



ACADEMIC SENATE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

Location: BDC 134 Conference Room and virtual

Zoom Link: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/81291128392?pwd=MzhRMW50UUJJNIRaMWttMUVESTRSQT09>

Members: A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair), V. Harper, J. Millar, D. Solano, E. Correa, D. Wu, M. Rush and K. Van-Grinsven (Senate Analyst)

Guest: President Zelezny

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
 - a. President Zelezny (**Time Certain: 10:10 AM**)
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain: 10:05 AM)
4. APPROVAL OF EC MINUTES
 - a. May 25, 2023 – Summer Senate (**handout**)
 - b. August 22, 2023 (**handout**)
 - c. August 29, 2023 (**handout**)
 - d. September 12, 2023 (*pending*)
5. CONTINUED ITEMS
 - a. AS Log and Committee Rosters (**handout – EXCEL document**)
 - i. AAC
 - ii. AS&SS
 - iii. BPC
 - iv. FAC
 - b. Provost Update (V. Harper)
 - i. CO Update
 - ii. Removal of Advising Holds (**handout**)
 - iii. Reference Letters Policy- Link: Employment Policy Governing the Provision of Employee References <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/12142918/latest/>

- iv. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (HOLD- *check with Provost*)

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain: 10:45 AM)

- a. Request from the Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee – FAC (**handout**)
- b. BPA Advising Center name change (**handout**)- BPC and AAC (?).
- c. SOCI Summer Issue (**handout**)- AAC
- d. GE Breadth and taskforce composition (**handout**)
- e. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth
 - i. IRA Committee Appointments- EC Recommendations to V. Harper (**handout**)
 - ii. U-wide RTP criteria taskforce (equity) (HOLD)
- f. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
- g. Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Handbook 311.1 (**handout**)
- h. Carry-over from 2021-2022 Annual Report (Possible New Referrals)
 - i. Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR) Constitution; academic integrity for faculty –FAC
 - ii. RES 212234 CSUB Faculty Retention and Tenure Density Priority – (HOLD- *pending action from President*)
- i. Resolution on CCC baccalaureate degrees [AB 927] – EC
- j. Cultural Taxation Award Criteria and Review Committee Structure – BPC and FAC (HOLD- *check with Provost on if award still exists*)
- k. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) - BPC
- l. Investment Divestiture – BPC
- m. Proposals Direct to ASCSU (E. Correa’s request)
- n. Proposal for emphasis in Biochemistry B.S. – AAC (HOLD; resolution in progress for Concentration and Emphasis)

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

LOCATION: DEZEMBER LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER, ROOM 409-411

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of Minutes
 - a. September 14, 2023 (**handout**)
- C. Announcements and Information
 - a. President’s Report – L. Zelezny (**Time Certain: 10:10 AM**).
 - b. Elections and Appointments- M. Danforth

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

E. Reports

- a. Provost's Report – V. Harper
- b. ASCSU Report - J. Millar
- c. Committee Reports: (*Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC posted on the Academic Senate webpage; Senate Log attached*)
 - i. ASI Report- D. Alamillo
 - ii. Executive Committee- M. Danforth
 - iii. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) - D. Solano
 - iv. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS) - E. Correa
 - v. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) - D. Wu
 - vi. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) - M. Rush
 - vii. Staff Report- J. Cornelison

F. Resolutions (**Time Certain: 10:45 AM**)

- a. Consent Agenda
- b. New Business
- c. Old Business
 - i. RES 232401 Statement on Campus Modality – EC
 - ii. RES 232403 Definitions of Undergraduate Concentrations and Emphases – AAC
 - iii. RES 232402 Statement on Reducing Educational Material Cost at CSUB – AS&SS

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

H. Faculty Recognition (**Time Certain: 11:25 AM**)

I. Adjournment

8. ADJOURNMENT

Handout: Removal of Advising Holds

From: [Vernon Harper](#)
To: [Danielle Solano](#); [Melissa Danforth](#)
Cc: [Senate Executive Committee Group](#)
Subject: Re: Removal of Advising holds
Date: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 5:43:17 PM

of course, let's talk about it at the first meeting

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 5:34:33 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>; Vernon Harper <vharper@csub.edu>
Cc: Senate Executive Committee Group <executivecommittee@CSUB.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: Re: Removal of Advising holds

Melissa brings up some good points. I think this is definitely worth a larger conversation with Kris in her role as Interim Advising Director when we reconvene in the fall. I like the idea of MOUs for faculty to help with advising moving forward. (I am concerned that continuing students who have advising holds still might be the ones that actually need advising. Usually the students that didn't take care of it already are a little clueless.)

For incoming transfer students, I do understand that part of the barrier has been transcript evaluation. Kris and I ran a program for transfer students in June, and many of them had submitted their transcripts (and I verified that they were received and in OnBase), but they had not been evaluated yet. This delay in transcript evaluation prevented them from scheduling an advising appointment, thus setting back course registration.

Thank you, Vernon, for the communication and letting us know.

--Dani

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

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

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

From: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 4:00 PM
To: Vernon Harper <vharper@csub.edu>

Cc: Senate Executive Committee Group <executivecommittee@CSUB.onmicrosoft.com>

Subject: RE: Removal of Advising holds

If the advising centers can't handle the load, there are options to bring faculty members into the process. I brought up department chairs since they're already under summer contract, but I'm sure other faculty members would be willing to sign MOUs to advise incoming students during the summer if more people are needed.

I personally had a large number of transfer students with all sorts of issues when I advised students in April/May, which I can't specifically attribute to advising holds being removed last year, but I can say that it was more issues with transfer students than I'd normally see.

Since this is the second year advising holds have been removed due to staffing issues in the advising centers, it might be worth considering bringing faculty advisors in under special contracts next summer and/or allowing incoming students to make appointments sooner.

Melissa

From: Vernon Harper <vharper@csub.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 3:43 PM

To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>

Cc: Senate Executive Committee Group <executivecommittee@CSUB.onmicrosoft.com>

Subject: Re: Removal of Advising holds

Yes, the appointments have been a bottle neck. We need to remove the barriers for registration. The interim director was consulted on the maneuver.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 3:38:10 PM

To: Vernon Harper <vharper@csub.edu>

Cc: Senate Executive Committee Group <executivecommittee@CSUB.onmicrosoft.com>

Subject: RE: Removal of Advising holds

These are my thoughts.

For continuing students, my primary concern is that removing the hold will likely not address the root cause of their lack of registration, since they've had since April to make an advising appointment. There may be other reasons why they are not making advising appointments, so I don't know how much enrollment would be generated for continuing students by removing their holds.

For incoming students, if this is a staffing issue with the advising centers, have department chairs been asked if they would be willing to meet with students over the summer? I'd be concerned that

incoming students would end up signing up for the wrong courses, which would generate FTES for the campus, but hurt their graduation progress. Department chairs could at least make sure the courses follow the roadmaps, with appropriate alterations for each individual's situation.

Also, I have never really understood why all incoming students have to wait until summer to register. If incoming students could start registering sooner, then that would spread the load out for the advising centers.

Melissa

From: Vernon Harper <yharper@csub.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 1:16 PM

To: Senate Executive Committee Group <executivecommittee@CSUB.onmicrosoft.com>

Subject: RE: Removal of Advising holds

Friends,

I have been monitoring our enrollment patterns over the past couple of weeks. In an effort to boost enrollment, I am planning to remove the advising holds for continuing students. I apologize for interrupting your summer; please let me know if you like to discuss.

Kind regards,

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Handout: Topic- Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee- Handbook Change - FAC

To: Aaron Hegde, Academic Senate Chair

From: Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee

Date: September 16, 2023

The Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee, on behalf of the Graduate Studies Committee, requests that the Academic Senate consider the following University Handbook change. The committee has provided a proposed draft of this handbook change and rationale.

Graduate faculty criteria are required by CSUB for graduate programs, and they delineate the faculty that are eligible to serve as primary/lead mentors and advisors to graduate students. The development and application of criteria differs on a program-by-program basis, which may create confusion and harm, especially in the case when a program denies a faculty member appointment as Graduate Faculty. If a faculty member feels as though they have been wrongly denied standing as Graduate Faculty by members of their program/unit, there should be a university-wide policy that provides an opportunity for them to appeal a potentially unfair decision. This topic emerged as a key area of concern following a retreat and planning meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee during Summer 2023.

The change that we are requesting is for a description of graduate faculty criteria to be added to the handbook that is consistent with existing university policy, with new language that creates an appeals process for faculty if they disagree with a unit decision on their review. This appeal process will occur outside of program. Preliminarily, we suggest that this be contained within section 308 of the University Handbook (i.e., "Review procedures for special awards and appointments"), since appointment to graduate faculty status is a special title of which only faculty within some programs will be eligible.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Our committee welcomes any additional meetings, information requests, or consultations that may relate to this request.

Respectfully,
Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee

Anna Jacobsen, Chair
Veronica Bethea-Amey
Heidi He
Luis Hernandez
Carmen Padilla
Anthony Pallitto
Adrienne Silva
Dan Zhou

CC:
Denver Fowler, Associate Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies and Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee
Martha Manriquez, Graduate Student Center Coordinator

DRAFT

RES Graduate Faculty

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend revisions to the University Handbook language regarding the Graduate Studies Committee (additions in **bold underline**) as specified below:

308.7 Graduate Faculty

308.7.1 Graduate Faculty criteria and evaluation

Programs offering graduate degrees shall develop qualification criteria and a policy for periodic evaluation for appointment of Graduate Faculty. Only designated Graduate Faculty may serve as the primary supervisor/advisor of a graduate student's culminating experience, and these faculty are responsible for maintaining the quality and standards of teaching and mentoring within the graduate program. Criteria for appointment and renewal of appointment as Graduate Faculty is primarily dependent upon demonstrated current expertise and active practice in the discipline of the relevant graduate program. A term of Graduate Faculty appointment shall not exceed five years.

Graduate faculty qualification criteria and policy for periodic evaluation for appointment shall follow the areas included below. Without altering the scope of the areas listed below, programs/units shall interpret and elaborate these areas in order to assess the eligibility of a faculty member for appointment as Graduate Faculty within their unit/program.

Qualification criteria and the evaluation process shall meet the following:

- a. Graduate faculty are selected from among the tenured and tenure-track faculty from the program/unit in which the graduate degree is to be conferred. At the discretion of programs/units, emeritus faculty from the program/unit in which the degree is to be conferred may also be considered for appointment as Graduate Faculty.**
- b. Faculty must be evaluated based on activities and productivity from only the most recent 5-year period.**
- c. Graduate programs shall develop an evaluation process for the submission and review of Graduate Faculty appointment requests. Faculty may request review or re-review at any time, which may occur in less than a five-year cycle for faculty not currently part of the Graduate Faculty.**
- d. Criteria shall set minimum expectations for qualification to a faculty appointment to Graduate Faculty, including the following:**
 - i. Maintaining/holding a discipline-specific Ph.D. or other appropriate terminal degree related to the graduate degree program in which the Graduate Faculty will serve.**
 - ii. Relevant professional experience and activity within the last 5 years, including with professional societies and organizations, maintenance of professional practice and connections, and evidence of the ability to model appropriate professional and academic behaviors.**
 - iii. Experience participating in graduate programs, including supervision of culminating experiences. This experience does not necessitate experience as**

- primary advisor, and may include experience as a successful and effective graduate committee member or mentor.
- iv. Relevant, and on-going research, scholarship, and creative activities, including the demonstration of significant recent professional peer-reviewed products and/or publications. Criteria related to this area shall be the most rigorous and extensive area of review.
- v. Demonstrated involvement of students in research, scholarship, and creative activities.
- vi. Programs may add additional areas of evaluation as may be required by disciplinary standards, accreditation requirements, or degree certification requirements.
- e. In the event that a graduate program/unit does not have current approved Graduate Faculty evaluation criteria, evaluation shall be based upon the most current criteria required for promotion within the unit under their criteria for RTP evaluation. This evaluation shall be based on only the most recent 5-years of activity. Rank is not an acceptable basis for Graduate Faculty appointment evaluation.
- f. Graduate Program Directors shall maintain documentation of faculty evaluations, including the duration of current appointments for all Graduate Faculty. Graduate Program Directors are responsible for ensuring that Graduate Faculty serve for no more than 5-years before being evaluated for re-appointment.
- g. At the beginning of each academic year, the relevant Graduate Program Director shall forward to the AD Graduate and Undergraduate Studies (AD-GUS) an up-to-date list of all faculty within the relevant graduate program currently appointed as Graduate Faculty.

308.7.2 Graduate Faculty criteria approval and revision

Unit/program Graduate Faculty criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Any unit/program faculty may propose changes in unit/program evaluation criteria at any time. After approval by a majority vote of all Graduate faculty of the relevant graduate program, changes in the Graduate Faculty criteria shall be forwarded to the AD Graduate and Undergraduate Studies (AD-GUS) and the AVP Academic Affairs (AVP AA) for review and approval. In the event that approval is not granted, the AD-GUS, AVP-AA and unit/program shall attempt to resolve any differences of opinion concerning the proposed criteria. In the event that the differences cannot be resolved, the AVP-AA shall request the Graduate Studies Committee to arbitrate and to determine a resolution.

308.7.3 Graduate Faculty appeal of decision

In the event that a faculty member is evaluated and declined appointment as Graduate Faculty they may request a re-evaluation by Graduate Faculty from outside their unit. They shall forward their request, including current unit/program Graduate Faculty criteria, a personal narrative outlining how they meet these criteria, and an up-to-date CV reflecting activity from the most recent 5-years to the AD Graduate and Undergraduate Studies (AD-GUS). An *ad hoc* committee consisting of a minimum of 5 Graduate Faculty selected from the members of the Graduate Studies Committee will be assembled by the AD-GUS to evaluate the faculty's qualifications and make an appointment decision. This

committee shall not include any members from the unit/program of the faculty requesting re-evaluation.

RATIONALE: Graduate faculty criteria are already required for graduate programs, but the development and evaluation of these has been applied on a program-by-program basis. This has led to confusion, and uneven implementation and application. To date, there has been no university-wide policy that provides faculty an option for re-evaluation or appeal when they disagree with the evaluation decision of their unit/program.

The proposed *University Handbook* change adds general language on Graduate Faculty criteria and evaluation for appointment that is consistent with existing university policy. Additionally, new language that creates an appeals process for faculty if they disagree with a unit decision on their evaluation. This appeal process will be independent and will occur outside of unit/program, offering faculty an important avenue to address or remedy potential conflicts within the unit/program.

CSU Bakersfield
Division of Graduate Studies

*Reviewed and approved by the Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee on 12/1/2020.
Reviewed by the Graduate Studies Committee on 3/2/2021 and approved on 4/28/2021.*

Graduate Program Checklist

A checklist outlining State of California, CSU, EO, and CSUB regulations and policies regarding graduate program culminating experiences and associated requirements for the format, evaluation, and storage/recording for graduate program documentation related to culminating experiences.

Program policy requirements related to Culminating Experience development, oversight, and evaluation:

- ___ Graduate faculty:
 - ___ Criteria are developed for designation of graduate faculty and a policy for periodic review is in place;
 - ___ Graduate faculty are selected from among the tenured and tenure-track faculty from the department/program/unit in which the degree is to be conferred;
 - ___ At the discretion of departments/programs/units and based on their formal criteria and policy for periodic review, emeritus faculty from the department/program/unit in which the degree is to be conferred may also be considered for Graduate faculty standing;
 - ___ Criteria must set minimum expectations for scholarly activity and productivity and may be more rigorous than standard departmental criteria for tenured or tenure-track faculty;
 - ___ Graduate faculty may serve for a limited term (max 5-year) prior to re-evaluation; and
 - ___ Only Graduate faculty may serve as a student's Graduate Committee Chair.

- ___ Graduate Committees:
 - ___ Each student has a Graduate Committee for the development and evaluation of their Culminating Experience.
 - ___ Graduate Committees must be comprised of a **minimum of three members**;
 - ___ Graduate Committee membership must include a **majority of Graduate faculty** from the department/program/unit in which the degree is to be earned;
 - ___ Policy is developed on Graduate Committee member selection:
 - ___ In some programs requiring a culminating thesis or dissertation, students may select the members of their Graduate Committee in consultation with their advisor (provided that individuals meet committee membership requirements), and
 - ___ In some programs requiring a culminating project or examination, Graduate Committee membership may be decided by the program; and
 - ___ Graduate Committee membership must be approved by both the graduate program director and the department chair.

- ___ Culminating experiences must be classified as one of the following products (California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 2, Article 7, (b), (3)):
 - (1) thesis/dissertation,
 - (2) project, or
 - (3) comprehensive examination.

Culminating experiences checklists:

See individual checklists below for each type of culminating experience. Graduate programs should have policies and procedures in place that meet these requirements.

● Thesis/Dissertation

Proposal development and project oversight:

- ___ Graduate Committee Chair (advisor) is assigned to assist the student with their thesis/dissertation proposal and project.
- ___ A Graduate Committee (**with a minimum of 3 members and a majority of Graduate faculty**) is formally assigned to the student and project, overseeing the development, progress, and completion of the student culminating experience.
- ___ The Graduate Committee is responsible for:
 - ___ determining the feasibility and merit of the proposal/plan;
 - ___ reviewing the proposal/plan;
 - ___ familiarizing the student with university policies concerning the handling of dangerous materials, laboratory and fieldwork safety, and maintenance of standards of quality, ethics, and professional performance;
 - ___ reviewing and approving the methodology and any instrument or questionnaire used in data collection; and
 - ___ ensuring that the student project/proposal is reviewed and approved by the appropriate campus-level committee (e.g., IRB or IACUC).
- ___ Students are only permitted to proceed with their proposed project after approval from their Graduate Committee.
- ___ Policies are in place to **document formal approval of a student's plan or proposal** from the Graduate Committee, signifying that the student has permission to proceed with the study as outlined in the proposal or plan.
- ___ **A copy of the student's approved proposal/plan should be retained by the program.**

Format and content:

- ___ The thesis/dissertation represents a written product of a systematic study of a significant problem. It identifies the problem, states the major assumptions, explains the significance of the undertaking, sets forth the sources for and methods of gathering information, analyzes the data, and offers a conclusion or recommendation(s).
- ___ The finished product evidences originality, critical and independent thinking, appropriate organization and format, and thorough documentation.
- ___ **The format of all theses/dissertations must meet the technical requirements established by the university as well as any specific program requirements.**

Evaluation and documentation:

- ___ An oral defense and/or public presentation of the thesis/dissertation is required;
- ___ The Graduate Committee shall determine the final approval of the thesis or dissertation;
- ___ The Graduate Committee shall evaluate the adequacy of the bibliography/literature cited to ensure that theses/dissertations adequately represent the state of knowledge on a topic, represent student expertise in their chosen area of specialty, and fairly present the research of others;

- ___ The Graduate Committee evaluates the culminating experience to determine if it meets university standards;
- ___ Successful completion of the culminating experience and the conferral of a program degree are dependent on **majority approval** from the Graduate Committee and may only be conferred with their **documented approval**;
- ___ **Certification for the completion** of the culminating experience must be provided prior to graduation and the awarding of the graduate degree through:
 - (1) designation of culminating experience course credit, or
 - (2) an alternative acceptable form of reporting to the Evaluations Office and the Office of Academic Programs;
- ___ In consultation with the other members of the Graduate Committee, the chair shall determine the final grade and/or assigning of complete credit for the culminating experience. The Graduate Committee Chair is responsible for accurately reporting the grade/completion status agreed upon by the Graduate Committee; and
- ___ **All final and approved theses/dissertations must be formally filed electronically with the CSUB Library.**

● **Project**

Project development and oversight:

- ___ Graduate Committee Chair (advisor) is assigned to assist student with their culminating project/activity plan;
- ___ A Graduate Committee (**with a minimum of 3 members and a majority of Graduate faculty**) is formally assigned to the student and project, overseeing the development, progress, and completion of the student culminating experience;
- ___ The Graduate Committee, when appropriate and related to the project, is responsible for:
 - ___ determining the feasibility and merit of the proposal/plan,
 - ___ reviewing the proposal/plan,
 - ___ familiarizing the student with university policies concerning the handling of dangerous materials, laboratory and fieldwork safety, and maintenance of standards of quality, ethics, and professional performance,
 - ___ reviewing and approving the methodology and any instrument or questionnaire used in data collection, and
 - ___ ensuring that the student project/proposal is reviewed and approved by the appropriate campus-level committee (e.g., IRB or IACUC).
- ___ Students are only permitted to proceed with their proposed project after a favorable determination has been made by their Graduate Committee;
- ___ Policies are in place to **document formal approval** of a student's plan or project proposal from the Graduate Committee, signifying that the student has permission to proceed with the project as outlined in the proposal or plan; and
- ___ **A copy of the student's approved proposal/plan should be retained by the program.**

Format and content:

- ___ The project demonstrates originality and independent thinking, appropriate form and organization, and an academic rationale; and
- ___ **The finished project must be described and summarized in a written abstract that includes the project's significance, objectives, methodology, and conclusion or recommendation(s).**

Evaluation and documentation:

- ___ An oral defense and/or public presentation of the project is required;
- ___ The Graduate Committee shall determine the final approval of the project;
- ___ The Graduate Committee evaluates the culminating experience to determine if it meets university standards;
- ___ Successful completion of the culminating experience and the conferral of a program degree are dependent on **majority approval** from the Graduate Committee and may only be conferred with their **documented approval**;
- ___ Certification for the completion of the culminating experience must be provided prior to graduation and the awarding of the graduate degree through:
 - (1) designation of culminating experience course credit, or
 - (2) an alternative acceptable form of reporting to the Evaluations Office and the Office of Academic Programs;
- ___ In consultation with the other members of the Graduate Committee, the chair shall determine the final grade and/or assigning of complete credit for the culminating experience. The Graduate Committee Chair is responsible for accurately reporting the grade/completion status agreed upon by the Graduate Committee; and
- ___ **Projects/project abstracts shall be submitted to the CSUB library or retained by the program.**

● **Comprehensive Examination**

Examination preparation:

- ___ Graduate Committee Chair (advisor) is assigned to assist student with their culminating experience planning;
- ___ A Graduate Committee (**with a minimum of 3 members and a majority of Graduate faculty**) is formally assigned to the student and oversees the completion of the student culminating experience;
- ___ The Graduate Committee is responsible for:
 - ___ developing and administering the comprehensive examination, and
 - ___ assisting students in preparation for comprehensive examinations.

Format and content:

- ___ The comprehensive examination is an assessment of the student's ability to integrate the knowledge of the area, show critical and independent thinking, and demonstrate mastery of the subject matter; and
- ___ The results of the examination evidence independent thinking, appropriate organization, critical analysis, and accuracy of documentation.

Evaluation and documentation:

- ___ The Graduate Committee shall determine the final approval of the comprehensive examination;
- ___ The Graduate Committee evaluates the culminating experience to determine if it meets university and professional standards;
- ___ Successful completion of the culminating experience and the conferral of a program degree are dependent on **majority approval** from the Graduate Committee and may only be conferred with their **documented approval**;
- ___ Certification for the completion of the culminating experience must be provided prior to graduation and the awarding of the graduate degree through:
 - (1) designation of culminating experience course credit, or

(2) an alternative acceptable form of reporting to the Evaluations Office and the Office of Academic Programs;

_____ In consultation with the other members of the Graduate Committee, the chair shall determine the final grade and/or assigning of complete credit for the culminating experience. The Graduate Committee Chair is responsible for accurately reporting the grade/completion status agreed upon by the Graduate Committee; and

_____ **A record of the examination questions and responses shall be retained by the respective graduate program.**

From: [Melissa Danforth](#)
To: [Aaron Hegde](#); [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: RE: Question: BPA Advising Center Name Change
Date: Friday, July 28, 2023 11:55:22 AM

Hi Aaron,

As far as I can recall, historically, those parts of campus haven't passed their renaming past the Senate. I think the NSME equivalent has tried to rename itself twice, although most people still just call it the "NSME Student Center" rather than the name placard that's now on their building (NSME Student Advising and Success Center).

I suppose the root issue would be what is considered a department under the purview of the Senate approval process. Is it just the academic units that oversee majors which lead to degrees? If that's the interpretation, then renaming of units like this wouldn't fall under Senate purview, but would instead be the purview of the appropriate MPP in Academic Affairs.

Melissa

From: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 28, 2023 11:42 AM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>; Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Subject: Re: Question: BPA Advising Center Name Change

Hi, Katie.

When this issue, in another matter had come up, the provost mentioned that there may be a role for shared governance. I am not yet sure where I stand. Melissa? Your thoughts? I might also run this by Summer Senate.

Would you please reach out to Maria and let her know that we will get back to her?

Thanks,
Aaron

Dr. S. Aaron Hegde, PhD
Chair and Professor, Economics
Chair, Academic Senate
Co-Director, Grimm Family Center for AGBS
Director, ERM Program
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy
shegde@csub.edu

From: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2023 8:13:57 PM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegade@csub.edu>; Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Subject: FW: Question: BPA Advising Center Name Change

Hello!

I received the question below from Maria in the BPA Dean's Office and I have no idea how to answer her question. Is this a Senate issue?

Katie

From: Maria Diaz <mdiaz41@csub.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2023 4:28 PM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: Question: BPA Advising Center Name Change

Hi Katherine,

The BPA Advising and Student Support Services department would like to change its name to the BPA Advising Center. I wanted to reach out to see if you know if there's procedure for this. Or any paperwork that we would need to complete to make this change official. I don't know if this would only apply to faculty departments and not student service departments. I want to make sure that we are doing the right thing.

Please advise.

Thank you,

MARIA DIAZ

Interim Administrative Support Coordinator – Dean's Office
School of Business and Public Administration
(661) 654-2207 Main Office
(661) 654-2023 Direct

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 20 BDC
Bakersfield, CA 93311

bpa.csub.edu



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

From: [Melissa Danforth](#)
To: [Aaron Hegde](#)
Cc: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: RE: Possible Summer SOCI issue
Date: Wednesday, July 26, 2023 11:10:26 PM

Hi Aaron,

I'll make that suggestion to Steve Miller, since August 10th is technically still the start of finals for SS3, so not following the same procedures as regular terms.

Melissa

From: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2023 10:58 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: Re: Possible Summer SOCI issue

Oops. Should have read this email. Ok. Let's put it on the EC agenda. I don't suppose Steve can make the last day for SOCI the 9th? Might be the quick fix for now.

Aaron

Dr. S. Aaron Hegde, PhD
Chair and Professor, Economics
Chair, Academic Senate
Co-Director, Grimm Family Center for AGBS
Director, ERM Program
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy
shegde@csub.edu

From: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2023 12:58:25 AM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: RE: Possible Summer SOCI issue

Hi Aaron,

Steve Miller provided further clarification that the SOCI's for those courses will go out on Monday July 31st and be available through Thursday August 10th. The only issue with that time frame is that August 10th is Grades Due day for the 10-week session (SS1), and normal term SOCI's are only

available until the day before final exams.

It should be noted that August 10th is the first day of finals for the second 5-week session (SS3), so ITS may have just been confused by the fact that the 10-week session (SS1) ends a week earlier than the second 5-week session (SS3) and that they needed to do different SOCI lengths for the different sessions.

I think BPC should still consider adding SOCI timing to the summer calendar, but there also likely needs to be a conversation with ITS about the timing of summer SOCIs to avoid having SOCIs available after students potentially have seen their final course grade in Canvas.

Thanks,
Melissa

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2023 1:34 PM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: Possible Summer SOCI issue

Hi Aaron,

I was in a faculty meeting today where the summer instructors said they didn't get SOCI notification emails for their courses. RES 192003 made SOCIs mandatory for summer and winter session courses.

It was a meeting for a self-support program and all the classes were self-support classes, so maybe that's why they didn't get SOCIs. I always have to remind ITS to generate SOCIs for my self-support course.

But we also noticed the Summer 2023 calendar does not have SOCI administration weeks listed:
<https://maindata.csub.edu/media/56626/download?inline>

On the chance that campus didn't administer SOCIs to any summer classes because there were no SOCI weeks in the Summer 2023 calendar, I wanted to bring this to your attention.

I also checked RES 222326 that added Juneteenth to the summer calendars. There are no SOCI weeks listed for Summer 2024 either, so that will need to go back to BPC for revision:
<https://maindata.csub.edu/media/63476/download?inline>

Also, it looks like Winter Intersession calendar has never been formally approved by Senate, other than the days available between Fall and Spring terms and that discussion with EEGO about starting in December vs January, but if Senate wants SOCI administration for Winter Intersession, we should be saying when SOCIs go out, at minimum.

Thanks,

Melissa

--

Dr. Melissa Danforth

Vice Chair, CSUB Academic Senate

Chair of the Pandemic Research Group Steering Committee

Professor of Computer Science

Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering/Computer Science

California State University, Bakersfield

Website: <https://www.cs.csub.edu/~melissa/>

From: [Gwendolyn Parnell](#)
To: [Aaron Hegde](#); [ORG-AcademicSenateChair](#)
Cc: [Isabel Sumaya](#); [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: Re: University Handbook Updates: HSIRB
Date: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 10:59:43 AM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)
[Office of P & VPAA Memo - HSIRB & IACUC Policies 11.28.2022.pdf](#)
[University Handbook Changes for HSIRB 2023 i.s.m.w.g.p..docx](#)

Hello Dr. Hegde,

As requested, please find attached the specific language for the HSIRB policy updates (April 2022) for the purposes of updating the CSUB University Handbook.

Kind regards,

Gwen

Gwen Parnell, B.A., CIP
Research Compliance Analyst
Office of Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs
California State University, Bakersfield
Office: DDH D108 Mail Stop: 24DDH
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, CA 93311
gparnell@csub.edu
Phone: 661-654-2231
Fax: 661-654-3342

From: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Sent: Monday, May 1, 2023 12:41 PM
To: Gwendolyn Parnell <gparnell@csub.edu>; [ORG-AcademicSenateChair](#) <academicsenatechair@csub.edu>
Cc: [Isabel Sumaya](#) <isumaya@csub.edu>; [Katherine Van Grinsven](#) <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: Re: University Handbook Updates: HSIRB & IACUC

Hi, Gwen

Thanks for the email. Any changes that need to be made in the handbook, will need to be done in early fall. We have had a backlog of resolutions and stopped considering new ones early April.

It would be helpful if you had the particular handbook language handy.

Thanks,
Aaron

DR. S. AARON HEGDE, PHD
Chair, Academic Senate
Chair and Professor, Economics

Director, ERM Program
Co-Director, Grimm Family Center for AGBS

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: BDC 20
Bakersfield, CA 93311

shegade@csub.edu



From: Gwendolyn Parnell <gparnell@csub.edu>
Date: Friday, April 14, 2023 at 1:43 PM
To: ORG-AcademicSenateChair <academicsenatechair@csub.edu>
Cc: Isabel Sumaya <isumaya@csub.edu>, Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: University Handbook Updates: HSIRB & IACUC

Hello,

Please find attached the HSIRB & IACUC updated policy documents as well as the approval memos for each.

Please review these documents for the purposes of updating our CSUB University Handbook.

Thank you!

Kind regards,

Gwen

Gwen Parnell, B.A., CIP
Research Compliance Analyst
Office of Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs
California State University, Bakersfield
Office: DDH D108 Mail Stop: 24DDH
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, CA 93311
gparnell@csub.edu
Phone: 661-654-2231
Fax: 661-654-3342



Date: November 28, 2022

To: Aaron Hedge
Academic Senate Chair

From: Vernon B. Harper, Jr., Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Re: HSIRB and IACUC Policies Procedures

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Vernon B. Harper, Jr.", positioned to the right of the "From:" field.

The intent of this memorandum is to request of the Academic Senate to consider modifying the faculty handbook to reflect the updated HSIRB and IACUC policies and procedures. The policies and procedures for both committees are attached.

The updated HSIRB and IACUC policies and procedures were approved by me, Dr. Vernon Harper, in April 2022.

Thank you.

303.9.2 Membership of the HSIRB

Membership of the CSUB HSIRB shall comply with the requirements specified in 45 CRF 46 which requires a minimum number of five (5) members: at least one (1) member whose primary concerns are in scientific areas, at least one (1) member whose primary concerns are in nonscientific areas, and at least one (1) member who is not otherwise affiliated with CSUB and is not part of the immediate family of a person affiliated with CSUB. Qualifications for membership shall include: professional competence necessary to review specific research activities, knowledge of standards of professional conduct and practice and reputation for professional compliance, knowledge of institutional commitments and regulations, knowledge of applicable law, and sensitivity to community attitudes. In consultation with the HSIRB and the Associate Vice-President (AVP) for Grants, Research and Sponsored Programs (GRASP), the P&VPAA appoints the chair and HSIRB members initially to a one-year term and to three-year terms thereafter. In consultation with the HSIRB chair, the P&VPAA may also remove members who do not participate in HSIRB activities. The AVP for GRASP provides administrative support for the HSIRB. Members of the HSIRB may not participate in the review of any project in which the member has an interest.



Memorandum

DATE: January 25, 2023

TO: CSUB Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

FROM: Vernon B. Harper, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

CC: Isabel Sumaya, Interim AVP for GRaSP, University Research Ethics Review Coordinator
Gwen Parnell, Research Compliance Analyst, GRaSP, IRB Logistical-Administrative Support

RE: Approval of Updated and Revised HSIRB Policy

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Vernon B. Harper', is written over the 'FROM' and 'CC' lines of the memorandum.

I have reviewed and approved the CSUB HSIRB revised and updated policy newly titled: **Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) Policy Procedures, and Practices: Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) April 2022.**

The document has been

- (1) updated to match and reflect the most current federal regulation codes and language,
- (2) revised to include the addition of a HSIRB Vice Chair position, and
- (3) revised to reduce the number of members required (to align with the federal regulations and standards).

The revisions and updates have been reviewed and approved by both the HSIRB committee members and the GRaSP Pre-Award staff members. The policy updates and revisions are important and valid and became effective on November 2, 2022.

The document has been posted on the HSIRB website at this address: [Background Documents | California State University, Bakersfield \(csub.edu\)](#)



Memorandum

DATE: January 25, 2023

TO: CSUB Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee

FROM: Vernon B. Harper, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

CC: Isabel Sumaya, Interim AVP for GRaSP, University Research Ethics Review Coordinator
Gwen Parnell, Research Compliance Analyst, GRaSP, IACUC Logistical-Administrative Support

RE: Approval of Updated and Revised IACUC Policy

I have reviewed and approved the CSUB IACUC revised and updated policy newly titled: POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS IN RESEARCH AND EDUCATION CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD April 2022.

The document has been:

- (1) updated to match and reflect the most current federal regulation codes and language,
- (2) revised to include the addition of an IACUC Vice Chair position, and
- (3) revised to reduce the number of members required (to align with the federal regulations and standards).

The revisions and updates have been reviewed and approved by both the IACUC committee and the GRaSP Pre-Award staff members. The policy updates became effective on November 2, 2022.

The document has been posted on the IACUC website at this address: [POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS IN RESEARCH AND EDUCATION \(csub.edu\)](https://www.csub.edu/iacuc/policy-procedures)

From: [Beth Bywaters](#)
To: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: FW: Request to prepare for GE changes
Date: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 10:39:32 AM

From: Debra Jackson <djackson9@csub.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 9:39 AM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Cc: Vernon Harper <vharper@csub.edu>; Beth Bywaters <ebywaters@csub.edu>
Subject: Request to prepare for GE changes

Dear Aaron,

I would like to request that the Academic Senate form a work group to plan for expected changes to our GE Breadth.

State Assembly Bill 928 (AB 928) calls for the establishment of a “singular lower-division general education pathway” that meets the academic requirements necessary for transfer admission from the California Community Colleges (CCC) to both UC and the California State University (CSU). AB 928 also limits the number of units in the pathway to a 34-unit ceiling. This new lower-division general education pathway goes into effect fall 2025.

While we do not yet have details about how the CSU will adjust our GE Breadth requirements in response to Cal-GETC, I do expect that there will be changes. If not, the lower division requirements for native CSU students will be different from those for transfer students, which creates a troubling inconsistency. Currently, CSU’s Breadth is 39 units, whereas Cal-GETC is 34 units. Cal-GETC has 3 units fewer in lower-division Area C, does not have the 3-unit Area E, and has one unit for B3.

Given that Cal-GETC goes into effect in fall 2025, I believe it behooves us to develop a plan to adopt these changes to the GE curriculum in the likely event that they are adopted across the CSU. Any changes to our GE curriculum would require full senate approval. To prepare for a fall 2025 implementation, we would need to have this in place by early fall 2024 for catalog deadlines.

Thank you for your consideration,
Debra

DEBRA L. JACKSON, Ph.D.
She/her/hers
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dean of Academic Programs
(661) 654-3420

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

Handout: Evaluation of Academic Administrators- Handbook 311.1

Background:

In August 2021, Beth Bywaters interpreted the language of Handbook 311.1 as the call for faculty on Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) Provost to be early in Fall '21 semester; the first academic year after the Provost's May 2020 hire. Upon mentioning the Fall '21 formation the AARC to Dee Dee Price, she shared her interpretation, having served as coordinator of many AARCs:

The AARC for Provost would be formed in the Spring of his second year after hire. That would be this semester.

Here is some clarifying language which conforms to the timing and practice of the Academic Administrator Review Committee.

311.1 General Guidelines

Each academic administrator shall be evaluated according to these procedures at three-year intervals. The **first** review **process** should be initiated early in fall semester after their initial hire. **The Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) is formed in the following Spring of the administrator's second year.** The President or the President's designee prepares the schedule of the evaluations.

The President may, if he or she believes it is appropriate, call for an evaluation of an individual before a scheduled evaluation.

The supervisor, after consulting with the administrator being evaluated, is responsible for developing the categories to be used for evaluating a director, dean, or academic vice president.

(Revised 12-01-16)

Please consider whether these suggestions go to the EC for discussion and referral.