5%	71.1%	67.3%	65.6%	67.0%	69.9%	74.4%	69.7%	67.7%	64.3%	63.7%	63.6%	63.0%	63.0%	61.9%	61.5%	59.5%	62.1%
San José	62.4%	64.5%	63.7%	61.8%	60.0%	56.7%	56.0%	60.6%	59.2%	53.6%	55.4%	55.1%	53.4%	54.2%	54.8%	53.8%	53.6%	52.2%	52.8%
San Luis Obispo	69.7%	71.8%	72.9%	70.7%	68.6%	70.0%	71.6%	74.0%	72.3%	70.6%	71.2%	68.4%	66.8%	65.4%	64.6%	64.1%	64.4%	64.2%	65.0%
San Marcos	67.1%	73.9%	74.9%	69.8%	65.8%	62.7%	64.9%	62.2%	60.1%	57.7%	55.8%	53.0%	51.8%	50.4%	50.9%	49.6%	49.5%	50.2%	48.6%
Sonoma	66.2%	74.1%	74.9%	72.6%	69.7%	67.8%	66.4%	72.9%	68.3%	70.6%	67.3%	62.4%	59.7%	60.4%	60.2%	62.2%	61.2%	63.4%	68.5%
Stanislaus	66.5%	67.5%	68.3%	66.6%	63.4%	64.1%	66.4%	77.3%	70.2%	70.2%	67.8%	64.6%	62.9%	61.6%	60.7%	60.4%	58.8%	58.2%	57.6%
<b>CSU Average</b>	64.2%	66.6%	66.6%	63.8%	62.3%	61.6%	62.5%	66.4%	64.7%	62.2%	60.9%	58.6%	56.8%	55.9%	56.0%	55.7%	55.9%	55.3%	56.3%

October 6, 2021

To whom it may concern,

I am pleased to provide this letter of support for Interim Dean Bozarth as the Library proposes migrating the FYS program into the Library. The FYS program is in need of a department to manage and evaluate the faculty teaching the course. The Library, as the managing department of the program, seems the correct choice.

The Library will evaluate and adapt the curriculum to standardize content, focus on student access to programs, and expose students to information literacy concepts. Along with that, the program will eventually be primarily taught by librarians so students would focus on how to locate and evaluate the information they need to succeed. As Interim Dean Bozarth stated in her proposal, these goals are in support of various AIMS Program Learning Outcomes and also the new information literacy foundational skill being integrated into the GE Compendium.

I have viewed and am satisfied with their proposal.

Fondly,


A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Vernon B. Harper Jr.", is positioned above the typed name.

Vernon B. Harper Jr.  
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

March 8, 2021

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: Fred E. Wood, Ph.D.   
Interim Executive Vice Chancellor

SUBJECT: Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI)

***Background***

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (504) require that qualified individuals be provided equal access to programs, services and activities. California Government Code 11135 applies Section 508 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act, as amended in 1998, to state entities and to the California State University (CSU). Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act was enacted to eliminate barriers in information technology, to make available new opportunities for people with disabilities and to encourage development of technologies that will help achieve these goals.

The CSU policy statement on accessibility is articulated in [Executive Order 1111](#). Implementation of this policy is guided by the Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI) as established in Coded Memo AA-2006-41 and revised in the following coded memos: AA-2007-04, AA-2007-13, AA- 2008-21, AA-2009-19, AA-2010-13, AA-2011-21, AA2013-03 and AA2015-22. This memo supersedes all previous memos.

***Vision***

All CSU programs, services and activities should be accessible to all students, staff, faculty and the general public. This encompasses all technology products used to deliver academic programs and services, student services, information technology services and auxiliary programs and services.

The ATI implementation approach is driven by the following principles:

- Technology accessibility is an institution-wide responsibility that requires commitment and involvement from leadership across the enterprise.
- Technology for individuals with disabilities must provide access to obtain the same result, gain the same benefit or have the same opportunity to reach the same level of achievement as persons without disabilities.
- The implementation of Universal Design principles should reduce the need for, and costs associated with, individual accommodations for inaccessible technology products.

### ***Key Strategies***

The ATI targets the elimination of accessibility barriers across the university. The CSU is using a “capabilities maturity” strategy to achieve its vision for accessibility. This strategy focuses campus and system efforts on continuously improving and institutionalizing business and academic processes that will reliably, sustainably and successfully deliver accessible educational, administrative and community services for all. The implementation of the ATI is based on the following key components:

- **Establish strong administrative/executive support.** The CSU codified its commitment to technology accessibility in Executive Order 1111. Pursuant to EO 1111, campus presidents are charged with appointing a campus ATI executive sponsor, establishing a campus committee and overseeing campus ATI activities.
- **Ensure continuous quality improvement.** Some ATI goals require investments and changes to business procedures that will require time to deploy to our large, diverse CSU community. Just as accessibility barriers often develop over a period of years, remediation activities will sometimes require years to fully implement. During this extended remediation period, the CSU should work to achieve incremental improvements in barrier removal each year.
- **Prioritize projects/activities.** The ATI covers a broad range of technology accessibility goals involving technology products in use across all university programs and services. Given that there are finite resources (e.g. staffing, time and tools) available each year to work on these goals, campuses should select ATI implementation activities that target accessibility barriers with the greatest impact.
- **Identify specific goals/success indicators.** In order to ensure that meaningful progress is made over time, the CSU has collectively established specific ATI goals and success indicators. The broad ATI goals are articulated in the “Goals” subsection below. The success indicators are published and available on the [ATI website](#).
- **Apply capabilities maturity model.** Campus performance on success indicators will be assessed according to levels of organizational capabilities to achieve ATI goals. The levels of organizational capabilities are: Not Started, Initiated, Defined, Established, Managed and Optimized. The levels of organizational capabilities are published and available on the [ATI website](#).
- **Document progress.** It is critical that the CSU document the substantive steps that have been taken over time to remove technology accessibility barriers. This approach establishes a credible institutional commitment to equal access for persons with disabilities and facilitates reporting during campus audits. The CSU ATI implementation therefore utilizes annual campus reports to document progress (discussed further in the “Annual Reports” subsection below).
- **Drive vendor improvements to product accessibility support.** The CSU seeks to improve product accessibility through partnerships and by leveraging the procurement process.

### ***Implementation Goals***

Campuses are required to accomplish the ATI goals listed below. Each ATI goal is supported by a set of success indicators that describe the processes, procedures and activities that need to be accomplished in order to meet the goal. As changes in technology occur, the success indicators may be modified following consultation with campus executive leadership.

### *Web Accessibility Goals*

- **Web accessibility evaluation process:** Identify and repair or replace inaccessible websites, applications (web or mobile) and digital content.
- **New website/web application and digital content design and development process:** New website, application (web or mobile) and digital content development complies with all Section 508 accessibility standards.
- **Ongoing monitoring process:** Updating and maintenance of websites, applications (web or mobile) and digital content complies with Section 508 accessibility standards.
- **Training process:** Professional development training has incorporated Section 508 accessibility standards into website and application (web or mobile) development and digital content preparation.
- **Communication process:** In general, the campus community is aware of Section 508 standards to make web-based information available to everyone (students, staff, faculty and the general public), regardless of disability.
- **ATI Web Accessibility Plan:** Campus annually reviews and updates the Web Accessibility Plan.

### *Procurement Accessibility Goals*

- **Procurement processes:** Campus has procurement processes that follow Section 508 requirements for all acquired Information Communication Technology (ICT) products and/or services.
- **Equally Effective Alternate Access Plans:** Equally Effective Access Plans are created for Information Communication Technology (ICT) products that are not fully Section 508 compliant.
- **Training and outreach:** Training and outreach programs are in place for all ICT procurement stakeholders (e.g., buyers, purchase requestors, vendors, etc.)
- **Experience/implementation:** Campuses have sufficient experience and expertise in completing ICT procurements.
- **ATI Procurement Plan:** Annually review and update the ATI Procurement Plan.

### *Instructional Materials Accessibility Goals*

- **Timely adoption of instructional materials:** The campus has implemented a comprehensive plan to ensure the timely adoption of instructional materials, including courses with late-hire faculty or adjunct faculty.
- **Instructor use of Learning Management Systems (LMS) and/or (non LMS) course websites:** The campus has implemented policies and procedures to promote the posting of accessible course materials in the university-approved LMS or other platforms.
- **Accessibility requirements for multimedia, interactive content and emerging instructional technologies:** The campus has implemented policies and procedures to ensure that accessibility has been incorporated into multimedia, interactive content and emerging instructional technologies.
- **Accessibility requirements for course review and remediation:** The campus has implemented procedures to ensure that accessibility requirements have been incorporated into the course review and remediation process.
- **Creation and adoption of accessible instructional materials:** The campus has implemented processes and procedures to support faculty in creating and adopting accessible instructional materials.

- **Communication process and training plan:** The campus has implemented a broad-based ATI awareness campaign, supported by a comprehensive training infrastructure to increase digital accessibility across the campus.
- **ATI Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan:** Annually review and update the ATI Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan.

### ***Implementation Approach***

The ATI recognizes that each CSU campus faces unique challenges with implementing the ATI. The implementation approach outlined below was developed in collaboration with the Executive Sponsors Steering Committee (ESSC) and the ATI Priority Area Communities of Practice to ensure that campuses have adequate flexibility to manage their ATI implementation.

Each year, the CSU will make progress toward accomplishing the ATI goals by using a combination of systemwide and campus-based activities. Campuses and the Chancellor’s Office will:

- Achieve the baseline status level of “Established” for the success indicators subject to timelines as described below and
- Assess their capacity, select specific success indicators to work on, engage in a variety of projects and activities that address these success indicators, and report on their progress in the ATI Annual Reports.

### ***Systemwide Support and Leadership***

The ATI department is part of systemwide Academic Technology Services (ATS) within the Department of Academic Programs, Innovations and Faculty Development within the Division of Academic and Student Affairs. ATS will continue to support ATI in fulfilling its commitment to helping campuses accomplish the ATI goals by engaging in the following activities:

- Supporting campus ATI planning and implementation efforts by developing guidance, providing training resources, sharing significant accomplishments and exemplary practices, and researching promising tools and techniques.
- Coordinating systemwide ATI activities that reduce costs, leverage CSU resources and increase capacity.
- Collaborating with campus leadership through the ATI Leadership Council and Executive Sponsors Steering Committee to implement systemwide accessible technology policy, projects and planning.
- Maintaining effective ongoing communication with key stakeholder groups and consulting with systemwide affinity groups.
- Coordinating the annual report process, including analyzing ATI Annual Reports and distributing systemwide aggregated report results.
- Providing systemwide support to drive improvements to product accessibility support by vendors and publishers.

### ***Campus and Chancellor’s Office ATI Responsibilities***

Each campus president and the chancellor or the chancellor’s designee are responsible for the establishment and implementation of accessible electronic information and technology programs to achieve the goals of ATI. Each campus president and the chancellor will appoint an executive sponsor to guide the ATI implementation at their institution.



The executive sponsor shall

- Regularly attend ESSC monthly meetings and participate in CSU-wide ATI policy development and implementation and other related activities and operations.
- Convene the ATI Steering Committee that includes members from the key stakeholder groups across the institution such as executive administrators, academic and faculty senates, Centers for Faculty Development, Academic Technology Office, Disability Services Office, Equity and Diversity Office and ADA Compliance.

The ATI Steering Committee will oversee the ATI implementation, including

- Reviewing and revising the ATI Plan,
- Meeting the systemwide baseline according to timelines for selected success indicators,
- Implementing projects and activities to meet ATI goals, and
- Documenting progress toward these goals using the ATI Annual Report process.

Each of these responsibilities is described in more detail below.

### **Reviewing/Revising the ATI Plan**

Each year, the executive sponsor, working with the ATI Steering Committee, will review and update their ATI plan to guide their implementation. The plan will indicate the specific success indicators which will focus effort across the three priority areas. The ATI plan template is available on the ATI website to adopt or adapt.

When developing the plan, the executive sponsor and committee will consider the following information:

- Current progress on selected list of success indicators subject to timelines.
- Current progress as described in the annual report, with particular attention to success indicators with a status level of “Not Started” or “Initiated.”
- Select ATI implementation activities across all three priority areas that will result in the greatest reduction of technology accessibility barriers.
- Use the ATI Prioritization Framework or a comparable process to consider factors such as impact, probability and capacity when prioritizing ATI implementation activities.
- Deliverables associated with systemwide ATI activities that would advance campus progress if adopted.
- Collaborations that may accelerate or improve the quality of ATI activities.

### **ATI Baseline/Timeline Process**

- Every three years, a set of success indicators with implementation timelines from one to three years shall be agreed upon by Chancellor’s Office ATI staff and the Executive Sponsor Steering Committee.
- Success indicators assigned a timeline shall be brought up to the baseline status level of “Established” within the assigned timeline.

### **Implementing the ATI Plan**

Ensuring the accessibility of information technology and resources is a shared responsibility and requires a coordinated, ongoing effort to ensure its success. Executive sponsors should lead the implementation effort through the following activities:

- Conduct regular ATI Steering Committee meetings, no less than twice per year.

- Ensure that the committee membership is comprised of key stakeholder groups and includes members with appropriate experience and expertise to inform decision-making.
- Engage in a periodic administrative review process with the committee regarding challenges, milestones, resources and documenting ongoing progress.
- Monitor, leverage and implement deliverables from systemwide ATI activities that will advance efforts.
- Ensure that committee members monitor, participate in, and contribute to Community of Practice activities.
- Channel ATI communications to appropriate parties.

### **Documenting ATI Compliance Progress**

Campuses and the Chancellor's Office will submit a collection of reports each year which details progress towards accomplishing the ATI goals. The Chancellor's Office ATI department will provide the framework and methodology for submitting ATI annual reports to campuses and the Chancellor's Office.

### **ATI Annual Report**

- Report on the status of all goals and success indicators. Consult the status level definitions; each status level has a set of criteria that must be met. Campus and Chancellor's Office will provide evidence of status levels in their report.
- Document progress toward achieving baseline/timelines on selected success indicators.
- Document the commitment to work on specific success indicators for the following year.
- Submit the annual report signed by the ATI sponsor affirming that the ATI plan was reviewed and revised and the report data is accurate.

### **President Summary Report**

- Progress and remaining effort
  - Summarize the annual report results to the respective campus president or chancellor advising as to the ATI progress being made and remaining effort in each of the priority areas.
- Web performance report
  - Provide summary reports of the overall compliance level of key areas in the campus web environment.
- The Chancellor's Office ATI office will be copied on the report communication.

### **Distributing the Aggregate ATI Annual Report to CO Executives**

The systemwide summary will be presented to the executive vice chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs.

### ***Implementation Timeline***

The timeline associated with ATI implementation tasks is provided below.

- July-October: Review/revise the ATI Campus Plan.
- November: Submit the ATI Campus Annual Report and President Summary Report.
- April: Review the systemwide aggregate reports that describe progress across the system.

The Chancellor's Office ATI department will support the implementation timeline through the following activities:

- July: Distribute the Campus Annual Report.
- December-March: Review the Campus Annual Report submissions and prepare systemwide aggregate reports.
- April: Distribute the systemwide aggregate reports that describe progress across the system.
- October of every third year: Conduct the ATI Baseline/Timeline Process to select success indicators and timelines.

If you have questions regarding these guidelines, please contact Dr. Leslie Kennedy, senior director, Academic Technology Services at [lkennedy@calstate.edu](mailto:lkennedy@calstate.edu) or (562) 951-4605.

FEW/amw

- c: Dr. Joseph I. Castro, Chancellor  
Provosts/Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs  
Vice Presidents for Student Affairs  
Chief Information Officers  
ATI Executive Sponsors  
Dr. Robert K. Collins, Chair, Academic Senate CSU  
Dr. Alison Wrynn, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs, Innovations and Faculty Development  
Dr. Luoluo Hong, Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management  
Dr. Leslie Kennedy, Senior Director, Academic Technology Services  
Ms. Cheryl Pruitt, Director, Accessible Technology Initiative

# ATI Instructional Materials Success Indicators Revision

## Summary

The IM group refreshed each goal and subsequent success indicator (SI) to provide clarity where the group deemed that an SI could be interpreted in a variety of ways. Some language was standardized throughout to be consistent among SIs, goal, and across the three priority areas. Also, SIs that were overly narrow or rigid were replaced with modern alternatives, often combining two or three SIs into a single replacement that reflects the matured processes across the CSU. Certain SIs that were constructed to illicit a binary yes/no response that was not conducive to the status levels were also deprecated. In turn, SIs that focused on data gathering, which is a component of the status levels managed and optimized, were also deprecated. Finally, SIs or goals reaching into areas other than ATI's charge of 508 proactive accessibility were deprecated. The overall result of these revisions is a reduction of duplicated effort and more meaningful success indicators that clarify current processes and allow for the integration of future technology and techniques.

## 2020 Revision At-A-Glance

- 2 entire goals deprecated
- 33 Success indicators deprecated (includes all SIs in deprecated goals)
- 16 success indicators added

## Goal 1: Timely Adoption of Instructional Materials

Current Goal	2020 Revision	Rationale
The campus has implemented a comprehensive plan to ensure the timely adoption of textbooks and other instructional materials.	The campus has implemented a comprehensive plan to ensure the timely adoption of instructional materials, including courses with late-hire faculty or adjunct faculty.	Combination of Goal 1 and 2

Current Success Indicators	2020 Revision	Rationale
1.1 Campus has formally documented (e.g. Policy, Resolution or Procedure) a process to ensure the timely adoption of textbooks and other instructional materials. [Commitment]	1.1 Campus has formally documented (e.g., Policy, Resolution, or Procedure) a process to ensure the timely adoption of textbooks and other instructional materials.	Minor language change
1.2 Campus has developed capacity (e.g. established practices, specified staff time, educational/training resources, and/or technology)	1.2 Develop a process (e.g., developed and documented practices, specified staff time, educational/training resources, and technology) to achieve compliance with timely adoption.	Minor language change

to achieve compliance with timely adoption. [Ability]		
1.3 Removed	--	--
1.4 Campus has established a process to gather data (e.g. percentage and number) regarding adoption of IM by established campus deadline. [Measurement]	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	Gathering data is a function of the Managed and Optimized status levels.
1.5 Campus has established a process to distribute performance reports regarding timely adoptions to campus administration at least annually. [Measurement]	1.5 Develop a process to distribute performance reports regarding timely adoptions to campus administration at least annually.	Minor language change
--	<b>NEW</b> 1.6 Develop a process to distribute performance reports regarding timely adoption and late-hire adoptions to campus administration at least annually.	The addition of this SI in goal 1 was to facilitate the removal of Goal 2.

Goal 2: Identification of IM for Late-Hire Faculty (Entire goal deprecated)

Current Goal	2020 Revision	Rationale
The campus has implemented a comprehensive plan to ensure that textbooks have been identified for courses with late-hire faculty.		Combine with goal 1

Current Success Indicators	2020 Revision	Rationale
2.1 All academic units have implemented specific procedures for late hire or adjunct faculty members for the timely adoption of curricular materials. [Ability]	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	
2.3 * Campus has established a process to gather data (e.g. percentage and number) regarding adoption of IM for late-hire adoptions.[Measurement]	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	
2.4 * Campus has established a process to distribute performance reports regarding timely,	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	

late-hire adoptions to campus administration at least annually.		
---	--	--

Goal 3: Early Identification of Students with Disabilities (Entire goal deprecated)

Current Goal	2020 Revision	Rationale
The campus has implemented a comprehensive plan to ensure that students with disabilities are identified and able to request alternate media materials in a timely manner.		Although the SIs contained in Goal 3 are important, they are deemed to be outside the purview of ATI reporting

Current Success Indicators	2020 Revision	Rationale
3.1 Campus has implemented a system to provide early registration for alternate media-eligible students. [Ability]	DEPRECATED	
3.2 Campus has implemented a system to track early registration usage by alternate media-eligible students (intended to provide alternate media programs with sufficient time to produce alternate media as well as to document student conformance with alternate media submissions procedures). [Measurement]	DEPRECATED	
3.3 Campus has implemented a system that allows alternate media requests to be submitted without appearing in-person during regular business hours (e.g. web-based forms, integration with student registration portal). [Ability]	DEPRECATED	
3.4 Campus has implemented a system to track the timeliness of alternate media requests. [Measurement]	DEPRECATED	
3.5 Campus has developed specific measures of success for early identification of students with disabilities (e.g., percentage of eligible students who utilize early registration) and implemented a system to track these measures. [Measurement]	DEPRECATED	

#### Goal 4: Instructor Use of LMS (or non-LMS) Course Websites

Current Goal	2020 Revision	Rationale
The campus has implemented policies and procedures to promote the posting of all required curricular and instructional resources (including print-based and multimedia materials) in a central, accessible electronic location	The campus has implemented policies and procedures to promote the posting of accessible course materials in the university approved LMS or other platforms.	Clarification of language

Current Success Indicators	2020 Revision	Rationale
4.1 Campus has formally documented (e.g., Policy, Resolution or Procedure) a process to promote or require the posting of instructional materials to a central, electronic location (e.g. LMS, lecture capture system, course website)	4.1 Develop a process to promote the posting of instructional materials to the university approved LMS and other platforms.	Clarification of language
4.3 Campus has established specific guidelines and procedures for submitting course and curricular materials hosted in campus LMS.	4.3 Develop a process and document specific guidelines and procedures for creating accessible course content hosted in the campus LMS.	Minor language change
4.4 Campus has implemented procedures to accelerate the delivery of alternate media materials to improve timeliness (e.g. electronic delivery via campus LMS or FTP).	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI pertains to 504 student accommodation and is outside of ATI reporting
4.5 Campus has implemented a procedure that provides alternate media production staff with timely access to instructional materials within the central electronic location.	4.5 Develop a process that provides alternate media production staff with timely access to instructional materials within the university approved LMS and other platforms.	Clarification of language
4.7 Campus has established a process to review vendor documentation and/or conduct product testing to determine the accessibility support provided by the central, electronic location (e.g. LMS)	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI is more appropriate for the ATI Procurement priority and is already addressed
4.8 Campus has established a process to periodically request and review updated vendor	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI is more appropriate for the ATI Procurement priority and is already addressed there

documentation and/or conduct updated product testing for the central, electronic location.		
4.9 Campus has developed an Equally Effective Alternate Access Plan (EEAAP) that addresses how the campus will ensure equal access for individuals with disabilities to IM stored within the central electronic location.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI is more appropriate for the ATI Procurement priority and is already addressed
4.10 Campus has established a process to measure the accessibility of IM posted to the university approved LMS and other platforms	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	Gathering data is a function of the Managed and Optimized status levels.
	<b>NEW 4.11</b> Develop a process to review the accessibility of faculty-maintained websites or web applications, whether hosted on the campus domain or elsewhere.	The purpose of this SI is to capture all other faculty developed websites that are not strictly instructional materials or controlled by a central authority.

#### Goal 5: Accessibility Requirements for Multimedia, Interactive Content, and Emerging Instructional Technologies

<b>Current Goal</b>	<b>2020 Revision</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
The campus has implemented policies and procedures to ensure that accessibility requirements have been incorporated into the adoption process for all multimedia-based instructional resources.	The campus has implemented policies and procedures to ensure that accessibility has been incorporated into multimedia, interactive content, and emerging instructional technologies.	Clarification of language to reflect updates in the goal.

<b>Current Success Indicators</b>	<b>2020 Revision</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
5.1 Campus has developed and implemented accessibility requirements for selecting and adopting multimedia curricular materials (e.g. requirements for captions, transcripts, audio description, accessible web players).	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI is covered in the Web priority
5.2 Campus has established a strategic process, based on available resources, for prioritizing the remediation of inaccessible multimedia materials.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI deletion reflects a matured IM process across the CSU system



5.3 Campus has established a process to inventory existing multimedia content including usage data.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI was deemed to be of little impact
5.6 Campus has specified staff for addressing the accessibility of existing and planned multimedia content.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI deletion reflects a matured IM process across the CSU system
5.7 Campus has acquired tools for addressing the accessibility of existing and planned multimedia content.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI deletion reflects a matured IM process across the CSU system
5.8 Campus has established work space for addressing the accessibility of existing and planned multimedia content.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI deletion reflects a matured IM process across the CSU system
5.9 Campus has specified staff to coordinate with postproduction captioning/transcription vendors and/or campus personnel that provide this service.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI deletion reflects a matured IM process across the CSU system
5.10 Campus has specified staff to coordinate with realtime captioning/transcription vendors and/or campus personnel that provide this service.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI deletion reflects a matured IM process across the CSU system
	<b>NEW 5.11</b> Develop a process for creating, selecting, adopting, and remediating audio and video assets.	Goal 5 revision and SIs 5.11 through 5.16 align with a matured process in IM accessibility. Updates capture existing categories and future trends in Multimedia, Interactive Content, and Emerging Instructional Technologies used across the system
	<b>NEW 5.12</b> Develop a process for creating, selecting, adopting, and remediating instructor developed course readers.	See 5.11 rationale above
	<b>NEW 5.13</b> Develop a process for creating, selecting, adopting, and remediating digital content: documents (word processor produced, spreadsheets, presentation software, PDF).	See 5.11 rationale above
	<b>NEW 5.14</b> Develop a process for creating, adopting, implementing, and remediating emerging instructional technologies.	See 5.11 rationale above
	<b>NEW 5.15</b> Develop a process for creating, selecting, adopting, and remediating publisher created content.	See 5.11 rationale above

	<b>NEW</b> 5.16 Develop a process for creating, selecting, adopting, and remediating learning and engagement tools.	See 5.11 rationale above
--	---	--------------------------

## Goal 6: Accessibility Requirements for Course Review and Remediation

Current Goal	2020 Revision	Rationale
The campus has implemented policies and procedures to ensure that accessibility requirements have been incorporated into the curricular review process.	The campus has implemented procedures to ensure that accessibility requirements have been incorporated into the course review and remediation process.	

Current Success Indicators	2020 Revision	Rationale
6.2 Campus has established accessibility standards or guidelines for selecting, authoring, and procuring curricular materials (e.g. documents, videos, web/mobile applications). Example: Course Accessibility Checklist	6.2 Develop a process for selecting, authoring, and procuring accessible course materials.	This SI is Revised for brevity and clarity. Overall, Goal 6's language changed from "curriculum" to "course" to emphasize materials rather than curriculum design.
6.4 Campus has established a process to allow for the review of the accessibility of online courses before posting.	6.4 Develop a process to facilitate the review and remediation of the accessibility of online courses before posting.	
6.5 Campus has established a process for faculty and/or instructional staff to incorporate accessibility at time of course redesign.	6.5 Develop a process for faculty and instructional staff to incorporate accessibility at the time of course redesign.	Minor language change
6.6 Campus has established a process to track courses that have been reviewed/revised for accessibility support.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	Gathering data is a function of the Managed and Optimized status levels.
	<b>NEW</b> 6.7 Develop a process to conduct regularly scheduled accessibility evaluations using automated tools and manual techniques to identify course content that requires remediation.	This SI captures automated accessibility tools in the LMS and processes around those tools.

	<b>NEW 6.8</b> Develop a process to prioritize and remediate inaccessible course content.	This SI added to emphasize the importance of prioritizing inaccessible course content for remediation
	<b>NEW 6.9</b> Develop Equally Effective Alternate Access Plans (EEAAPs) that address how the campus will ensure equal access for individuals with disabilities to LMS container and integrations (learning tools interoperability [LTI]) stored within the university approved LMS and other platforms.	This SI was moved from Goal 4 (previously SI 4.9), and language added to distinguish between the LMS interface and the content contained within, as well as programs that are integrated within the LMS platform

### Goal 7: Creation and Adoption of Accessible Instructional Materials

Current Goal	2020 Revision	Rationale
The campus has implemented policies and procedures to support faculty in selecting, authoring, and delivering accessible instructional materials.	The campus has implemented processes and procedures to support faculty in creating and adopting accessible instructional materials.	Clarification of language

Current Success Indicators	2020 Revision	Rationale
7.1 Campus has formally documented (through Policy, Resolution or Procedure) the nature of faculty responsibility for selecting and authoring accessible curricular materials.	7.1 Campus has formally documented (through Policy or Resolution) faculty responsibility for selecting and authoring accessible instructional materials.	Minor language change
7.3 Campus has developed and disseminated examples of accessible curricular materials and practices (e.g. accessible syllabus template, faculty exemplars).	7.3 Develop a process to create, distribute, and update examples of accessible instructional materials.	Minor language change
7.5 Campus has established a procedure and provided associated tools to allow faculty and/or instructional staff to verify the accessibility of curricular content. [Ability]	7.5 Develop a process and provide resources for faculty and instructional staff to create accessible instructional content.	Minor language change

7.7 Campus provides access to technology to support faculty creation of accessible instructional materials (e.g. workstations, software, scanners)	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI removed to reflect a matured process across the system
7.8 Campus provides personnel resources (e.g. instructional designers, lab technicians, and student assistants) necessary to support faculty creation of accessible instructional materials.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI removed to reflect a matured process across the system
7.9 Campus has established a process to provide digital copies of course readers to alternate media production staff upon request.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI removed to reflect a matured process across the system
7.10 Campus has established a process to provide digital copies of library electronic reserves to alternate media production staff upon request.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI removed to reflect a matured process across the system
	<b>NEW 7.11</b> Develop a process that incorporates accessibility when acquiring, converting, digitizing, creating, and maintaining library assets.	This SI is inclusive of deprecated 7.9 and 7.10 and is updated to reflect a matured process across the system while providing clarity and reducing prescriptiveness

### Goal 8: Communication Process and Training Plan

<b>Current Goal</b>	<b>2020 Revision</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
The campus has implemented a broad-based ATI awareness campaign, supported by a comprehensive training infrastructure to increase technological accessibility across the campus.	The campus has implemented a broad-based ATI awareness campaign, supported by a comprehensive training infrastructure to increase digital accessibility across the campus.	Minor language change

<b>Current Success Indicators</b>	<b>2020 Revision</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
8.1 Campus has developed a formal awareness campaign to increase knowledge of accessibility issues and responsibilities.	8.1 Develop a formal communication campaign with executive support to increase knowledge of accessibility issues and responsibilities.	Clarification of language
8.3 Campus has developed and disseminated a variety of training materials, both in content and modality (e.g. quick use guides, workshops, FAQ), for selecting, authoring, procuring, and distributing accessible instructional materials.	8.3 Develop a process including various training materials, both in content and modality, for creating, selecting, adopting, and remediating instructional materials.	Clarification of language

8.5 Campus is tracking participation in training activities and usage of training materials for accessible authoring, conversion, and delivery of curricular materials (e.g. number of workshop attendees, number of users who download templates or watch training videos)	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	Gathering data is a function of the Managed and Optimized status levels.
8.7 Campus provides personnel necessary to support the awareness campaign.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI removed to reduce redundancy and reflects a matured process across the system
8.8 Campus provides resources necessary to support the development of awareness campaign.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI removed to reduce redundancy and reflects a matured process across the system
8.9 Campus provides personnel necessary to support the training activities	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI removed to reduce redundancy and reflects a matured process across the system
8.10 Campus provides resources necessary to support the development and delivery of training activities.	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI removed to reduce redundancy and reflects a matured process across the system
	<b>NEW 8.11</b> Develop a process that integrates accessibility information into faculty orientations.	This SI focuses efforts on areas that are deemed important for accessibility awareness and reflects a matured process across the system
	<b>NEW 8.12</b> Develop a process that integrates accessibility information into faculty development.	This SI focuses efforts on areas that are deemed important for accessibility awareness and reflects a matured process across the system
	<b>NEW 8.13</b> Develop a process that integrates accessibility information into academic technology activities.	This SI focuses efforts on areas that are deemed important for accessibility awareness and reflects a matured process across the system
	<b>NEW 8.14</b> Develop a process to provide ongoing professional development for employees with ATI accessible instructional materials responsibilities.	This SI is added for parity across all three priority areas

### Goal 9: ATI Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan

<b>Current Goal</b>	<b>2020 Revision</b>	<b>Rationale</b>
Campus IMAP committee has sufficient breadth, resources, and authority to effectively implement a comprehensive IMAP initiative.	Annually review and update the ATI Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan.	Goal language changed to emphasize ATI plan, and reflect similarities across all three priority areas.

Current Success Indicators	2020 Revision	Rationale
9.1 Campus IMAP committee membership consists of stakeholders from all key units (Student Affairs, Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee, Academic Technology, Library) as well as faculty, staff and students	<b>DEPRECATED</b>	This SI removed to reflect a matured process across the system
	<b>NEW 9.2</b> Develop a process for the ATI Steering Committee to review, revise and approve the updated ATI Instructional Materials Plan.	Standardizes ATI plan requirements and language
	<b>NEW 9.3</b> Develop a process for the instructional materials subcommittee to inform the revision and coordinate the implementation of the Annual Instructional Materials Plan.	Specification of the subcommittee role within the ATI Plan process

**From:** Andreas Gebauer <[agebauer@csub.edu](mailto:agebauer@csub.edu)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 14, 2021 7:44:42 PM  
**To:** Aaron Hegde <[shegade@csub.edu](mailto:shegade@csub.edu)>  
**Subject:** GECCo authority

Hi Aaron,

I have a question regarding how far GECCo's authority in regard to GE course designation goes. Specifically, GECCo recently received a request from the Department of Geological Sciences to approve a new upper division Area B course under the GEOL designation. However, for more than 20 years, our campus has chosen to offer Upper Division Area B courses under the SCI designation. This is to provide a clear distinction between upper division major courses and upper division GE courses. It also reduces student confusion, as well as their preconceived notion about course difficulty based on prefix (some don't think they cannot succeed in a CHEM or MATH course). GECCo does have the authority to ensure that GE courses use either a -8 or -9 as the last number for a GE course. Does this authority extend to this designation, i.e., would it have to be GECCo that approves that Upper Division Area B courses are offered under department designations or the SCI designation? Or is this something that would be decided solely by the NSME Curriculum Committee. Tony desires the change because he thinks that his department is not credited for FTES properly by IRPA because the UD B courses are listed as SCI, not GEOL. This is, of course, in error, as FTES go with instructor name, not course name.

I bring this up because this was already discussed by GECCo and their decision was to keep the SCI designation. However, I know that Tony, the chair of geological sciences, continues to pursue this issue, having first brought it up at the CC level (after I asked that this is done to make sure it is a deliberate decision, but they didn't vote on it when the discussion tended to a "stay at SCI" direction because Tony withdrew it, for now) and now at the Chair's Council level. I do not know what side the NSME curriculum committee will come down on, but in case they want to change it, who has the last word?

My initial response to the question is that GECCo is responsible for the course designation in this case as well as it is specific to UD B GE and will affect student success in GE courses. What do you think? Is this a question that should be referred to AAC/senate for consideration, or can it be resolved, one way or the other, right now?

Thanks,

Andreas

Dr. Andreas Gebauer  
Professor of Chemistry  
General Education Faculty Director  
General Education Assessment Coordinator  
California State University Bakersfield



**California State University, Bakersfield  
Division of Academic Affairs**

**Policy Title:** PROVOST Direct Reports Professional Development Funding

**Policy Status:** DRAFT

**Affected Units**

Provost's Council, Provost's Direct Reports

**Policy Statement**

Professional Development is a critical component of CSUB's success. By investing in people, CSUB internally grows its base of talent.

For professional development expenses above \$500, the Provost must provide written authorization to his/her direct reports before any professional development expense is incurred. A professional development expense would be a workshop or training series designed to enhance an individual's skill or competence. Importantly, regular travel for conference meetings etc. are not included within the scope of this policy.

**Consultations**

Provost's Council

**Approved Date**

TBD

**Effective Date**

TBD

**Date Submitted to Policy Portal**

TBD





Dr. Aaron Hegde  
Chair CSUB Academic Senate  
California State University, Bakersfield  
(661)-654-3110  
[shegade@csub.edu](mailto:shegade@csub.edu)

## 2021-2022 REFERRAL # 30 Completeness of RTP File – Handbook Change

**FROM:** Aaron Hegde, Academic Senate Chair  
**TO:** Mandy Rees, Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) Chair  
**DATE:** November 2, 2021  
**cc:** Beth Bywaters, Academic Senate Administrative Analyst

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Aaron Hegde".

At its meeting on November 2, 2021, the Academic Senate requested that the FAC address the issue of Completeness of RTP File – Handbook Change 305.5.3. During your discussion, please consider:

- Direction for the unit committee if they feel something is missing in the file
- Clarifying the wording to better communicate the meaning of the current language, such that materials have to be inserted and go through all levels of review
- Whether the order of review to include chair as follows: the unit committee, chair, dean, University Review Committee (URC), and Provost
- Whether to alter the schedule to include chair letter
- The timeline of the review schedule
- Whether things could be taken out of the PAF and then put in the WPAF

Please take up this matter with your committee and get back to me with your recommendation. If your recommendation requires Senate action, please prepare a resolution and the rationale for the resolution.

## **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>