Academic Senate Meeting – Fall 2023

Agenda

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

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

Zoom Link: https://csub.zoom.us/j/82118036177?pwd=SjZvdWd6ei9TaVRMaGlPU1N5bUtWdz09

A. Call to Order
B. Approval of Minutes (tabled)
   a. September 28, 2023
C. Announcements and Information
   a. President's Report – L. Zelezny (**Time Certain: 10:10 AM**).
   b. Respondus Software – J. Paschal and A. Slabey **(Time Certain: 10:20 AM**).
   c. 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 *(handout)*
      iv. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS) – M. Taylor (AS&SS Vice-Chair) *(handout)*
      v. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) – A. Grombly (BPC Vice-chair) *(handout)*
      vi. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) - M. Rush *(handout)*
      vii. Staff Report- J. Cornelison
F. Resolutions **(Time Certain: 10:45 AM)**
   a. Consent Agenda
   b. New Business
      i. RES 232404 Posthumous Degree Policy – AAC *(handout)*
      ii. RES 232405 Standing Committee- Bylaws Change – FAC *(handout)*

   iii. RES 232406 RTP and PTR Committees- Handbook Change – FAC *(handout)*
   iv. RES 232407 Pilot of Interfolio – FAC and EC *(handout)*
  c. Old Business
G. Open Forum **(Time Certain: 11:15 AM)**
H. Faculty Recognition **(Time Certain: 11:25 AM)**
I. Adjournment

Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)
Report to the Academic Senate

Thursday, October 5th, 2023

AAC discussed referral 2023-2024 #18 – Posthumous Degree Policy which we worked on at our previous meeting. Since our last meeting, AAC members consulted with various groups on campus and no opposition to the current draft was expressed. We finalized the policy and drafted a resolution to forward to the Senate.

We received the DNP Program Proposal from Heidi He but have not received a formal referral yet (the proposal has been approved by the NSME Curriculum Committee and is awaiting approval from Dr. Debra Jackson before it is forwarded to AAC). Since this is a time sensitive issue (needs to get in the 2024-25 Catalog so students can start applying in Fall 2024 to start in Fall 2025) and the proposal is extensive, we began discussing the proposal. The nursing department currently has an MSN/FNP program which they are proposing to place on moratorium due to a change in national standards for nurse practitioners (NPs). NPs will be required to be trained at the doctoral level in 2025, so the DNP program will replace the existing MSN/FNP program. Nursing is also proposing an MSN-to-DNP program for NPs that have already completed the MSN, and a certificate program for DNPs that want to become certified nurse educators (i.e., faculty).

AAC also briefly discussed a couple other pending referrals (BPA Advising Name Center Change and Proposal for the ACS Biochemistry Degree).

Report to Academic Senate for AS&SS

October 5, 2023

Dr. Melanie Taylor (Vice-Chair for AS&SS) ran the meeting in the absence of Dr. Correa (away for a training workshop). AS&SS discussed the Academic Integrity Pledge (Referral #37) with invited guest Dr. Rebecca Penrose. Prof. Matt McCoy presented an update on the draft of the survey to faculty and the survey to students for the testing center referral. The ATI Appendix Changes (Referral #41) was discussed, and the committee decided to wait for feedback from the ATI committee before moving forward with a resolution.

California State University Bakersfield

AY2023-2024 Budget and Planning Committee Report

Thursday, October 5, 2023
10:00-11:30 AM
BDC 134A-Conference Room

BPC committee met on October 5 and focused on the following issues:

1. N. Hayes went through the draft slides for the Fall 2023 Campus Budget Open Forum on October 16, 11am to 12pm as well as the 2022-2023 budgetbook with the committee for inputs and advice. Faculty would receive the forum announcement as well as the link that can be used to submit their questions before the forum. ASI was suggested to hold a student meeting to review the forum materials.
2. 2023-2024 Referral 04 – Time Blocks and Space Utilization. D. Wu met Tommy Holiwell, Director of Enrollment Management recently. However, the data request was not finished yet. The BPC will share the current proposal with the DCLC group as well as Academic School Deans for their inputs recently.

Faculty Affairs Committee
Thursday, October 5, 2023
10:00 –11:30 AM

1. 2023-24 Referral #10: Standing Committee — Bylaws Change Section IV – draft resolution to the Senate attached.
2. 2023-24 Referral #12: Three-Year Lecturers and PTR Committee - **Handbook Change** – draft PTR portion attached.
3. 2023-24 Referral #17: Option to Retreat Policy – Handbook Change?

FAC drafted two resolutions (on agenda today) and decided to take up referral 17 next time. Also working on second part of referral 12 – lecturer issue.

2023-2024 Academic Senate Log

Date	Referral	Status	Committee/s Charged	Action	Resolution	Handbook/Bylaws	Approved by S	Sent to Presi	Approved by P
10/19/2021 09/6/2023	2023-2024 #01 Academic Testing Center Exploratory Sub-Committee		AS&SS	Reference RES 202123. Form sub-committee & include AVP EM, Director Testing Center, ASI & provide path; *Carry over referral 2021-2022 #28 Academic Testing Center Exploratory Sub-Committee*					
3/1/2022 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #02 Digitizing the Performance Review Process	**RES 232407 IP**	FAC	Access, process, CFA & HR perspective, training of chairs & deans. FAC recommends that discussion be postponed until new software is selected. *Carry over referral 2021-2022 #40 Digitizing the Performance Review Process* **Update:** *Memo/ Addendum sent with Faculty Performance Software Review Committee report*	RES 232407 Pilot of Interfolio *(1st reading 10/12/2023)*				
3/1/2022 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #03 Sixth-year Lecturer Review – Handbook Change		FAC	Purpose and outcome(s) of the Sixth-year Lecturer Review, etc. Work has begun on major topic. *Notes drafted; Carry over referral 2021-2022 #41 Sixth-year Lecturer Review – Handbook Change*		Handbook;			
6/1/2022 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #04 Time Blocks and Space Utilization		BPC	The need to reconsider Time Blocks for classes. *Memo received 05/03/2023; carry over referral 2022-2023 #01 Time Blocks and Space Utilization*					
6/1/2022 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #05 Academic Integrity Campaign- Ombudsperson and Committee on Professional	*Withdrawn*	AAC, AS&SS, BPC, FAC	Whether one person serving as Faculty Ombudsperson is enough; funding to support position; ways the committee Professional Responsibility works with the Faculty Ombudsperson; *carry over referral 2022-2023 #02 Academic Integrity Campaign-Ombudsperson and Committee on Professional Responsibility*					
1/9/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #06 ATI Instructional Materials - Handbook Change Appendix K		AS&SS	New goals and metrics from the CO *Carry over referral 2022-2023 #19 ATI Instructional Materials - Handbook Appendix K*		Handbook; Appendix K			
2/21/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #07 Concentration vs. Emphasis to Describe Size of Program	**Complete**	AAC	Use of the terms "Concentration" and "Emphasis" and whether CSUB is using appropriate term(s) in reporting. *Carry over referral 2022-2023 #21 Concentration vs. Emphasis to Describe Size of Program*	**RES 232403** Definitions of Undergraduate Concentrations and Emphases	No	9/28/2023	10/6/2023	10/9/2023
2/21/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #08 GECCo Review and Appointment		FAC	Whether GECCo draws the review of Faculty Director etc. and whether the position is open for another three-year appointment. *Carry over referral 2022-2023 #22 GECCo Review and Appointment*					
3/1/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #09 Effect of Sabbatical on Assigned Time		FAC	Where a person serving on a committee should step down. What is effect on assigned time & release time. FAC recommends consulting with URC and UPRC to see if a policy is preferred.					
3/7/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #10 Standing Committee Bylaws Change Section IV	**RES 232405 IP**	AAC, AS&SS, BPC, FAC	Whether statements of interest in Chair required, two-year experience required, term limits, and qualifications. *Recommendations drafted; carry over referral 2022-2023 #27 Standing Committee Bylaws Change Section IV*	RES 232405 Standing Committee *(1st reading 10/12/2023)*	Bylaws change			
3/7/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #11 Academic Administrators Search & Screening -Handbook Change		BPC	Whether to add use of search firms, add language regarding exceptions, and add an option for university to retreat. *Carry over referral 2022-2023 #31 Academic Administrators Search & Screening -Handbook Change*		Handbook;			
3/7/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #12 Three-Year Lecturers and PTR Committee – Handbook Change	**RES 232406 IP**	FAC	Language regarding 3rd-Yr Lecturers and post-tenure faculty, PTR Committee Structure, and outside department procedures. *Carry over referral 2022-2023 #32 Three-Year Lecturers and PTR Committee – Handbook Change*	RES 232406 RTP and PTR Committees *(1st reading 10/10/2023)*	Handbook;			
3/14/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #13 Advisor and Student Initiated Course Add/Drops in Adobe Sign		AS&SS	Whether there is a need for guidance or policy when student initiates form, when there is compound input from faculty, etc. *Recommendations drafted; carry over referral 2022-2023 #34 Advisor and Student Initiated Course Add/Drops in Adobe Sign*					
3/14/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #14 Skipping Course Waitlist		AS&SS	Whether it's possible to skip queue, roll students off waitlist, policy change, etc. *Carry over referral 2022-2023 #35 Skipping Course Waitlist*					
3/14/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #15 Academic Integrity Pledge		AS&SS	Creating an Academic Integrity Pledge to be included in matriculation, place in student file, etc. *Recommendations drafted; carry over referral 2022-2023 #37 Academic Integrity Pledge*					
3/21/2023 9/6/2023	2023-2024 #16 Statement on Open Educational Resources (OER)	**RES 232401 IP**	AS&SS	Support and obligation to reduce costs for students, ways to incorporate OER, Bookstore terminology change. *Carry over referral 2022-2023 #41 Statement on Open Educational Resources (OER).*	**RES 232401** Statement on Reducing Educational Material Costs at CSUB *(1st Reading 9/6/2023)*				
9/6/2023	2023-2024 #17 Option to Retreat Policy		FAC	Review the proposed CSUB policy regarding administrator's options to retreat.					
9/6/2023	2023-2024 #18 Posthumous Degree Policy	**RES 232404 IP**	AAC	Review the proposed policy regarding the considering and granting an Posthumous Degree.	**RES 232404** Posthumous Degree Policy *(1st Reading 10/12/23)*				
9/6/2023	-	**RES 232401 IP**	EC	*Carry over from 2022-2023*	**RES 232401** Statement on Campus Modality *(1st Reading 9/6/2023)*				
10/3/2023	2023-2024 #19 HSIRB and IACUC Policy Updates- Handbook Change		FAC	Review the proposed policy and procedure updates for HSIRB and IACUC for proposed handbook changes.		Handbook; 303.9.2			
	2023-2024 #20 BPA Advising Center Name Change	**HOLD**	BPC and AAC	Review the request for the BPA Advising Center Name Change **Update:** *Awating memo from BPA Dean with offical request- 10/2/2023.*					
10/2/2023	2023-2024 #21 Proposal for emphasis in Biochemistry B.S.		AAC	Whether to approve the proposal for an emphaisis in Biochemistry B.S. **Update:** *Per D. Solano, department will be sending revised proposal reflecting RES232403 pending review and approval from NSME curicculum committee- 10/03/2023.*					
	2023-2024 #22 Summer SOCI Issues	**HOLD**	BPC	SOCI Summer Issue **Update:** *Addressed in Calendar Committee (per D. Wu- EC 9/26/2023). Awaiting memo from Calendar Committee.*					

Posthumous Degree Policy
RES 232404

AAC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt the "Posthumous Degrees" policy.

RATIONALE: Currently there is no policy for the granting of posthumous degrees, resulting in varying standards across schools, departments, and programs. The "Posthumous Degrees" policy provides clear and consistent standards for granting such honors.

Attachments:
   "Posthumous Degrees" policy

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:

Policy Title: Posthumous Degrees

Policy Number: TBD

Policy Status: [Draft]

<u>**Affected Units**</u>
Cabinet
Deans
Academic Departments and Programs

<u>**Policy Statement Text**</u>
Students who, at the time of their death, had completed a "substantial portion" of the requirements for graduation may be awarded a posthumous degree by the President upon recommendation of the faculty.

<u>**Procedures for Considering and Granting the Posthumous Degree**</u>

Baccalaureate Degrees:

The President may, upon recommendation of the faculty, confer a posthumous bachelor's degree to a student who, at the time of death, had completed a "substantial portion" of the requirements for graduation. The request for consideration must come from the dean or associate dean of the student's major school upon the recommendation of the faculty of the student's major program. A "substantial portion" means that at the time of death, the student:

1.   was actively matriculated or eligible to be matriculated at the California State University, Bakersfield;
2.   was within 30 units of completing their degree;
3.   had satisfactorily completed at least 20 semester units of coursework at the University;

4. had a grade-point average of 2.0 or higher for all units used in calculating the student's grade-point average, including those grades received at the University and grades accepted by California State University from other institutions.

Master's and Doctoral Degrees

The President may, upon recommendation of the faculty, confer a posthumous master's or doctoral degree to a student who, at the time of death, had completed a "substantial portion" of the requirements for graduation. The request for consideration must come from the dean or associate dean of the student's major school upon the recommendation of the faculty of the student's graduate program coordinator and department chair. A "substantial portion" means that at the time of death, the student:

1. was actively matriculated or eligible to be matriculated at the California State University, Bakersfield;
2. had completed at least 75% of the required units for the formal program;
3. had a grade-point average of 3.0 or higher in all courses attempted to satisfy requirements for the degree.

Normal processing of requests:

In the case of a student's death, the request for consideration of the posthumous degree can be made by the faculty of the student's program or the family of the student.

Requests are routed through the Office of Academic Programs to the Associate Dean, Department Chair, and, if applicable, Graduate Program Coordinator of the student's program.

Once approved by the School and Department faculty and administration, the Office of Academic Programs notifies the President's Office of the approval. If the President also approves the awarding of the degree, the Office of Academic Programs notifies Enrollment Management and requests the awarding of the degree.

Exceptional Circumstances

The President may, upon consideration of the recommendation of the school and departmental leadership, and the Provost, confer a posthumous degree regardless of completion of the above requirements.

Presentation of the Degree

At the President's discretion, the posthumous bachelor's, master's or doctoral degree will be awarded either at a private ceremony or at the appropriate commencement exercise.

Honors at Graduation

Students receiving a posthumous bachelor's degree under this policy will be awarded honors at graduation for which their academic performance qualifies.

Consultations
Cabinet
Academic Senate
Provost's Council

Policy Foundations and References
Title 5

Approved Date: TBD

Effective Date: TBD

Date Submitted to Policy Portal: TBD

Standing Committee – Bylaws Change

RES 232405

FAC

RESOLVED: That the Bylaws reflect the election process for Standing Committee Chairs. (Deletions in ~~strikethrough~~ and additions in **bold underline**, as edited below.)

SECTION IV: STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Regulations Governing Standing Committees

1. Standing Committee Chairs shall be elected by the Academic Senate from its membership at the Organizational Senate meeting at the end of Spring semester. **A call for nominations for Standing Committee Chair positions should be posted two weeks prior to the Organizational meeting. Eligible members include those who have served at least one year on the Academic Senate and have served at least one year on the Standing Committee for which the Chair position is sought. Each nominee is expected to attend the Organizational meeting and speak to their interest and qualifications.**

RATIONALE: The current process by which a Senator is nominated for a Standing Committee Chair does not give enough time for nominations to be considered, and then time for adequate consideration of the candidates prior to a vote of the Senate. The goal is to make the process transparent and open, giving the Senate time to consider a meaningful vote during the Organizational Senate meeting in Spring. The underlined addition also makes clear who is eligible for nomination as Chair of a Standing Committee.

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:

RTP and PTR Committees - Handbook Change

RES 232406

FAC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend revisions to the University Handbook language regarding the composition of RTP and PTR committees (deletions in ~~strikethrough~~, additions in **bold underline**) as specified below.

305.6.1 Election and Composition of the Unit RTP Committee

The academic deans will be responsible for ensuring that departments are in compliance with this section. To ensure that the unit committee is appropriately constituted, the department will submit to the dean, at least three weeks before the beginning of a review cycle, a list of members of the Unit RTP Committee.

If a unit committee is inappropriately constituted, the review(s) performed by that committee is (are) null and void. The review level that discovers the violation will notify the department that it must reconstitute the Unit RTP Committee so that it can reevaluate the file(s).

a. The probationary and tenured faculty of each unit shall elect a committee from among its tenured members for the purposes of evaluating and recommending faculty for retention, the award of tenure, and/or promotion. Tenured faculty enrolled in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) are eligible to serve, in accordance with their FERP contracts but may decline such service. If elected, eligible tenured members not in the FERP are obligated to serve. Faculty serving as President of the CFA, Director of the Teaching and Learning Center, or Director of Assessment are not eligible to serve on a Unit RTP Committee.

b. At the candidate's discretion, for unstated reasons, the candidate may request a specific **eligible** member from within or outside the ~~department~~ **unit** ~~who is jointly acceptable to other members of the RTP Committee~~**to serve as an additional member of the committee. This member serves in addition to the three or more faculty elected by the unit**. ~~All other criteria for membership on the committee must be met.~~ The requested member shall serve as a voting member of the unit RTP committee for the requesting faculty case only. Such members shall not participate in the review of any faculty except those who have requested their service.

c. A faculty with a formal joint appointment shall have, at the time of appointment, designated the unit to conduct ~~his/her~~**their** review.

   ~~xi~~. **A** ~~The~~ faculty **with a formal joint appointment** shall have the right to participate in the elections of both the unit RTP committee of the designated unit and that of the other unit.

~~d~~**ii**. When reviewing a faculty holding a formal joint appointment, one or ~~more~~ **two** members selected by and from the secondary unit RTP committee shall augment the designated unit RTP committee.

~~e~~**iii**. ~~When reviewing a faculty without a formal joint appointment but one who does a portion of his/her teaching outside the unit, the probationary and tenured faculty of the unit may augment the unit RTP committee with one or more members from the outside peer review committee.~~

~~f~~**d**. The unit RTP committee shall consist of no fewer than three (3) full-time tenured faculty. If a unit has fewer than three members qualified to serve on the committee, **all eligible members from the unit are expected to serve on the committee.** ~~t~~**T**he probationary and tenured faculty shall elect one or more **eligible** committee members from other units **to fill the remaining positions on the unit committee up to a total number of 3 members**. The outside member(s) shall have the same responsibilities as all such committee members.

~~g~~**e**. With respect to librarians and counselors, the word "unit" as used in this section of the Handbook refers to the library and the counseling center, respectively, as the administrative unit for the election of a unit RTP committee.

~~h~~**f**. Except in cases of probationary faculty already at the top rank (professor or equivalent), in promotion and tenure considerations, members of the unit RTP committee must have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion or tenure.

~~i~~**g**. Faculty may serve on the review committee of more than one unit during a given RTP cycle.

~~j~~**h**. Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review may serve on RTP committees unless they are requesting promotion during that academic year.

~~k~~**i**. A **unit** chair submitting a separate evaluation and recommendation shall not serve on the unit RTP committee. **The unit chair review shall be conducted independently and in parallel with the unit committee review.**

~~l~~**j**. A faculty serving as a dean (including assistant or associate dean) or as a member of the University Review Committee (URC) shall not serve on any unit RTP committee.

~~m~~**k**. The unit RTP committee shall elect its own chair, who participates in the evaluation and votes on the recommendation.

306.3 Post-Tenure Review

a. For the purpose of maintaining and improving a tenured faculty's effectiveness, tenured faculty shall be subject to periodic performance reviews at intervals of no greater than five (5) years.

b. Each unit shall determine explicate criteria for post-tenure review of faculty (including Associate Professors, Associate Librarians, or Associate Counselors) provided that, at minimum, the criteria include faculty teaching performance, scholarship, service (as appropriate to their appointment), and currency in the field appropriate to university-level expertise. Those units that do not specify criteria for evaluation shall follow the

campus criteria used for retention, tenure, and promotion reviews. *(Revised July 15, 2021)*

c. A performance review for the purposes of promotion shall serve as the post-tenure periodic review.

d. Subject to approval by the appropriate dean, a faculty member may request an early review.

e. By October 31, the department chair shall notify those faculty who are scheduled for post-tenure review that they should prepare a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) by the designated deadline. The evaluation process shall normally be conducted during the fall semester, prior to the beginning of the evaluation process for the first performance review cycle. Compensation for librarians eligible for difference in pay leaves shall be the difference performance review cycle.

f. The probationary and tenured members of the unit shall elect a post-tenure review committee to carry out the periodic review. The committee shall consist of no fewer than three (3) full-time tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the individual being evaluated. ~~The committee shall elect its own chair, who participates in the discussion. The committee evaluation and file shall be forwarded to the appropriate dean.~~ **If a unit has fewer than three members qualified to serve on the committee, all eligible members from the unit are expected to serve on the committee. The probationary and tenured faculty shall elect one or more eligible committee members from other units to fill the remaining positions on the committee up to a total number of 3 members. The outside member(s) shall have the same responsibilities as all such committee members.**

g. At the candidate's discretion, for unstated reasons, the candidate may request a specific eligible member from within or outside the department to serve as an additional member of the committee. This member serves in addition to the three or more faculty elected by the unit. The requested member shall serve as a voting member of the unit PTR committee for the requesting faculty case only. Such members shall not participate in the review of any faculty except those who have requested their service.

h. The unit PTR committee shall elect its own chair, who participates in the evaluation and votes on the recommendation.

i. The committee evaluation and file shall be forwarded to the appropriate dean. ~~g~~**j**. The **unit** chair may submit an evaluation as part of the post-tenure review, but then shall be ineligible to serve on the unit committee. **The unit chair review shall be conducted independently and in parallel with the unit committee review.**

~~h~~**k**. Faculty who are undergoing post-tenure reviews shall not serve on any post-tenure review committee during that academic year.

~~i~~**l**. A copy of each level's evaluation shall be sent to the faculty member who may comment on it in writing **using the rebuttal process**. ~~Such comment shall be included in the WPAF.~~

j**m**. The school dean shall prepare a summary of the evaluations prepared during the periodic review. The school dean and the unit **committee review** chair shall meet with the faculty to discuss the evaluations and the summary. The faculty may submit a response to the written summary.

k**n**. The written summary and the evaluations shall be placed in the faculty member's Personnel Action File (PAF) that is kept in the appropriate Dean's office. ~~Post-tenure review materials shall be kept in the PAF until a second post-tenure review is completed. Materials relevant to the first review shall then be removed from the file.~~

RATIONALE: The composition of the unit review committees is a key component of the faculty review process. The proposed changes align language and processes between the RTP and PTR processes. Additionally, these changes clarify the process for the election and appointment of members from outside of units to serve on unit committees.

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:

Pilot of Interfolio for Faculty Performance Review

RES 232407

EC and FAC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate conduct a one-year pilot of Interfolio for faculty performance review (RTP, PTR, and PEF[1]).

RESOLVED: That faculty have the option of using Box without penalty during the pilot period.

RATIONALE: The selection of an electronic repository and review system for faculty performance review is a critical issue for faculty and requires a careful and fully executed process of consultation and shared governance. Per RES 202219 (Submission of Electronic Faculty Performance Review Files), the Academic Senate established an exploratory committee to evaluate software options for a new electronic repository and review system for faculty performance review (RTP, PTR, and PEF*) files, and recommend the best available option that meets our campus requirements. After evaluating several options, the committee concluded that a pilot period of the top-rated option, Interfolio, is best to give interested faculty the opportunity to fully experience the system and provide feedback before committing to a three-year contract.

Attachments:

Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee Report
Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee Recommended Questions
Interfolio Quote
OnBase/Hyland Quote
Watermark/Faculty Success Quote

---

[1] RTP: Retention, Tenure and Promotion; PTR: Post-Tenure Review; PEF: Periodic Evaluation File

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
    AVP Information Technology Services & Chief Information Officer

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

Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee Report

Description

The Academic Senate convened the Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee to evaluate software options for a new electronic repository and review system for faculty performance review (RTP, PTR, and PEF[1]) files, and recommend the best available option that meets our campus requirements, per RES 212219 (Submission of Electronic Performance Review Files).

Membership

Per RES 212219 (Submission of Electronic Performance Review Files), the exploratory committee is to be composed of faculty members from all schools, and with additional representation from other faculty units including the library. Faculty on this committee should represent differing ranks, and it is recommended that tenured, tenure-track, and lecturers all be represented. The AVP Faculty Affairs should be included on this committee as well as representatives of the CFA. ITS staff should be consulted as required. The following is the list of the initial committee membership:

Membership Position	Name	Rank
FT Tenured Faculty A&H	Leo Sakomoto	Associate Professor
FT Probationary Faculty A&H	Gladys Gillam	Lecturer
FT Tenured Faculty BPA	Chandra Commuri	Professor
FT Probationary Faculty BPA	Atieh Poushneh	Assistant Professor
FT Tenured Faculty NSME	Danielle Solano	Professor
FT Probationary Faculty NSME	Jonathan Troup	Assistant Professor
FT Tenured Faculty SSE	Gitika Commuri	Associate Professor

---

[1] RTP: Retention, Tenure and Promotion; PTR: Post-Tenure Review; PEF: Periodic Evaluation File

FT Probationary Faculty SSE	Tzu-Fen Chang	Assistant Professor
FT Librarian	Andrea Anderson	Associate Librarian
CFA Representative	Zachary Zenko	Assistant Professor
AVP of Faculty Affairs	Deborah Boschini	Administrator

The first meeting was convened by the AVP of Faculty Affairs, Dr. Deborah Boschini. During the first meeting, Dr. Danielle Solano was elected chair of the committee. After discussions at the initial meetings, the committee decided it needed feedback from the URC, ITS, and FTLC. The following members were added to the committee:

Membership Position	Name
University Review Committee (URC)	Emerson Case
Information Technology Services (ITS)	Jaimi Paschal
Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC)	Alex Slabey

The committee also consulted other ITS staff during the process including Brian Chen and Jason Ferguson. Additionally, Andrea Anderson left CSUB at the end of spring 2023 and was replaced by Chris Livingston in fall 2023.

Current Platform Issues
Per RES 212219 and committee discussions, the following issues of concern were identified:
1. The quick change to Box from physical files during pandemic-related shifts to virtual campus activities was not a careful and fully executed process.
2. A survey conducted in Spring 2021 by the Faculty Affairs Committee and additional consultation revealed potential concerns about the accessibility, security, ease of use, tracking of access and records, and the ownership of files within Box.
3. Some faculty are exceeding the physical "3-inch" requirement and including an extensive number of files in Box.
4. PAFs will eventually be digitized and thus a platform compatible with electronic PAFs would be ideal.
5. Committee members who had experience submitting RTP files in Box found the process to very time consuming and had issues organizing files in Box.
6. Committee members who had experience reviewing RTP files in Box stressed that organization (i.e., finding things) was a very large issues as different departments often organize files differently; there were also concerns with the lack of completion of access sheets and log sheets.

Platform Requirements
Per RES 212219, the committee developed a list of required and preferred capabilities of the selected electronic faculty review platform.

Required Capabilities
1. Secure
2. Tracks access & file changes
3. Aids in the ease of faculty organization

4. Be easily reviewed by all levels of the review process

1. Compatible with PAF
2. Limits the number of documents
3. Not clunky/ugly
4. Easy to post/upload CV
5. Easy to re-organize folders & files
6. Easy to export items (i.e., in the event we convert to a new system)
7. Workflow is easy to use
8. Minimal cost

Platform Exploration

The committee started by consulting other CSUs to see what platforms are utilized across the system and their experiences with those platforms (Appendix A). Committee members also consulted with their constituents to develop an initial list of software solutions for consideration. The following is a list of all platforms evaluated to some degree. In evaluating these platforms, the committee considered both the process of preparing an RTP file and the process of reviewing it. Three of these systems will be discussed in extensive detail in the following section.

Platform	Comments
Adobe Binder/Portfolio	While this platform is free with Adobe CS license, it is primarily meant for creating a personal website portfolio and there would likely be a significant learning curve to use it. After discussion, we decided not to request a demo.
Faculty Success (Digital Measures)	One of our top three choices. See detailed discussion later in this section.
OnBase/Hyland	One of our top three choices. See detailed discussion later in this section.
Interfolio	One of our top three choices. See detailed discussion later in this section.
Live Binders	This platform is used by some universities for RTP; we requested a demo, but learned this system in incompatible with SSO and it also did not seem to be able to track views; additionally, it seem more like way to organize Box documents rather than a full RTP review. We do not recommend further consideration.
Mahara	This platform is an eportfolio design; after discussion, there was not a lot of excitement about this option, so we decided not to request a demo.
Scholarly Software	Scholarly is a higher ed startup building software for faculty affairs to compete with Interfolio and Watermark (Digital Measures). Their Tenure & Promotion module does not appear to be available yet.

Faculty Success (Digital Measures) by Watermark

A summary of committee evaluations ranked this platform 3rd, and similar in comparison to Box. Monetary costs include a one-time implementation fee of $6,300 and an annual fee of $31,132 (includes optional $5,400 Silver Service Package). The annual fee is based on FTE and thus subject to change. Additionally, in the quote we received, the annual fee increases by approximately $800 each year. (While the university is already planning to adopt some aspects of this system for use in annual reports, these costs would be additional.)

Pros

1. The university is already planning to adopt some aspects of this system for use in annual reports, so faculty will need to learn to use the platform anyway (BPA uses it already for accreditation reporting, so those faculty would already be familiar with it).
2. Uses information already existing in the system (CVs, publications) for RTP.
3. Pulls data from LMS and other systems.

Cons

1. Most faculty will need to be trained how to use the system; also, faculty members who are already familiar with it may need to learn how to use the additional modules.
2. Some committee members did not find the system visually appealing and referred to it as "ugly".
3. Some committee members did not find the system easy to use and referred to it as "clunky".

Technical support

Watermark has email, phone, and chat support. The Silver Service Package is optional but allows for group training or post-implementation meetings with WM's implementation experts.

OnBase/Hyland

A summary of committee evaluations ranked this system 2nd, and higher in comparison to Box. Since we already use OnBase and own the required modules, the only cost would be a one-time setup fee of $140,500 to assist with configuration. Additionally, we currently pay for a certain number of concurrent user licenses; it is likely that we will need to add more concurrent user licenses if more people will be using the system (Hyland recommends 10 additional concurrent licenses which would cost $5,416.61 annually). The committee inquired about the option to explore the system or do a trial run but was informed that this is not an option; OnBase/Hyland does not provide a "sandbox" option and the cost of $140,500 is required to configure out system even for a small trial.

Pros

1. This system is already used on campus, so ITS is familiar with it and already supports it.
2. Currently, few faculty use OnBase for advising. Using the platform for RTP may increase faculty familiarity with it and increase its utilization for advising.
3. The platform is compatible with storing PAF files electronically.

Cons

1. Most faculty will need to be trained how to use it.
2. For off campus users, this system is accessible by VPN only.
3. Some committee members did not find the system easy to use and referred to it as "clunky".

4. Many committee members felt the platform was not intuitive (i.e., would be harder for those unfamiliar with it to start using it).
5. Some committee members noted that the process for uploading files seemed complicated.
6. It was noted that OnBase sometimes freezes during advising.

Technical support

Hyland provides 24/7, 365 Technical Support for all emergency process down scenarios through a toll-free hotline; for all other non-emergency issues or even functionality questions, Technical Support Analysts are available to assist through the Hyland Community Customer Portal with typical response time to each ticket submitted within 24 hours. There is also a team of Customer Care Advocates that are engaged in the Customer Portal for any other request or support needed. Beyond these formal Technical Support resources – CSU Bakersfield's current OnBase System Administrators are also trained by Hyland to be a good on-campus resource.

Interfolio

A summary of committee evaluations ranked this system 1st, and higher in comparison to Box. Annual cost is $27,907 for year one (includes mandatory $4,651 Client Advisory Service fee). The annual fee is based on FTE and thus subject to change. Additionally, in the quote we received, the annual fee increases by approximately $1700 each year (6% inflationary rate increase).[2] The committee inquired about the option to explore the system or do a trial run, but was informed that this is not an option; Interfolio does not provide a "sandbox" option and the cost of $27,907 for one year is the same regardless of the number of faculty who use it.

Pros

1. There was general agreement that this system was the most user friendly and intuitive.
2. Many committee members thought the system was the most aesthetically pleasing.
3. The platform seems be designed specifically for RTP.

Cons

1. Some campuses have reported issues with the slowness of the system and documents taking a while to load.
2. All faculty would have to be trained how to use this system.
3. Some campuses have expressed frustrations with the External Review functionality.[3]

Technical support

The "Client Advisory Service" is a mandatory fee that includes: Dedicated Client Success Manager to help provide best practices for usage across the campus; Technical and Product Roadmap consultation services around usage with API's, SSO and other configuration questions; access to Interfolio University LMS system to provide on-demand training; bi-annual executive briefing reports delivered to Provost; end user training either live or virtually; and access to best practices webinars to help inform decisions and support. They also provide a support desk called, Scholar Services, that not only supports the administrators who will manage the software from but also support faculty if they experience any technical issues.

---

[2] Other CSUs have reported higher annual escalations for their three-year renewal (as high as a 15% escalation each year).
[3] Communicated via personal email to Jaimi Paschal.

Recommendations

1. Faculty Success (Digital Measures) by Watermark is **not recommended** as it was ranked similarly to Box and thus the committee feels that the additional cost is not justified.
2. The committee had mixed feelings about OnBase/Hyland as there were several cons to this platform, but overall, it was ranked higher than Box. The committee considered a pilot of OnBase/Hyland, but ultimately decided against it due to the high cost associated with the setup ($140,500).
3. Interfolio was easily the highest ranked platform, but the committee had reservations due to the high annual cost. **Ultimately, the committee decided to recommend a one-year pilot of Interfolio to determine if the benefits of Interfolio outweigh the cost.**
4. The committee further recommends a Qualtrics survey for faculty to evaluate Interfolio during the pilot period (one for reviewers and one for faculty undergoing review) and reviewing the results of this survey during/after the pilot period to determine if Interfolio is worth the additional cost to using Box. The committee developed a list of recommended questions to use in the Qualtrics survey which are included in an attached file.

Appendix A: Survey of Other CSUs[4]

Platform	Response
Box	It's better than the paper system we used before, so I think most faculty are happy about that, but there are areas for improvement.
Interfolio	[Our campus] was one of the earlier adopters of Interfolio for our tenure-track RTP process and we have been very pleased; we are now using it for faculty awards and sabbaticals/DIPs as well. Unlike some campuses, though, we have not moved lecturer evaluations to Interfolio because of workload and staffing issues in our office and in the colleges.
Interfolio	…we use Interfolio RPT for all tenure-track evaluations, post-tenure review, promotions of tenured faculty, all lecturer evaluations, and range elevation evaluations. We are satisfied and able to run everything fairly smoothly—no plans to change. But, users do complain about the slowness of the system sometimes. And I wish the reporting features were better. Also, we manually archive the cases into our PAF storage, although our office does this for only the full-time employees. It's up to the colleges to deal with the part-time lecturers' PAFs.
Interfolio	…we are using Interfolio for our faculty evaluations – tenured/tenure-track and faculty lecturers. We also have complaints from reviewers about slowness and the character limit on evaluation forms…the campus views it as a great improvement over paper. We will be re-signing for our next contract soon. We have heard from faculty that the functionality is better at [another campus], so I will explore that some more and try to determine if it is something with our configuration or what the difference is.
Interfolio	…we are also using Interfolio for faculty evaluations and don't have any plans to change. Overall, it is a significant improvement from the hard copy files that were used pre-pandemic and the workflow system is really good. There are some complaints from reviewers (e.g., slowness) and we don't yet have integration with our PAF storage system (OnBase). But we have invested in the system and view it as our long-term solution.
Interfolio	We use Interfolio for our evaluation processes for both RTP and lecturers and like it very much. But we are having serious technical challenges getting the material from Interfolio to OnBase which we are just starting to use to digitize our PAFs.
OneDrive	…we implemented on the fly a homebuilt system in OneDrive (we were still using physical binders when COVID hit, fortunately in S20 all files were already to the deans/provost so it was manageable to move binders). The OneDrive system wasn't elegant, and I suspect it may be similar to what you've got in Box. The biggest concern that [we] had with that interim solution is the manual processing required for granting and removing access. But when we looked at other solutions, it was determined in discussion with other campuses that Interfolio was just as time consuming in that aspect. Ultimately, [we] decided to keep the "interim" homebuilt system for the time being because a) it didn't cost $75k a year, b) wouldn't trigger folks to need to learn something new, c) was leveraging a tool that was otherwise commonly already in use, and d) the few extra features of Interfolio seems insignificant when taking a-c into consideration. "The grass is always

---

[4] Responses are from the AVP of Faculty Affairs or equivalent position at the campus as sent via email to our AVP of Faculty Affairs, Dr. Deborah Boschini (not all campuses responded); they have been edited for clarity and to remove identifying information.

	greener…." When I taught electronics I reminded folks that for every benefit found there is a cost: that could be a cost in more money, longer to develop, or at the expense of other performance characteristics. Finding the right balance is the key. As I was the one that spend a long weekend developing and doing the primary testing of the OneDrive system, I'll say that I'm personally extremely proud of finding this solution in the middle of a crisis and it has stood the test of time. The biggest issue we've had with it, to be honest, is the challenges with building an access log that everyone was satisfied with.
Interfolio	Systems and Issues. [Here] we use Interfolio for all collectively bargained for faculty evaluations. Faculty put career information into their F180, reviewers use their RPT interface. Most faculty are settled in with and appreciate the Interfolio products.

The F180 interface isn't intuitive, which leaves us having to provide lots of training on using it. RPT is integrated with F180 in that it can retrieve all information within specified semesters/terms. RPT is often slow for reviewers--it takes quite some time for pdfs to load. Also, there are restrictions on the size and types of files that can be warehoused within the Interfolio product.

We use OnBase to host the faculty PAFs. OnBase is okay, but there is a certain level of clunkiness in how items are stored and viewed. I highly recommend the packet reader for OnBase to deliver PAFs to any party, relieving them of having to enter OnBase itself to review the PAF other than to log the view (as we configured that [here]). The packet reader creates a single pdf with a table of contents that can be exported.

Getting items into OnBase presents problems for us. There are a lot of steps/obstacles to getting stray documents into PAFs. We have begun using OnBase for more processes (appointments, additional employment) from start to finish because the documents must end up in OnBase eventually. OnBase wasn't really built for workflow, but there are some simple routing configurations that allow approval within OnBase.

Our biggest issues with OnBase have to do with our campus's IT having extreme restrictions on users making modifications. My team must meet with IT staff to redraft forms or add features. We can use an IT ticket to change simple things like toggles (required or not) or change a few words or correct grammar. There are systems integrations marketed by OnBase (e.g., DocuSign from/to OnBase) that our IT group has been very slow to help us implement. So my frustrations are more with our local systems administration than with OnBase itself.

Getting information from Interfolio to PAFs. Faculty Services partnered with IT about 2 years ago to develop a system to retrieve review materials from Interfolio to deposit them into OnBase PAFs. The IT team worked with us and Interfolio to leverage Interfolio's APIs (which had some errors) to create a solution. Unfortunately, the OnBase side still requires "manual" steps which should be automated.

The solution includes: |

	• A web-based dashboard to order the retrieval of evaluation materials from RPT. (We also have a "legal" option to retrieve all submitted materials rather than the PAF version). • The files are downloaded to a drive with proper naming convention for OnBase. • The team member requesting the download notifies the OnBase team at IT and requests a sweep the files into OnBase. After they developed the solutions for Faculty Services, I told the IT team leader that other campuses will wish to get his team's assistance with Interfolio and its APIs. He volunteered to help out, so if you could use IT help with moving files from Interfolio to OnBase, just send me a message and I will connect you with that IT group.
Interfolio	Overall we are pleased with the platform, but there are things we would like to change. For instance, our current configuration does not integrate with our Canvas, our LMS. Additionally, the platform is often slow to load/view pdfs, which slows down the review process.
Interfolio	The items [noted directly above] are similar to what we've seen, but I don't see any traction for us to move to something else due to the "cost of change."
Canvas	We never had funding for Interfolio, or other programs, so we developed an in-house approach to create e-Working Personnel Action File/review folders. Originally it was in Moodle and recently migrated to Canvas. Downside is it is a little clunky and somewhat time intensive. Upside is we owned the programs so we incurred no additional cost…We are mostly satisfied – occasional person who is not well versed in using it and have issues with creating their file.
OnBase/ Google Drive	I think campus satisfaction ranges from neutral to dissatisfied. It is hard to navigate and find what you are looking for. It is also difficult to manage and change or add workflows to it. We are not in a position to change this year, but I suspect we will in the near future. We also use OnBase to store our PAFs. I am still learning about that.
Interfolio	I can't say that we are satisfied, but we are not dissatisfied.

Appendix B: Average Committee Rankings

Summary of Rankings[5]

Platform	TOTAL Required	TOTAL Preferred	GRAND TOTAL
Box.com	14.9	17.6	**32.4**
Faculty Success (Digital Measures)	15.5	16.5	**32.0**
OnBase/Hyland	15.8	21.6	**37.5**
Interfolio	19.1	25.4	**44.5**
Live Binders	13.8	19.3	**33.1**

Required Capabilities[6]

Platform	Secure	Tracks Access & File Changes	Ease of Faculty Organization	Easily Reviewed	TOTAL Required
Box.com	4.9	3.6	2.9	3.5	**14.9**
Faculty Success (Digital Measures)	4.7	4.2	3.6	3.0	**15.5**
OnBase/Hyland	4.4	4.4	3.3	3.8	**15.8**
Interfolio	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8	**19.1**
Live Binders	4.1	3.0	3.3	3.4	**13.8**

---

[5] Ranked 1-5 with 5 being the best
[6] Ranked 1-5 with 5 being the best

Preferred Capabilities[7]

Platform	Compatible with PAF	Limits # of documents	Not Clunky/Ugly	Easy to post CV	Easy to re-organize files/folders	Workflow Easy to Use	TOTAL Preferred
Box.com	1.0	3.4	2.8	4.7	3.2	2.5	**17.6**
Faculty Success (Digital Measures)	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.6	3.2	3.2	**16.5**
OnBase/Hyland	4.5	4.0	2.4	4.0	3.1	3.6	**21.6**
Interfolio	2.3	4.3	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	**25.4**
Live Binders	2.5	3.2	3.4	3.8	3.5	2.9	**19.3**

---

[7] Ranked 1-5 with 5 being the best