



ACADEMIC SENATE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

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

In- Person: BPA 134 Conference Room

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

Guest: none

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain: 10:05 AM)
4. APPROVAL OF EC MINUTES
 - a. November 7, 2023 (**handout**)
 - b. November 21, 2023 (**handout**)
 - c. Carry over from 2022-2023
 - i. November 15, 2022 (**handout**)
 - ii. November 22, 2022 (**handout**)
 - iii. December 6, 2022 (**handout**)
 - iv. January 24, 2022(**handout**)
 - v. January 31, 2022 (**handout**)
 - vi. May 2, 2023 (**handout**)
 - vii. May 9, 2023 (**handout**)
5. CONTINUED ITEMS
 - a. AS Log (**handout – EXCEL document**)
 - i. AAC (D. Solano)
 - ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
 - iii. BPC (D. Wu)
 - iv. FAC (M. Rush)

- b. Provost Update (V. Harper)
 - i. Academic Affairs Pandemic Response Budget Advisory Task Force (***handout***)
 - ii. SSE Dean Review Committee Composition
 - 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. Current SOCI Software replacement using Class Climate (***handout***)
 - b. New Department Proposal – Public Health– ***Link to BOX files:***
<https://csub.box.com/s/kibjg6yje7juuxm0dw3rscp3rwxhwwv4>
 - c. FTLC Director Review
 - d. Campus Climate Survey- Senate actionable items (***handout***)
 - e. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth
 - i. Various university-wide appointments
 - ii. Distributed Learning Committee (DLC)
 - iii. U-wide RTP criteria taskforce (equity) (HOLD)
 - f. Academic Integrity Policy- Graduate and Undergraduate (***handout***)
 - g. Considering Support for Scholarship and Creative Activities (***handout***)
 - h. Administering SOCs (***handout***)
 - i. GE Breadth and taskforce composition (***handout***) HOLD *waiting for CSU Academic Senate Chair to come to EC – see minutes 10/1/2023. (Resolutions at Fullerton, SLO, Maritime, LA, San Marcos)*
 - j. 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*)
 - k. Resolution on CCC baccalaureate degrees [AB 927] – EC
 - l. Cultural Taxation Award Criteria and Review Committee Structure – BPC and FAC (HOLD- *check with Provost on if award still exists*)
 - m. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) - BPC
 - n. Investment Divestiture – BPC

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING**

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of Minutes
 - a. October 26, 2023 (**handout**)
 - b. November 9, 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 (**handout**)
 - 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 (**handout**)
 - iv. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS) - E. Correa (**handout**)
 - v. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) - D. Wu (**handout**)
 - vi. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) - M. Rush (**handout**)
 - vii. Staff Report- J. Cornelison
- F. Resolutions (**Time Certain: 10:30 AM**)
 - a. Consent Agenda
 - i. RES 232414 Commencement – Fall 2023 (**handout**)
 - b. New Business
 - i. RES 232410 Doctor of Nursing Practice – AAC and BPC (**handout**)
 - c. Old Business
 - i. RES 232413 Academic Calendar 2024-25, Summer 2025, 2025-26 – BPC (**doc pdf**) (*waiting for updated version*)
 - ii. RES 232411 Academic Master Plan (AMP) for 2024-25 through 2033-34 – AAC and BPC (**doc pdf**)
 - iii. RES 232412 Evaluation of Academic Administrators – FAC (**doc pdf**)
 - iv. RES 232407 Pilot of Interfolio – FAC and EC (**doc pdf**) (*tentative*)
 - v. ~~RES 232401 Statement on Campus Modality – EC (**doc pdf**)~~ Remove; hold for second reading.
- G. Open Forum (**Time Certain: 11:10 AM**)
- H. Recognition (**Time Certain: 11:15 AM**)
- I. Adjournment

8. ADJOURNMENT

Academic Affairs-Budget Advisory Task Force (AA-BAT)

Rv. 11-9-2023

Overview

Over the course of the institution's history the university's budget has consistently expanded with brief periods of reduction. During each reduction period, the university will always protect its core activities of teaching, scholarship, and service. As was described in the November Budget Forum, the university's overall resources face a significant decline. To address this reduction, an Academic Affairs Budget Task Force will be formed to recommend tactics that protect the university's core activities.

Charge

The AA-BAT will begin meeting once populated recommend budgetary adjustments that can be deployed in the current fiscal year including the capture of current open positions (including management), reductions in operating and other resources. The Task Force will have access to data within Academic Affairs.

Limitations

- AA-BAT will only provide recommendations for Academic Affairs
- Curriculum, department and/or program structure cannot be addressed by the AA-BAT

Composition

- Co-Chaired by both an administrator appointed by the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Senate
- One member of the Academic Senate
- One Department Chair
- One School Dean
- CFA President
- Academic Affairs Budget Analyst and University Budget Officer
- A staff member appointed by the Provost

Timeline

- The Task Force should begin its work immediately upon formation with recommendations expected before the start of the Spring term.
- All faculty will receive Winter stipends for work performed over the break



2023-2024 Referral #13

Advisor and Student initiated Course Drops in Adobe Sign

FROM Dr. Elaine Correa

Academic Support and Student Services Chair

TO Dr. Aaron Hegde

Academic Senate Chair

DATE November 2, 2023

cc: Katherine Van Grinsven, ASC

RE Memo on 'Deny Feature' on Form

At its October 19th 2023 meeting, AS&SS committee members identified the following recommendations to Referral #13 Advisor and Student initiated Course Drops in Adobe Sign:

Visual Enhancement to the Form: Larger Deny Feature on the form.

Training: Offer training (in person or video format) and/or a business process guide could be available to those who may be routed the form for approval.

Direction for students: Student(s) are advised to contact the instructor before requesting to add or drop a course.*
(*There is no way to enforce this recommendation)



2023-2024 Referral #14

Skipping Wait Lists

FROM Dr. Elaine Correa

Academic Support and Student Services Chair

TO Dr. Aaron Hegde

Academic Senate Chair

DATE November 26, 2023

cc: Katie Van Grinsven, ASC

At its November 16, 2023 meeting, AS&SS committee members discussed the carry over referral on Skipping Wait Lists. In consultation with Dr. Jennifer McCune, the committee agreed that this issue is no longer a concern, and that there are no additional steps that could be assumed to prevent skipping wait lists due to the way that our CSUB system is designed. IT would be required to make substantial changes which would be expensive, and time consuming to address this concern, which recently has not been an issue. AS&SS committee members agree that no action should be taken in response to this referral at this time.



2023-2024 Referral #15

Academic Integrity Pledge

FROM Dr. Elaine Correa

Academic Support and Student Services Chair

TO Dr. Aaron Hegde

Academic Senate Chair

DATE November 16, 2023

cc: Katie Van Grinsven, ASC

At its November 16, 2023 meeting, AS&SS committee members identified support for the idea of an Academic integrity pledge but felt it would be of greater educational value for students to complete the Module on Academic Integrity designed by CSUB faculty librarians. The following recommendations to Referral #15 Academic Integrity Pledge were identified:

1. CSUB should demonstrate its commitment to academic integrity by requiring students who are matriculated into CSUB to complete the Module on Academic Integrity and sign an academic integrity pledge at the end.
2. Encourage faculty to consider integrating the Module on Academic Integrity (currently in Canvas Commons) into their courses, with the incorporation of an academic integrity pledge signed at the end.
3. We recommend that at Orientation or a Group Welcome of new students, the value of Academic Integrity to the University is discussed and clear consequences for violation are stated.

Topic: Current SOCI Software Replacement using Class Climate

From: [Aaron Hegde](#)
To: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: FW: SOCI Replacement using Class Climate discussion
Date: Monday, November 20, 2023 1:48:32 PM
Attachments: [Paper SOCI risks93.docx](#)

DR. S. AARON HEGDE, PHD

Chair, Academic Senate
Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
Executive Director, Grimm Family Center for AGBS

California State University, Bakersfield

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

shegde@csub.edu



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

From: Deborah Boschini <dboschini@csub.edu>
Date: Monday, May 15, 2023 at 1:17 PM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Subject: FW: SOCI Replacement using Class Climate discussion

Aaron,

Brian provided a summary of a recent conversation that I had with him and Steve Miller. They are proposing using different software to create/process paper SOCIs, and it sounds like a reasonable plan to consider.

I'm not sure what level of engagement the Senate would expect with this proposal. The plan would solve some issues while only creating minor changes in the faculty experience. However, the changes that seem minor really do need to be reviewed by the faculty.

Let me know how you'd like to proceed.

Best,
Debbie

DEBORAH J. BOSCHINI, EdD, MSN, RN

she / her / hers

Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs

Professor of Nursing

(661) 654-2154

From: Brian Chen <bchen@csub.edu>

Sent: Thursday, May 4, 2023 11:42 AM

To: Deborah Boschini <dboschini@csub.edu>

Cc: Steve Miller <smiller@csub.edu>; Faust Gorham <fgorham@csub.edu>

Subject: SOCI Replacement using Class Climate discussion

Hello Debbie,

Attached is a document Steve drafted to provide a summary of what we discussed. I hope it could be helpful for discussions with the senate.

Thank you.

--

Brian Chen

Director, Enterprise Applications

Information Technology Services

California State University, Bakersfield

<https://www.csub.edu/its/>

<https://twitter.com/itscsub>

Phone: 661-654-2538

Executive Summary

The Paper SOCI processing has two points of failure that are not easily remediated. Failure at either of these points would significantly delay SOCI processing and could impact faculty RPT procedures. The technology used is out of date and has limited functionalities. Class Climate, a product CSUB already licensed, can replace the current system with a new form that is a facsimile of the current form and is equivalent in every functional way. In addition to alleviating the current risks, Class Climate provides several advantages, including the ability to use pens on the forms as well as eliminate the need for paper forms to be scanned by the Print Shop.

Problem

The current state of paper Student Opinionnaire of Course and Instruction (SOCi) processing at CSU Bakersfield has a number of risks. Software for scanning and reporting are outdated and needs replacement to work on modern computers. Scanning hardware is out of date, problematic in scanning, and is limited to only pencils being used.

Failure of the computer that runs the scanning software would negatively impact the timeline for survey processing. The computer is currently running an outdated Operation System and has been removed from the network for security reasons. A replacement machine would be difficult to find as more modern computers no longer has the required hardware to communicate with the legacy scanner. Successful installation of the scanning software on a newer machine, if one were to be found, is not certain.

The current reporting software was created to generate reports that were facsimiles of reports created using the VAX system. Compared to the reports generated by Class Climate for online surveys, the older reports provide less detail. The reporting software is written in PERL, which is a scripting language and not a true programming language that can produce standalone executables, making portability problematic.

Proposed Solution

Class Climate, the current tool for administering online surveys, provides a solution to these issues, and CSUB already has a license to use all the tools necessary. The only additional cost requirement is the purchase of a compatible scanner(s).

A new paper survey could be produced to emulate the current survey. The questions would be the same, the ranking scale in the same order, and the comment prompts identical. Unfortunately, this would render the stock of current SOCI forms unusable, and the campus would have to purchase new forms created in Class Climate.

Benefits

The Class Climate solution, in addition to answering all the risks with current system, has additional advantages:

1. Multiple scan stations could be utilized, thereby speeding up processing.

2. Surveys can use pens as well as pencils.
3. Eliminates the need for students to accurately identify the course they are reviewing. This also eliminates manual data checking currently required.
4. Electronic reports contain not only the quantitative analysis, but the comments are captured as well, eliminating the need for the paper surveys to be scanned into electronic format after the fact.
5. Electronic reports can be delivered to school, department and faculty at the same time.

From: [Aaron Hegde](#)
To: [Debra Jackson](#)
Cc: [Vernon Harper](#); [Todd McBride](#); [Jane Dong](#); [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: Re: New Department Proposal - Public Health
Date: Monday, November 20, 2023 1:32:02 PM

Thank you, Dr. Jackson.

We will put this on the EC agenda for tomorrow and if are able to get to it, will send it to standing committees.

Aaron

DR. S. AARON HEGDE, PHD

Chair, Academic Senate
Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
Executive Director, Grimm Family Center for AGBS

California State University, Bakersfield

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

shegde@csub.edu



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

From: Debra Jackson <djackson9@csub.edu>
Date: Monday, November 20, 2023 at 9:05 AM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Cc: Vernon Harper <vharper@csub.edu>, Todd McBride <tmcbride@csub.edu>, Jane Dong <jdong2@csub.edu>
Subject: New Department Proposal - Public Health

Dear Dr. Hegde,

A team of faculty from the Public Health, Kinesiology, and Biology programs have proposed a new department, the Department of Public Health, to be housed within the School of Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering. This proposal is supported by Jane Dong, Dean of NSME, and Vernon Harper, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The documents can be found at <https://csub.box.com/s/kibjg6yje7juuxm0dw3rscp3rwxhwv4>.

With Dr. Harper's consent on November 19, 2023, I send these documents for Academic Senate review and approval.

Thank you,
Debra

DEBRA L. JACKSON, Ph.D.

She/her/hers
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dean of Academic Programs
Accreditation Liaison Officer
(661) 654-3420

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

<http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms>



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

From: [Claudia Catota](#)
To: [Senate Executive Committee Group](#)
Cc: [Vernon Harper](#)
Subject: Great Colleges to Work For Survey Data
Date: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 2:33:31 PM
Attachments: [Copy of 2021 CSUB Faculty Experience Spreadsheet \(version 1\) 9-15-2022.xlsx](#)

Good afternoon, Senate Exec,

Attached is the *Great Colleges to Work For* survey data. In addition, the presentations are available on our website. <https://www.csub.edu/equity-inclusion-compliance/great-colleges-work-survey>

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Best regards,
Claudia

CLAUDIA CATOTA, J.D., M.A.

She/her/ella ([why pronouns matter](#))

Chief Diversity Officer & Special Assistant to the President
Division of Equity, Inclusion, & Compliance (Office of the President)
(661) 654-2137

[SCHEDULE A MEETING](#)

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy
Bakersfield, CA 93311

<https://www.csub.edu/equity-inclusion-compliance>

TOPIC: Academic Integrity Policies- Graduate and Undergraduate

From: [Emily Poole Callahan](#)
To: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Cc: [Aaron Hegde](#)
Subject: Academic Integrity Policies for Academic Senate Review/Approval
Date: Sunday, December 3, 2023 12:40:56 PM
Attachments: [Academic Integrity Policy- Graduate.docx](#)

Hello Katie-

Hope you are doing well. Attached are two policies 1) The newly drafted Academic Integrity Policy-Graduate for review by the Senate and 2) The Undergraduate Academic Integrity Policy that has already been reviewed/approved by the Senate however, we recently updated Artificial Intelligence information that needs review (in yellow).

Dr. Hegde serves on the committee that drafted these documents and suggested I send them to you for inclusion in the next round of review for the Senate at the beginning of next semester. Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Thank you,

EMILY POOLE CALLAHAN

Pronouns: She/Her/Hers

Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and
[Dean of Students](#) for Student Integrity and Well-Being
(661) 654-6090

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 44CAF
Bakersfield, CA 93311



CSUB Graduate Academic Integrity Policy

Philosophy on Academic Integrity:

The California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) [Guiding Principles](#) begin with a commitment to academic excellence and to the pursuit of integrity and truth. CSUB administrators, faculty, staff, and students are expected to honor and uphold these principles and in so doing protect the integrity of all academic work. A degree at CSUB is a product of our campus's commitment to ethical behavior, academic integrity, and academic excellence. When a violation of academic integrity occurs, it diminishes the value of that degree and impacts the reputation of our campus.

Policy:

Students at CSUB are expected to do all their academic work (coursework, assignments, exams, research, etc.) without getting or giving unauthorized assistance. Faculty have the responsibility of planning and supervising academic work so that honest effort is encouraged and positively reinforced. This policy is in addition to the Professional Standards of the student's graduate program.

Types of Academic Integrity Violations:

Academic integrity violations include, but are not limited to, plagiarizing, cheating, providing unauthorized assistance, collaborating with other students without the approval of the instructor, using technology improperly, and falsifying university documents for the purpose of gaining an unfair academic advantage, improving a grade, or obtaining course credit. Academic Integrity violations are listed in the Student Conduct Code and the University Handbook, and all offenses listed below, but not limited to the following, are taken seriously.

Plagiarism is claiming the published or unpublished work of someone else as your own. This includes handing in someone else's work; turning in copied or purchased compositions; using paragraphs, sentences, phrases, words, or ideas, including paraphrasing, written by another writer; or using data and/or statistics compiled by someone else as your own without giving appropriate credit to the original writer. Plagiarism also includes using work submitted in another class without permission of the instructor.

Cheating includes, but is not limited to, using "cheat (crib) sheets" or notes during an exam without the approval of the instructor, copying from someone else or looking at another student's answers during an exam, using books or outside sources without permission during an exam or assignment, receiving answers on an exam or assignment from someone else, or using an online source to obtain answers without approval.

Unauthorized Assistance is providing answers or information on an assignment or exam to a fellow student without approval of the instructor.

Unauthorized Collaboration is working with others on an assignment or exam without approval of the instructor and/or copying from someone else without their knowledge.

Both unauthorized assistance and collaboration interfere with the ability of the instructor to evaluate the individual student's performance in their course.

Improper use of technology includes using computers, computer programs, cell phones, calculators, or other software or electronic aids to gain an unfair academic advantage without

permission of the instructor.

Falsification of University Documents includes, but is not limited to, falsifying signatures, such as another student's signature or a faculty/staff signature on a university form (for example, an add/drop form).

Using Artificial Intelligence to complete an assignment or exam developed to assess your knowledge of a particular subject matter, idea, or concept or using it without the permission of the instructor for the purpose of gaining an unfair academic advantage would also be considered a violation.

Procedures for Reporting a Violation of the Graduate Academic Integrity Policy:

Any violation of Academic Integrity should be reported to the Office of the Dean of Students.

When a faculty, staff, or administrator discovers a violation of the academic integrity policy, they shall discuss the violation, including the evidence, with the student(s) involved and allow the student(s) to respond. Any academic penalty, including the student's potential grade penalty for the offense, falls within the purview of the faculty member teaching the course. (See "Recommended Consequences for Academic Dishonesty.") For further guidance, consult with the appropriate Program Director, Department Chair, Academic Dean, or Dean of Students' office.

After the violation has occurred and the penalty imposed, the incident, with all supporting evidence, shall be reported to the Dean of Students Office through the [Academic Integrity Violation Reporting Form](#) to be considered in its totality in order to determine whether the reported incident is part of a larger pattern of misconduct. Disciplinary sanctions for academic dishonesty are processed through the procedures outlined in the [CSU Executive Order 1098, Student Conduct Procedures](#).

Recommended Consequences for Academic Integrity Violations:

Grade penalties are at the sole discretion of the faculty member. This policy assumes that every graduate student is familiar with the expectations of ethical writing and decision-making. Suggested guidelines for academic penalties within the course can range from failure of the assignment/exam/paper/project to failure of the course depending on the severity of the academic integrity violation. Any additional academic penalty, including whether the degree/program can continue, should also align with the professional standards of the specific graduate program.

Additional Potential Sanctions for a Violation of the Graduate Academic Integrity Policy:

In addition to the academic penalty assigned by the faculty member and/or program, disciplinary sanctions imposed by the University may include probation, suspension, permanent expulsion from the university and from the CSU system, or the withholding of a degree.

Disciplinary probation will be noted on the student's formal academic record only for the duration of the probationary period. Disciplinary suspension of more than an academic year and expulsion will be part of the student's permanent academic record. Once a disciplinary sanction is determined, the outcome will be provided to the instructor who reported the incident and remains in the student's electronic disciplinary file in accordance with the [CSU Records/Information Retention and Disposition Schedule](#).

Repeated Violations of the Graduate Academic Integrity Policy:

Any repeated violation of the academic integrity policy will result in more serious academic sanctions. Normally, this will include suspension or expulsion from the university with a note on the student's permanent record. Decisions regarding penalties for repeated violations shall be determined by the Student Conduct Officer after conferring with a committee composed primarily of one tenured faculty member per school with teaching responsibilities in at least one of their respective graduate programs.

Proposed Syllabus Language:

Academic Integrity: Certain forms of conduct violate the university's policy of academic integrity and the [Student Conduct Code](#). Academic dishonesty (cheating) is a broad category of actions that use fraud and deception to improve a grade or obtain course credit. Academic dishonesty is not limited to exams alone but arises whenever students attempt to gain an unearned academic advantage. Plagiarism is claiming the published or unpublished work of someone else as your own. This includes handing in someone else's work; turning in copied or purchased compositions; using paragraphs, sentences, phrases, words, or ideas, including paraphrasing, written by another writer; or using data and/or statistics compiled by someone else as your own without giving appropriate credit to the original writer. Plagiarism also includes using your work submitted in another class without permission of your current instructor. Using Artificial Intelligence to complete an assignment or exam developed to assess your knowledge of a particular subject matter, idea, or concept or using it without the permission of the instructor for the purpose of gaining an unfair academic advantage would also be considered a violation.

When a faculty member discovers a violation of the university's policy of academic integrity, the faculty member will meet with the student(s) involved and is required to notify the Dean of Students' office. The Dean of Students or designee will investigate; confer with the faculty member, student(s), and any witnesses identified; and review all evidence submitted by the faculty member and student(s) to impose an administrative sanction, beyond the academic penalty already placed by the faculty member. Students who perform dishonestly in this course may earn zero credit on the assignment/exam or a failing grade in the course.

Students are expected to uphold the standards of academic integrity, the [CSUB Guiding Principles](#), the student conduct code, and the professional standards of their graduate program.

Catalog Statement:

The principles of truth and integrity are recognized as fundamental to our campus community. CSUB administrators, faculty, staff, and students are expected to honor and uphold these principles and in so doing protect the integrity of all academic work. A degree at CSUB is a product of our campus's commitment to ethical behavior, academic integrity, and academic excellence. When a violation of academic integrity occurs, it diminishes the value of that degree.

Students at CSUB are expected to do all work assigned to them without getting or giving unauthorized assistance. Faculty have the responsibility of planning and supervising academic work so that honest effort is encouraged and positively reinforced.

TOPIC: Consideration for Support for Scholarship and Creative Activities

From: Zachary Zenko <zzenko@csub.edu>

Sent: Monday, October 23, 2023 7:07:31 PM

To: Aaron Hegde <shegade@csub.edu>

Subject: Considering Support for Scholarship and Creative Activities

Dear Chair Hegde,

I hope this message finds you well. I have recently been contacted, independently, by several faculty on this issue in my capacity as Faculty Rights Representative.

I am writing to request that the Academic Senate consider the allocation of support for scholarship and creative activities at our university. Specifically, I would like to address the issue of Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) and how they are allocated for (direct and indirect) instructional activities but not for scholarship, despite the expectation that faculty engage in scholarship and creative activities for retention, tenure, and promotion. WTUs are defined on page 2 of the attached.

This discrepancy in the allocation of WTUs poses a significant challenge to faculty members who are expected to balance their teaching responsibilities with their scholarly and creative pursuits.

Furthermore, if I correctly understand, the support for scholarship and creative activities varies significantly between different schools within the university. While some schools offer release time to faculty to focus on their research and creative work, others do not provide such opportunities. This inconsistency creates disparities in workload and workload equity and places an undue burden on faculty members in schools without access to release time for scholarship.

The impact of this issue is particularly concerning given the diverse demands of scholarship and creative activity across different schools and departments. Faculty members in various fields have distinct needs and expectations when it comes to their scholarly work. Failing to address these differences in workload allocation and support for scholarship can hinder the overall academic productivity of our institution and create an environment where faculty members feel unduly stressed and unsupported.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Zack

ZACHARY ZENKO, PH.D., FACSM, PAPHS

He/Him/His

Associate Professor

Graduate Program Director, [MS in Kinesiology](#)

Department of Kinesiology
(661) 654-2799
Office: EDUC 149
[Zoom Link](#)

Fall 2023 Office Hours

Mondays and Wednesdays: 2:30 pm to 3:45 pm
Thursdays: 1:15 pm to 3:45 pm
By appointment

California State University, Bakersfield

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

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



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

I am a proud member of the California Faculty Association; if you are not already a proud member of CFA, [join here](#).

Attachment: epr_76-36

EP&R 76-36

**Faculty Workload:
Policies and
Procedures**

Faculty Workload: Policies and Procedures

The President of each campus is responsible for the overall conduct of the campus' educational program including the utilization of budgeted instructional faculty positions and the proper assignment of individual faculty workloads.

Variations in campus curricula require variations in the use of instructional faculty positions allocated to each campus. There is, nevertheless, need for a common frame of reference for faculty workload assignments. The intent of the document is to stipulate those policies and procedures which are to be common guides to each President in determining how best to use instructional positions to operate academic programs most effectively.

1. Definition of Faculty Workload *

The normal workload of a full-time faculty member consists of two components:

A. 12 weighted teaching units (WTU) of direct instructional assignments, including classroom and laboratory instruction and instructional supervision (such as student thesis, project or intern supervision) equivalent to 36 hours per week, and

B. 3 WTU equivalences of indirect instructional activity such as student advisement, curriculum development and improvements, and committee assignments (4 to 9 hours per week).

Thus Weighted Teaching Units are a measure of the weekly rate of faculty effort.

* Faculty belong to workweek group 4D7 as defined in the California State University and Colleges Sal Schedule (issued annually).

11. Assignment of Faculty Workloads

A. Legislative Restrictions

Recent budget language requires "...that no instructional faculty positions ... shall be used for administration, department chairmanships, administrative assistance or non-instructional research."

Funds budgeted for instructional positions are therefore prohibited from being used or disencumbered for support of

1. the budgeted function of the Institutional Support Program;
2. administrative functions at the campus, school or division level of organization;
3. department chairperson or comparable positions or duties; or
4. positions or duties related to noninstructional research.

In order that we may be prepared to respond appropriately to any questions raised in management audits, if the President has any doubts regarding the propriety of a particular assignment in terms of the legislative mandate or Trustee policy, he or she may submit the case to the Chancellor's Office for review.

B. System Policy

1. Each campus shall meet its budgeted FTES (full time equivalent students) with its budgeted faculty allocation within the following limits-

150 FTES (campus size 10,000 FTES or less)

200 FTES (campus size over 10,000 FTES)

2. Assignment of individual faculty to direct instructional activities should be made in accordance with the Faculty Workload Formula in Appendix A. This Workload Formula is the basis for

calculating the faculty workload reported in the Academic Planning Data Base.

It is intended that the workload formula should not, in and of itself, serve as a basis for significant deviations from historic campus class size experience; a flexible approach to class size by the campus is encourage where it is consistent with the optimal use of faculty skills and is not detrimental to the quality of instructional programs.

3. In special cases, approved by the President (or a designated Vice President,) a faculty member may be assigned up to three WTU (four WTU for for individuals whose course assignments would each normally generate four WTU) for an exceptionally heavy indirect instructional activity. Such assignments are primarily possible because of the assignment of 15 WTU of direct instructional activity per faculty position used for part-time appointments and the related unavailability of part-time faculty to perform the indirect instructional activity. However, assignments for legitimate non-administrative instructional support functions may also be authorized in addition to that derived from the averaging-in of part-time faculty workloads.

More than four WTU may be assigned to an individual faculty member for indirect instructional activities if in the judgment of the President such an assignment is necessary for the effective conduct of the academic program. Individual exceptions may be granted only through direct application to the President of each campus.

a. Such assignments are no to be used in such a way as to cause widespread of across-the-board deviation from or reduction of normal instructional workloads.

b. Assigned WTU should no be provided to individuals where such an assignment results in a workload in excess of 12 WTU. Exceptions to this provision must be individually approved by the President (or a designated Vice President). All such assignments should be reported.

c, Records of all WTU assignments for indirect instructional activities are subject to review and audit and should include:

1. a description of the specific task(s) to be performed and the number of WTU assigned;
2. formal approval of the assignment; and
3. an after-the-fact evaluation of the assignment.

d. Each campus must prepare an annual report summarizing its use of assigned WTU during the previous fiscal year. Such a report should include a summary of assigned WTU by academic department and purpose of assignment and will serve as the basis for campus administrative review of assigned WTU activities.

e. Unusually heavy responsibility in any of the indirect instructional activities listed in Appendix B may serve as the basis for these workload adjustments which take the form of assigned WTU in lieu of WTU generated through direct instructional activity. All such assignments should be reported in the Academic Planning Data Base.

4. Variations in course credit hours and workload formula factors make it impossible always to schedule faculty members for exactly 12 WTU of direct instruction each term; however, the workloads during the semesters or quarters should be balanced, so that faculty members are responsible for a full workload on an annual average basis. Where made necessary by calendar considerations, and in rare instances only, such adjustments may be made between one fiscal year and the next if a faculty member has not been present for the full preceding academic year.

APPENDIX A

The California State University and Colleges Faculty Workload Formula

Classes meeting 1 hour for 1 unit of credit - - K factor: 1

C-1	Large lecture	Unlimited except by physical facilities or scheduling necessities.
C-2	Lecture-Discussion, including methods	normal limit 40
C-3	Lecture-Composition Lecture-Counseling Law-Case Study	normal limit 30
C-4	Composition Accounting Mathematics Mathematical Statistics, Logic, and Philosophy; Business Math and English Science Math Music (Harmony, Theory, Composition, Counterpoint, Orchestration, Instrumentation, Conducting, Form and Analysis, Sight Singing) Speech: Public and Correction Foreign Language (including literature and culture courses taught in the foreign language) Engineering Lecture Problems Linguistics	normal limit 25
C-5	Undergraduate Seminars Graduate Discussion Honors and Graduate Seminars	normal limit 20 normal limit 15
C-6	Clinical Processes Education (Testing) Nursing Psychology Driver Training in simulator	Lower Division -- normal limit 20 Upper Division -- normal limit 10 Grad. Division -- normal limit 10 (or physical facilities in all divisions)

Classes meeting 2 hours for 1 unit of credit -- K factor: 1.3

C-7 Art, Anthropology, Science activities	normal limit 24 or physical facilities
C-8 Education Workshops (includes methods taught on an activity basis in education and subject areas) Social Science activity Science demonstration	normal limit 30
C-9 Music activity - large group	normal limit 40
C-10 Instrumental or vocal instruction	normal limit 10
C-11 Physical Education and Recreation activity	normal limit 30, (or physical facilities)
C-12 Speech, Drama, and Journalism activities	normal limit 20
C-13 Business and Accounting Labs Geography Foreign Language Home Economics Psychology Library Science Photography Engineering Industrial Arts Agriculture Mathematics Statistics	normal limit, physical facilities or scheduling necessities
C-14 Remedial Instruction: EOP courses only: Mathematics Reading Speech Writing	normal limit 15

Classes meeting 3 hours for 1 unit of credit -- K factor: 1.5

C-15 Laboratories in Art
Foreign Language
English (as a foreign language)
Home Economics
Industrial Arts
Kinesiology
Speech Correction
Cartography
Audio-Visual
Mathematics
Library Science
Police Science)

normal limit: physical Facilities

Classes meeting 3 hours for 1 unit of credit -- K factor 2.0

C-16 Laboratories in Science
Agriculture
Engineering/Meteorology
Psychology
Natural Resources
Photograph

normal limit: physical facilities, generally 24;
allowable range 8-24 based upon learning situation, hazard to
health and equipment, and availability of equipment

C-17 Demonstration-Laboratory, for
clinical practice in off-campus
facilities:

normal limit 8

Classes meeting more than 3 hours for 1 unit of credit -- K factor 6.0

C-18 Coaching major intercollegiate sports
(Not more than four per year for women)
(Not more than four per year for men)
(The sum including coeducational sports no to exceed eight per year)

normal limit 20

Classes meeting more than 3 hours for 1 unit of credit -- K factor 3.0

C-19 Coaching minor intercollegiate sports

normal limit 20

C-20 Production courses or workshops in:

Art

Drama

Journalism

Music

Photography

Radio-TV

Debate:

(resulting in a major public performance, showing or distribution.)

normal limit 20

C-21 Music -- major performance groups:

Symphony orchestra

College band

College chorus

normal limit 40

S -- Allowance for supervisory staff:

(Only for courses providing individual supervision)

Undergraduate level:

S-25 Supervision of directed teaching
and public school nursing

ratio: 1:25

S-36 Supervision of field work
Driver Training in car off campus
Work Study
Project Supervision

ratio: 1:36

S-48 Music - Studio instruction (majors only)

ratio: 1:48

Graduate level:

S-25 Supervision of directed teaching
and public school nursing
Supervision of field work
Work study
Theses and projects

ratio: 1:25

S-12 * MSW Field Courses

ratio 1:12

APPENDIX B

Activities for which Weighted Teaching Units may be assigned.

This is the code used for reporting assigned WTU in the Academic Planning Data Base

11. Excess Enrollments

- a. For classes with census date enrollment of between 75 and 120 exceptional workload, a graduate assistant or student assistant may be allocated.
- b. For classes with census date enrollment of over 120, a graduate assistant, a student assistant, or and additional 3 WTU may be assigned.

Assignment of graduate assistants is a preferable way of handling such large class loads, but it is recognized that qualified graduate assistants are not always available.

In no case shall a faculty member be granted assigned WTU for more than one class with excess enrollments.

12. New Preparations

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for preparation of courses never before taught by that particular faculty member, if courses actually taught include two or more such new preparations.

14. Course or Supervision Overload

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU equal to course of supervision overload earned in a prior fiscal year provided that calendar considerations so necessitate and the faculty member has not been present for the full preceding academic year.

18. Instructional Support for Graduate Students

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for special graduate student testing duties, in particular for conducting comprehensive examinations for master's degree candidates and examinations in fulfillment of foreign language requirements.

2 1. Special Instructional Programs

- a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for participation in a team teaching effort. The total assigned and earned WTU associated with a team-taught course may not exceed the WTU generated by the course multiplied by the number of faculty members teaching the course. In addition, no individual faculty member may be given more WTU, both earned and assigned than the course generates.
- b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for program and tape production for instructional television.
- c. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for liaison duties among multiple sections of the same course.
- d. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for the ad-ministration and evaluation of tests for credit by examination.

22. Instructional Experimentation, Innovation, or Instructionally Related Research

- a. A faculty member may be given assigned time for development and implementation of experimental programs involving:
 1. Instructional television
 2. Computer assisted instruction
 3. Other innovations in instruction
- b. A faculty member may be given assigned time for documented research evaluations which are demonstrably related to the instructional functions and programs of the college.

23. Instruction Related Services

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for his services related to college clinics, study skill centers, farms, art galleries, and other campus institutions and facilities which are ancillary to the instructional program.

31 Advising Responsibilities

a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for carrying an excessive advising load due to a relatively high proportion of part-time faculty in his department.

b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for carrying a greater than normal share of departmental or school advising responsibilities.

c. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for services as departmental graduate advisor.

32. Instruction-Related Committee Assignments

a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for participation over and above normal levels in such areas as curriculum, personnel, budget, library, audiovisual, and selection committees at the department, school or college level.

b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for membership in or liaison to special committees whose activities have significant bearing on the instructional programs of the college, or the CSUC system at large.

33. Curricular Planning or Studies

a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for special individual or committee-related curriculum planning, development and redevelopment activities.

b. A faculty member may be give assigned WTU for development of special tests for credit by examination.

34. Accreditation Responsibilities

A faculty member may be give assigned WTU for accreditation responsibilities.

3 5. Instruction-Related Facilities Planning

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for duties related to planning of instructional facilities.

Memorandum of Understanding

The California State University and the California Faculty Association agree that in the calculation of faculty workload, the following definitions shall be used in describing instruction involving one-on-one contact between faculty and student.

S-Factor Definitions

S-Factor courses are assigned when the mode of instruction involves direct one-on-one contact between faculty and student. The average amount of faculty time per student referenced in the definitions includes faculty preparation, evaluation, travel, and liaison with agencies when necessary.

S-1. This category maybe used for any supervision that requires of the instructor * an average of three-quarters of one hour per week of activity with each individual supervised student. The faculty member would receive one-third WTU for each student.

S-2. This category may be used for any supervision that requires of the instructor an average of one hour per week of activity with each individual supervised student. The faculty member would receive one-third WTU for each student.

S-3. This category is restricted to supervision as a primary technique of instruction in requiring of the instructor an intensity of supervision resulting in an average of on and one-half hours per week with each supervised student or in liaison with school or agency personnel. The faculty member would receive one-half WTU for each student.

S-4. This category is restricted to supervision as a primary technique of instruction in which the instructor assumes direct responsibility for the activities of the student, and that requires of the instructor an intensity of supervision resulting in an average of two hours per week with each supervised student or in liaison with agency personnel. The faculty member would receive two-thirds WTU for each student.

S-5. This category is restricted to supervision as a primary technique of instruction in which the instructor assumes direct responsibility for the activities of the student, and that requires of the instructor an intensity of supervision resulting in an average of three hours per week with each supervised student or in liaison with agency personnel. The faculty member would receive one WTU for each student.

Supervision Courses --Amend. to EP&R 76-36

You are aware that the current contract between the CSU and the California Faculty Association (CFA) provides for a joint CSU/CFA Workload Committee to, inter alia, review and recommend revisions and clarifications to existing workload formulae. This committee has reviewed the existing supervision (S factor) course classification and recommended that revised definitions which are discipline independent be provided for existing supervision categories, and that a new category S-4 (equivalent to S-18 in the previous nomenclature) be created. These recommendations have been reviewed by the Management Advisory Group and, subsequently, by all campus presidents. A memorandum of understanding involving these revisions has been signed by the CSU and CFA (see attachment).

These new supervision course classifications are available for use by the campuses beginning with the Summer 1992 term. The new definitions and numbers make no changes in workload for the categories. They do, as indicated above, add a new category (S-4) for which eighteen supervised students constitutes a full workload. The new definitions attempt to clarify the connection between the workload measured in WTU and the amount of time spent with each student in the course of the supervised activity. Please note that the existing supervision course categories have been renumbered as S-1 through S-5 (corresponding to S-48, S-36, S-25, S-18, and S-12, respectively).

The new category and the revised numbers should be used for faculty workload reporting beginning with Summer quarter, 1992.

From: [Aaron Hegde](#)
To: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: FW: Academic Senate Considerations of SOCI process and timelines
Date: Monday, November 20, 2023 1:43:29 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-lqf0ffdq.png](#)

DR. S. AARON HEGDE, PHD

Chair, Academic Senate
Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
Executive Director, Grimm Family Center for AGBS

California State University, Bakersfield

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

shegde@csub.edu



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

From: Zachary Zenko <zzenko@csub.edu>
Date: Thursday, November 16, 2023 at 9:29 AM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>, Maureen Rush <mrush@csub.edu>
Subject: Academic Senate Considerations of SOCI process and timelines

Dear Chairs Hegde and Rush,

I am emailing you with a topic to consider for referral.

As we engage in ongoing conversations regarding the efficacy and fairness of student evaluations, I would like to propose some considerations.

The subject of student evaluations of courses bears inherent biases that have been well-documented in numerous studies. These biases challenge the reliability and fairness of such evaluations in accurately assessing teaching effectiveness.

I mentioned in the previous senate meeting that the typical time for paper-based SOCIs is one week, and in fact one class period. In contrast, the online SOCIs have more than

one month for data collection. This is, of course, extremely different and inequitable. I also worry that this causes additional bias.

Allowing a month for evaluations introduces numerous variables that could significantly influence the feedback received, including final grades on major projects or exams, potentially skewing the results. Moreover, the nearly undeniable correlation between grades and student evaluation scores emphasizes the need to understand this relationship more thoroughly to prevent faculty members from being unfairly penalized for maintaining academic rigor (although I like to believe that one can be rigorous and achieve excellent SOCIs).

Specifically, I suggest considering:

1. Shortening the time frame for students to submit evaluations to minimize the impact of external factors such as final grades on their feedback. If paper-based SOCIs are available to students for one class meeting, then I think it is reasonable that online SOCIs are available for one or two weeks (not a month).
2. Encouraging the provision of summary correlations between grades and student evaluation scores to aid in distinguishing between rigor and ease within courses - or at least recognize this as a confounding variable. To facilitate this, students would need to submit their student IDs with their evaluation. Same for the next suggestion.
3. Developing a system to identify and flag biased, discriminatory, or prejudiced responses within evaluations and exploring the feasibility of automatically excluding students with multiple occurrences of such responses across multiple courses from the summary scores. I believe this has already been implemented in other institutions. Currently, the online SOCIs do not allow the linkage between quantitative scores and qualitative comments. If a student makes a discriminatory comment, then their quantitative evaluation cannot be automatically or manually addressed.

In my opinion, the Academic Senate must ensure the fairness and reliability of our student evaluation process. This approach aligns with our commitment to teaching excellence and the integrity of our educational standards.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this proposal.

Warm regards,

ZACHARY ZENKO, PH.D., FACSM, PAPHS

He/Him/His

Associate Professor

Graduate Program Director, [MS in Kinesiology](#)

Department of Kinesiology

(661) 654-2799

Office: EDUC 149

[Zoom Link](#)

Fall 2023 Office Hours

Mondays and Wednesdays: 2:30 pm to 3:45 pm

Thursdays: 1:15 pm to 3:45 pm

By appointment

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 22

Bakersfield, CA 93311

Essentials of Exercise and Sport Psychology: An Open Access Textbook



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

I am a proud member of the California Faculty Association; if you are not already a proud member of CFA, [join here](#).

Topic: GE Breadth and Task force Composition

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



Commencement – Fall 2023

RES 232414

EC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to the President those appropriate degrees be conferred to students satisfying the requirements of their programs of study.

RATIONALE: Faculty are responsible for designing curriculum, establishing program and degree requirements, teaching classes, advising and mentoring students, and ensuring standards are met. Let us join together as a university community in celebrating the accomplishments of these graduates and candidates for graduation.

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP Academic Affairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:
Sent to the President:
President Approved:



Doctor of Nursing Practice

RES 232410

AAC and BPC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approve the proposed Doctor of Nursing Practice.

RATIONALE: Elevation of the MSN to a DNP is an emerging national standard for nurse practitioners. The proposed degree addresses an important community need and every level of review has found it to be sound academically. The proposed degree will have the committed resources that will be adequate for its future program operations.

Attachment:

CSUB DNP Program Proposal

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
VP Student Affairs
AVP Faculty Affairs
AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
School Deans
Dean of Libraries
Dean of Antelope Valley
Dean of Extended University and Global Outreach
Department Chairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Academic Senate

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy. • 22 EDUC • Bakersfield, CA 93311



Academic Master Plan 2024-25 through 2033-34

RES 232411

AAC and BPC

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate approve the one-year extension request for the BA in Latina/o/x and Chicana/o/x Studies to stay on the Academic Master Plan.
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate approve the one-year extension request for the MS in Applied Analytics to stay on the Academic Master Plan.
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate approve the addition on the MA in Mass Communication to the Academic Master Plan.
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate approve the attached Academic Master Plan.
- RATIONALE:** Major changes include the addition of the MA in Mass Communication, the removal of one discontinued program, the removal of programs that have exceeded the implementation time limit, name changes for some programs, the addition of the most recently completed program review date, and updates the dates for the next scheduled program review for several programs.

Attachments:

CSU Bakersfield AMP 2024-25 through 2033-34 clean
CSU Bakersfield AMP 2024-25 through 2033-34 tracked
Ethnic Studies LS-CS Degree Proposal Extension Request
MS Analytics Extension Request complete
Projected Degree Proposal- M.A. in Mass Communication-Signed

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
VP Student Affairs
AVP Faculty Affairs
AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
School Deans

Academic Senate

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy. • 22 EDUC • Bakersfield, CA 93311

Dean of Libraries
Dean of Antelope Valley
Dean of Extended University and Global Outreach
Department Chairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:
Sent to the President:
President Approved:



Evaluation of Academic Administrators

RES 232412

FAC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend revisions to the University Handbook language regarding the initiation of the review process for Administrators and the timeline for review. (Deletions in ~~striketrough~~, additions in **bold underline**.)

RATIONALE: Each administrator must undergo review at three-year intervals, and it is critical to schedule this review process in a timely manner. The proposed changes help clarify who initiates these reviews, when the review committee is formed, and when the review process begins and ends.

311.1 General Guidelines (old)

Each academic administrator shall be evaluated according to these procedures at three year intervals. The first review should be initiated early in fall semester after their initial hire. 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)

311.1 General Guidelines (new w/revisions)

Each academic administrator shall be evaluated according to these procedures at three-year intervals. The President will initiate the review process for the Provost, and the Provost's office will initiate the review process for all academic administrators. In August of each academic year, the Provost's office will send to the Executive Committee of the Senate a schedule of which administrators will undergo review in the current academic year and the next academic year. The President **or Provost** may, if they believe it is appropriate, call for an evaluation of an individual before a scheduled evaluation.

The Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) is formed in the Spring of the administrator's second year, and the review process begins in the Fall of the third year. The supervisor for each administrator undergoing is responsible for providing the criteria for evaluation to the administrator and to the AARC.

311.2 Academic Administrators (revised)

The following positions shall be subject to this policy:

- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA)
- AVP Academic Programs/Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies
- **AVP Enrollment Management**
- AVP Faculty Affairs
- AVP Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs (GRaSP)
- **AVP Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA)**
- Dean, School of Arts and Humanities
- Dean, School of Business and Public Administration
- Dean, School of Natural Sciences, Mathematics & Engineering
- Dean, School of Social Sciences and Education
- Dean, University Library
- Dean, Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO) *(revised 07-10-17)*
- Dean, California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley *(Revised Name Change 6-28-18)*
(Section Revised 12-01-16, XX-XX-23)

311.3 Review Committee Membership

For review of the P&VPAA, AVP Academic Programs/Dean of Undergraduate Studies, **AVP Enrollment Management**, **AVP Faculty Affairs**, AVP GRaSP, **AVP IRPA**, and Dean of EEGO, the review committee shall be as follows:

- A. The faculty of each school shall elect one tenured faculty;
- B. The President or the President's designee **Provost** shall select a member of the Academic Affairs Council; and *(Revised 12-01-16)*
- C. The President or the President's designee **Provost** shall choose a sixth member of the committee.

For review of the Dean of Arts and Humanities, Dean of Business and Public Administration, Dean of Natural Sciences, Mathematics & Engineering, Dean of Social Sciences and Education, Dean of University Library, and Dean of the CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley, *(Revised Name Change 06-28-18)* the review committee shall consist of five members. *(Revised 12-01-16)*

- A. The faculty of the school dean being reviewed, or the librarians in the case of the Dean of University Library, shall elect three (3) tenured faculty members or librarians. In the case of the Antelope Valley Campus Dean, an election shall be held to select three (3) representatives from the faculty, staff, and librarians who are at the Dean of the Antelope Valley Campus. *(Revised 12-01-16)*
- B. The P&VPAA shall select a school dean; and
- C. The P&VPAA shall choose the fifth member of the committee.

Any prospective committee member with an active grievance (or other legal proceeding) against the specific Administrator under review at the time of review is not eligible for election or selection and cannot serve on the review committee.

The administrator under review may request that the supervisor of the review dissolve the review committee if one of its members is ineligible due to an active grievance (or other legal proceeding) against them, and the Senate will initiate a new election. *(Added June 28, 2018)*

311.4 Review Procedures

The procedures for review committees of academic officers are as follows:

A. The President and P&VPAA shall maintain a schedule showing the year in which the regular review of each administrative officer is due, and shall complete the committee selection and initiate the review process prior to the end of the academic year preceding the actual academic year the review takes place. A schedule for an evaluation should then be constructed with ~~March 1~~ **April 1** as the target date for completion of the process. *(Revised 12-01-16)*

B. At the time of initial appointment and immediately following each review, the supervisor will review with the administrator being evaluated the areas (i.e., academic leadership, program development, management, diversity initiatives, etc.) in which his or her performance will be assessed. In all cases, the areas to be evaluated will include:

- 1) The individual's effectiveness in commanding respect as an academic administrator and, if appropriate, as a scholar;
- 2) The individual's effectiveness in creating an educational environment conducive to excellence in teaching, scholarship, and mutual respect;
- 3) The individual's effectiveness in fulfilling their assigned role in achieving the mission and goals of CSUB.

In setting up the review process, the supervisor will solicit advice from the administrator under review as to any additional areas that should be included in the evaluation and what constituencies should be sampled. In all cases, the appropriate faculty, librarians and staff shall be given the opportunity to participate in the evaluation. The supervisor will provide the review committee information regarding the additional areas where the administrator's performance is to be assessed and recommend constituencies to be sampled. The areas of assessment should not be changed once the supervisor has reviewed them with the administrator being evaluated unless the administrator and supervisor agree. Throughout the review process, all parties shall bear in mind that the purpose of the administrator review is developmental as well as evaluative, in keeping with the essential mission of the University.

C. The review committee shall request from the administrator under review a concise self-study. The self-study will focus on areas to be evaluated, major accomplishments, problems and issues related to the responsibilities of the position (e.g. job description), future goals and plans, and personal professional development and accomplishments. This self-study shall be completed and submitted to the review committee and the supervisor.

D. The review committee shall survey various performance appraisal systems to determine the appropriate guidelines and instruments for the evaluation process. The evaluation shall cover a three-year period; therefore, the guidelines and process should be constructed to reflect this time frame. The committee, in consultation with the supervisor and the person being reviewed, shall develop the specific format for the appraisal. (Revised 12-01-16)

E. In the case of evaluation of School Associate Deans, during the third year, all School Associate Deans, including those in their final year of service as School Associate Dean and those who are retiring, shall be reviewed by the School faculty. The Dean shall meet with the faculty to discuss how they wish to proceed with the review. In preparation for the review, School Associate Deans, may, at their own initiative, submit to the School faculty and the Dean a brief self-evaluation of their performance for the period under review. In addition, the appropriate Dean shall offer the opportunity to all faculty of the School to give individual, confidential advice, orally, or in writing. This review shall assess the School Associate Dean's effectiveness based on the criteria established at the time of appointment. The review must occur during the fall semester of the third year. The written review of the School Associate Dean should be submitted to the School Dean by April first (1st) of that year. The Dean and the School Associate Dean shall then meet to discuss the report by April 15th.

(Added 06-06-17)

F. The P&VPAA, in consultation with the review committee and administrator to be evaluated, shall determine the individuals and/or groups to be consulted. In all cases, the faculty concerned shall be given the opportunity to participate in the evaluation. Individuals participating in the evaluation of administrators shall enclose their written comments in a sealed envelope, signed across the seal. The enclosed comments will then be coded to ensure the person's confidentiality in the review process. Examination of the documents by the administrator under review may occur in the event of a protested personnel action. Comments will be collected and the confidential coding maintained in the office of the P&VPAA.

G. The review committee shall consolidate all evaluations and forward the final report, which will include the administrator's self-study, to the appropriate supervisor and the administrator being evaluated. In most cases, this shall be the P&VPAA who will review the evaluation, self-study, and any written response, discuss these with the administrator under review, and forward the package with appropriate comments/recommendations to the President with a copy to the administrator under review **by April 15th**. In cases where there is a supervisory level between the administrator under review and the P&VPAA, the evaluation shall pass through that level for comments and go forward to the P&VPAA. The supervisor's written comments and recommendations should include components related to future goals and plans in addition to the expected review and comments on the evaluation.

In the case of the P&VPAA, the same process as outlined above will be followed except that the review committee's report shall be forwarded directly to the President. In all cases the final review level will be the President. The President or the administrator under review may elect to have a meeting about the

report. In this case, the President, P&VPAA, and the administrator under review will meet before releasing a comprehensive, explanatory report to the campus **by May 1st**.

In the event the administrator under review does not agree with any aspect of the evaluation, a written commentary may be submitted and it shall accompany the report. The administrator under review shall have ten working days after receiving a copy of the final evaluation to prepare his/her reaction and commentary. The administrator under review shall have complete access to all evaluation materials, with confidentiality of all reviewers being preserved. In the event of a protested personnel action, the coded comments may be assessed as required by current state law. In this event, persons who had submitted written comments will be notified of the action. Such individuals are protected from any form of reprisal, not only by the expectation of high ethical behavior from all University personnel, but by Executive Order No. 929 and California Government Code Section 8547.12.

H. Provisions governing campus personnel files such as confidentiality, disclosure, and rebuttal shall apply to the evaluation process. The consolidated report and all data collected for this report will become a part of the personnel file and will reside in the office of the P&VPAA.

Distribution List:

- President
- Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
- VP Student Affairs
- AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
- AVP Enrollment Management
- AVP Faculty Affairs
- AVP GRaSP
- AVP IRPA
- School Deans
- Dean of Libraries
- Dean of Antelope Valley
- Dean of EEGO
- Department Chairs
- General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved: