ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda
Tuesday, September 17, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Rm 100

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   Faculty Forum with President Zelezny regarding Provost Search, October 1,
   Student Union MPR 9:00 – 10:00

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   September 10, 2019 Minutes

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (M. Danforth)
      ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
      iii. FAC (M. Rees)
      iv. BPC (B. Street)
   b. Interim Provost Update
   c. Searches - Update
      i. Provost and VP AA – Election for Search Committee members, by school.
      ii. AVP Academic Programs
      iii. Dean SS&E
      iv. Associate Dean SS&E
      v. Faculty Director of Interdisciplinary Studies
      vi. Faculty Director of the Teaching and Learning Center
      vii. Faculty Ombudsperson
      viii. Faculty Coordinator for Sustainability
   d. AS&SS Chair
   e. UPRC Recommendations (see previous handout: Annual Report 8/27/19)
   f. Update from Student Misconduct Task Force (handout)
g. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
h. Call for Interest:
   i. ATI Faculty Coordinator – roles and responsibilities
   i. University Handbook APPENDIX K: Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan (IMAP) (tabled until ATI Coordinator appointed)

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Course Forms for Catalog and Curriculum Review (see handout 9/10/19)
   b. Summer Service
   c. GRaSP post-award – BAS
   d. Financial Aid
   e. Faculty parking
   f. senate rep for Alumni Association
   g. calendar referendum

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING September 26, 2019 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   Campus Safety – M. Williamson (Time Certain 10:05)
   President and Faculty Forum regarding Provost Search, October 1, SU MPR 9:00 – 10:00
   Budget Forum – October 21, 2019 11:00 a.m. – Noon SU MPR
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   Old Business

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes
Tuesday, September 10, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
ADM 101


Absent: D. Boschini, E. Correa

1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   - Interim Associate Dean SS&E – E. Correa has been offered the position
   - Election of Academic Senate SS&E Representative to finish E. Correa’s term May 2018-May 2020 – Call will go out next week
   - Election of new AS&SS Chair to replace E. Correa
   - Faculty Forum with President Zelezny regarding Provost Search – The purpose is to get faculty feedback on whether to conduct a national search, CSU search, or hire a national search firm, etc. The total cost of the search firm may be a factor.
   - J. Tarjan informed the EC that Weber AS 1460; CSU Graduation Requirement: Ethnic Studies (three-unit course) was amended to continue into next year’s session. The prior version was a diversity bill, not ethnic studies. Until it passes, the attitude from the Chancellor’s Office (CO) is not to spend time on it. However, private discussions are occurring, excluding faculty.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   B. Street moved to approve September 3, 2019 Minutes. M. Rees seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
   J. Tarjan requested to place New Regulation on Consensual Relations first item under NEW DISCUSSION. M. Danforth moved to approve the revised agenda. B. Street seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
i. AAC (M. Danforth) The vice-chair nomination was deferred.
   - 2019-2020 Referral 01_Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) – AAC will invite Bob Carlisle to explain DLC’s purpose and duties.
   - 2019-2020 Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology – the committee is reviewing the large packet of support material in preparation of a joint meeting with BPC.

ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
   - 2019-2020 Referral 03 ASI Executive Director as Ex-Officio Non-Voting Member of Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS) - Bylaws Change – Not controversial.

iii. FAC (M. Rees)
   - 2019-2020 Referral 02 Faculty Workload – One WTU Defined – It will need research, survey, and a discussion with the Department Chair Leadership Committee (DCLC)
   - 2019-2020 Referral 05 SOClS for Summer Courses - the committee is considering whether to include Winter Courses
   - 2019-2020 Referral 06 Faculty Award for Scholarship – Handbook Change FAC will look at the description and duties of the Research Council of the University (RCU) and Faculty Honors and Awards Committee (FHAC).
   - 2019-2020 Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change - The committee is looking for the reason that the review of nominees goes to Executive Committee (EC) rather than FHAC. The Honors and Awards committee has representation from every school, and that is not always the case on the EC. Discussion ensued. The EC has done it in the past. The FHAC is busy enough. The Honorary Doctorate requires a quick turn-around. The candidate has to go through the EC before going to the President’s Office, anyway. The President’s Office then submits to the Board of Trustees. The awardee has to be present on campus to receive the award. The Academic Senate Chair (if not the EC) should be able to sign-off on the final candidate, even if a Trustee brings forth a candidate.

The need for a Policy Portal was discussed. (Where does faculty go to see flow charts, how to rent a room, permission for field trip, etc.) Where there is an absence of policy, decisions are made. A university-wide Policy Portal would need to be actively managed. V. Harper will follow-up with F. Gorham on a content management system.
iv. BPC (B. Street) - D. Jackson briefed the committee in preparation of the WSCUC Visiting Team inquiry on cost of integration of the Strategic Plan. The committee is working with T. Davis to get those numbers, and the GI 2025 data. Those topics will also come up at the Budget Forum.  
- 2019-2020 Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology – the committee will develop questions to go to the Program Coordinator. B. Street will recuse himself from the chairing.

b. 2019-2020 Referral 07 Academic Calendar – Spring and Fall Semester Breaks - The committee is considering a campus-wide survey. There are things that the campus can weigh in and others that are static. Example, 180 fixed teaching days. V. Harper sees Spring break as the most important. He suggests a faculty referendum on Spring Break in response to a vote on a direct question, so the issue doesn’t resurface. Commencement shouldn’t be on survey because people can’t be informed enough on costs to weigh in appropriately. There are pedagogic concerns. Faculty to have their referendum. Staff has theirs. ASI have their own referendum. The nature of the question will be worked out, later. If we don’t have a vote that is respected, then it won’t work. EC will make recommendation after more discussion.

c. Interim Provost Update (handouts)  
2019-20 Budget Bill – Senate Bill 106 excerpts: Section Related to GI 2025 reporting - CSU was appropriated $75,000,000 for the Graduation Initiative (GI). Of that, $30,000,000 is provided on a one-time basis. The campus is expected to receive $500,000 - $600,000. It’s unclear how much is recurring, and when it will be received. More will be known after the CSU Provost Council, later this month. 
Section related to tenure track faculty hiring and reporting - The CSU shall give consideration to qualified existing lecturers that apply for tenure-track faculty position. CSU needs to report how money is spent for specific areas.  
The 2017-2018 Report excerpts containing V. Harper’s answers to specific questions. It includes definitions for expansion hire, etc. Sometimes there is a difference in definitions. The Provost’s Office will have to submit a new report to the CO for the period they specify.

d. Searches - Update  
  i. Provost and VP AA – Call for Search Committee ends September 13, 2019  
  ii. AVP Academic Programs - (no update)  
  iii. Dean SS&E – (no update)  
  iv. Associate Dean SS&E – E. Correa has been appointed as interim.
v. Faculty Director of Interdisciplinary Studies - The job posting expected to go out next week
vi. Faculty Director of the Teaching & Learning Center – to follow the above
vii. Faculty Ombudsperson - to follow fulfillment of the above
viii. Faculty Coordinator for Sustainability - to follow fulfillment of the above.

V. Harper expects all the positions to be filled by January.

The Handbook 309.5 only specifies FT faculty for the search committee for Provost instead of tenured-track faculty members. Referred to FAC.

e. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – covered under Announcements and BPC report.

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
a. New Regulations on Consensual Relations –The new regulation states, “...each Campus shall develop a procedure to reassign such authority to avoid violations of this policy.” The EC referred this issue to FAC to develop a procedure to accommodate the Executive Order.

b. Appointments (Handout)
   i. Instructionally Related Activities Committee – J. Tarjan moved to approve the appointment of D. Peterson. M. Rees seconded. Approved.
   ii. Student Recreation Center Advisory Committee - M. Danforth moved to approve J. Millar, and B. Street seconded. J. Millar approved

c. Recommendations for HSIRB (see previous handout) J. Tarjan moved to approve the re-appointments. M. Danforth seconded. Approved:
   i. Dr. Nate Olson
   ii. Dr. Jessica Williamson
   iii. Ms. Marianne Wilson

d. Recommendations for re-appointments to IACUC - M. Danforth moved to approve the re-appointments. J Tarjan seconded. Approved
   i. Dr. Amber Stokes
   ii. Dr. Amy Gancarz-Kausch
   iii. Ms. Lyda-Craft

e. Call for Interest:
   i. ATI Faculty Coordinator - A. Hegde will work with F. Gorham and V. Harper on role and requirements of the position.

i. Letter from California State Senator Richard Pan to Chancellor Timothy White, dated July 8, 2019 regarding Assembly member Weber’s AB 1460
ii. Letter from Chancellor White to CSUB President Mitchell dated December 1, 2017 specifying Areas of Action
iii. Letter from Chancellor White to California State Senator Richard Pan dated August 28, 2019

Referral made to AAC with instruction to consult GECCo about the recommendation of the task force report. J. Tarjan is available for consultation. AAC will consider whether to include AS&SS and other sub-committees.

g. UPRC Recommendations - see Annual Report of the University Program Review Committee, AY 2018-2019, dated May 13, 2019. The concern is that program review doesn’t have that much value, what is the minimum review, people don’t want to do review, program dis-accreditation, and what are the minimal Federal guidelines? The DCLC agreed to decouple tenure line allocation process from the program review process. There was discussion about removing the Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP). However, that would require that the UPRC move to remove the MOUAP. The Provost Office cannot. Comments from the floor: The MOUAP seems to be somewhat empty because it took eight years to get a final line for a 2010 MOUAP. UPRC straddled administrators; an agreement was made with a particular Dean and Provost, and then when that person was replaced, it switches. Budget is also an issue. A. Hegde said that the UPRC is not a sub-committee of the Senate. It is a university-wide committee that submits reports to the Senate. The UPRC always existed, and the MOUAP was added to it. The MOUAP is not a federal requirement. The idea was to make the process worthwhile, tie in a budget, and be of consequence. The history of doing them on time is spotty. It’s a long report and it takes a lot of time. Release time was discussed. The request is that the process be streamlined:
   i. The Senate to review the Program Review Template and MOUAP Template and reaffirmed if appropriate
   ii. Address the issue of programs not completing reviews

One of the charges of the UPRC is to recommend changes in policies and procedures and consequences of non-compliance. The Senate would have to change the nature of the UPRC in the Handbook. The topic carried over.

h. Graduate student grievances and appeals policy: Reporting chain – J. Tarjan introduced the issue. The University Handbook Appendix D: STUDENT COMPLAINT AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES states clearly that the process of includes the department chair, VP AA, etc. In the catalog, the graduate students
go to their Program Coordinator and up. The Handbook could state that graduate students refer to something else. It may not be a change in Policy so much as stating who the policies applies to. Referral made to AS&SS.

i. Update from Student Misconduct Task Force – A. Hegde provided background: The task force was charged to address that the Office of Students Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR) reports to the VP to Student Affairs and there lacks a formal link to VP AA. There is no aggregate database on violations of academic honesty or data shared about violations. The responsibility of violations is assumed by the OSRR but there isn’t protocol on the department level and nothing on the university level. J. Millar referenced policy which states that faculty has ultimate decision over the grade and assignment of the grade. Sometimes faculty send violations to OSRR to do the investigation. Some don’t understand that OSRR has responsibility only for violation of student code of conduct but not academics. J. Tarjan stated that academic integrity is a core value of CSUB. There is great frustration over the way academic honesty has been followed and tracked, especially for serial offenders. We cannot expect faculty to have academic standards if the university doesn’t enforce academic integrity. A. Hedge thanked J. Millar for being on Task force. A. Hegde will share the Task Force Report with EC and then have it consider a referral to AS&SS.

j. Course Forms for Catalog and Curriculum Review (handout) (deferred)

k. University Handbook APPENDIX K: Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan (IMAP) (Deferred until an ATI Faculty Coordinator is appointed.)

l. Summer Service (deferred)

m. GRASP post-award – BAS (deferred)

n. Financial Aid (deferred)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING September 12, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

   - Announcements
     - University Advancement – J. Self (Time Certain 10:05)
     - WSCUC Update – D. Jackson (Time Certain 10:10-10:25)
     - Budget Forum – October 21, 2019 11:00 a.m. – Noon SU MPR

   - Elections and Appointments

   - Consent Agenda
   - New Business
   - Old Business

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
2019-20 Budget Bill – Senate Bill 106
http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB106

You can search the document online for the CSU – by searching 6610, or scroll down to Section 5 – this will show you all reporting requirements related to the 2019-20 budget.

Section Related to GI 2025 reporting

1.3. (a) Of the funds appropriated in this item, $75,000,000 is
provided for the Graduation Initiative, of which $30,000,000
is provided on a one-time basis.

(b) As a condition of receiving these funds, the California
State University shall report to the Legislature by January
15, 2021, regarding:

(1) The amount each California State University campus

(2) How specifically these funds were spent in 2019–20.

(3) A narrative on how these spending activities are
linked to research on best practices for student
success.

(4) Campus data indicating whether these activities are
achieving their desired effect.

(5) A description for each campus on its efforts and
spending activity to close the achievement gap for
low-income students, historically underrepresented
students, and first-generation college students.

(6) Growth in management, faculty, and support staff
positions in 2019–20 when compared to 2018–19,
and how this employee growth advances student
success.
Section related to tenure-track faculty hiring and reporting.

1.45. (a) Of the amount appropriated in this item, $35,000,000 shall be expended to increase the number of tenure-track faculty pursuant to the Graduation Initiative. Funds shall be used to hire full-time, tenure-track faculty above and beyond the university’s 11,228 current tenure-track faculty. The California State University shall give consideration to qualified existing lecturers that apply for tenure-track faculty positions.

(b) By October 2019 the California State University shall provide a plan to the Legislature for allocating the funds designated in subdivision (a) to campuses and their expected hiring amounts.

(c) No later than December 1, 2020, and every two years thereafter until funds are fully allocated, the California State University shall report to the Legislature on how the funding allocated in this provision was spent to increase the number of tenure-track faculty.

(d) The California State University shall use evidence-based equal employment opportunity practices to improve faculty diversity for the purposes of reflecting the student population enrolled at the California State University.
The questions included on this form are intended primarily to respond to legislative reporting requirements. The Office of the Chancellor recognizes that the responses to particular questions may not fully illustrate the context, accomplishments, or additional campus investments made to support Graduation Initiative 2025. Please use the text box below to provide any additional information or context to explain other activities or spending related to Graduation Initiative 2025. The narrative provided here may be highlighted as a campus example or to development a systemwide narrative in support of continued Graduation Initiative funding from the legislature.

Interim Provost, VP Art, V. Harper (handout)
Please provide a description of how these expenditures are expected to advance student success.

Following your categories:

- Please list any expenditures related to academic support.
- Please list any expenditures related to academic advising.
- Please list any expenditures related to early outreach.

Your campus received $100K in one-time funds to support incoming first-year students who received additional academic support in both writing and communication and improved the likelihood of graduation.

- Please provide a brief description of how campus coordination and administration support is expected to advance student success.

- Please provide a brief description of how campus coordination and administration support is expected to advance student success.

- Please provide a brief description of how on-going development and improvement of facilities and equipment is expected to advance student success.
When considering the Graduation Initiative activities on your campus over the last two years, describe how campus-wide efforts and spending activity have narrowed/focused on narrowing equity gaps for low-income as defined by Pell eligibility, historically underrepresented and first-generation college student populations. We are aware that these three student populations may not be mutually exclusive; ensure that all three student groups are included in your description below.

The GI2025 Task Force has been committed to reducing both time-to-degree for first-time and transfer students, while eliminating equity gaps for sub-populations. The GI2025 Task Force has begun to disaggregate metrics related to equity gaps for Pell, URM and first-generation students. To address the issues posed by these different, but related populations, the Task Force is in planning stages for a First Generation Center. The First-Generation Center will be a communal, learning, and advocacy space for members of the University community who identify with the undocumented, first-generation, and/or low-income student experience. By providing undergraduate students with a dedicated space that affirms their identities, the Center aims to contribute to the endurance and success of students at CSUB.

Upload any supporting studies, documentation, or relevant data based on the description

On July 23, 2018, your campus received Coded Memo ASA-2018-10 outlining one-time Graduation Initiative 2025 allocations. Each campus was provided $150K to support continuous implementation of Executive Order 1110. Provide the percent your campus intends to spend across the four categories below:

- 50%
- 20%
- 20%
- 10%

Please provide a brief description of how continuous development of newly designed supported courses is expected to advance student success

Due to the implementation of EO1110, the University, in consultation with the faculty, redesigned its entire first year English and Mathematic instructional plan. Since CSUB incoming students were subject to substantial remedial work, the elimination of remedial education is expected to have a dramatic and positive impact on the credit completion rate for students. Each new pathway has a new supported course (e.g. supplemental instruction, tutoring, just-in-time support).
Upgraded any supportive studies, documentation of or relevant data based on the description.

The incoming class has a unit load of 17 compared to 15 in prior years. For the Fall 2018, 15 units per term to have an attrition rate of graduation of 4 or 5 years. For the Fall 2018, enrollment was slightly below for graduation rates, for students must be enrolled in the student population. One key metric that has increased considerably has been units developed to improve 4-year graduation rates, while addressing equity gaps having until.

The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.

The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.

The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.
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The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.

The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.
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The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.

The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.

The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.

The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.

The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.

The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.

The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.
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The GIUB 2012 task force has worked closely with the campus community over the past 2 years to develop a range of additional initiatives to support the work of the task force.
Which new Financial Support activities will your campus undertake because of the FY 2018-2019 Graduation Initiative campus allocation?

- X
- X
- X

Please provide a description of the activities supporting Financial Support:

The University has a variety of Financial Literacy resources. Through the use of iGrad, the university provides a personal finance course on budgeting, banking, credit card debt, identify theft, and financial goals. iGrad also offers videos and articles related to financial literacy. During the 2017-2018 AY, President Mitchell launch a campus-wide student employment initiative to provide financial support to students through campus jobs. Lastly, there is currently a proposal to provide short-term micro grants to students who have small balances in order to assist graduation rates.

Which new Data-Driven Decision Making activities will your campus undertake because of the FY 2018-2019 Graduation Initiative campus allocation?

- X
- X

Please provide a description of the activities supporting Data-Driven Decision Making:

CSUB is currently implementing Smart Planner which creates an individualized, optimized study plan, for a student's remaining years of study based on a student's declared major, transcript to date, the published schedule of classes. Smart Planner recommends the shortest-path course sequence for the remainder of a student's years of study. Data drawn from the Smart Planner system will help determine and remove course bottlenecks for students. In future years, the campus will harness GI2025 funds to implement EAB Campus, which is an innovative platform that combines technology, analytics, consulting, and best practice research to CSUB use data and analytics to measurably improve student outcomes. In addition, EAB Campus will be the primary hub for students to connect with their team of advisors, schedule advising sessions, retrieve advising notes, connect with campus resources.

Which new Academic Barriers activities will your campus undertake because of the FY 2018-2019 Graduation Initiative campus allocation?

- X
- X

Please provide a description of the activities supporting Administrative Barriers:
I. Please provide a description of the activities supporting student engagement and wellbeing:

- [ ]

II. Which new student engagement and wellbeing activities will your campus undertake because of the FY 2019 Graduation Initiative?

- [ ]

III. Which new enrollment management activities will your campus undertake because of the FY 2019 Graduation Initiative?

- [ ]

IV. Impacted by the faculty to improve throughput to graduation.

- [ ]

V. Regularly scheduled peer-facilitated study sessions outside of the classroom.

- [ ]

VI. Academic preparation has been one of the major roles for CSUB during the FY 2019 AY.

- [ ]

VII. The Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan has completed including the following:

- [ ]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net new Non-tenure-track Faculty (e.g., lecturers) hires (FTE):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net new Academic Advisors Support Staff hires (FTE):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net new all other Support Staff hires (FTE):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FY 2018-19**

This question asks about how your campus intends to spend new Graduation Initiative resources received in the FY 2018-2019 budget [budget allocation amount]. Do not report actual dollar amounts. Instead, you will report percentages across Graduation Initiative priorities below to total 100%. After reporting the percentage for each priority, use the text field to provide a more detailed description that helps us understand how these funds will be used. Do not comingle the use of funds from other fiscal years although some activity may be on-going. Only account for the new activities that will be undertaken because of the FY 2018-2019 Graduation Initiative campus allocation. There is no requirement to cover every category. For example, some campuses may achieve 100% across only three categories. Faculty or staff hiring may be included across the categories. In a later question you will be asked to describe how many net faculty, staff, and management FTE will be hired to support the activities below.

Please report percentages for each activity your campus intends to undertake.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Which new Academic Preparation activities will your campus undertake because of the FY 2018-2019 Graduation Initiative campus allocation?

- [X]  
- [X]  

Please provide a description of the activities supporting Academic Preparation:
Net new Tenure-track Faculty hires (Headcount):
0
Net new Management Personnel (MPP) hires (FTE):
0

Tenure-track faculty recruited in FY 2017-2018 who joined the campus in FY 2017-2018, who joined the campus in FY 2018-2019, do not include faculty recruited in FY 2017-2018 who joined the campus in Question 2. Include tenured-track faculty in support of the GL 2023 initiative, you described in Question 2. Only include positions without GL2025 funds.

Student life and wellness at the university would not have been able to fund this position during FY 2017-2018, the university was able to hire a Mental Health Counselor to support graduates.

Provide a description of other student support activities funded with FY 2017-2018 Graduation Initiative 2025 funds.

Other Student Support Activities:

- Whose who are close to graduation, can expect broader availability of course sections.
- What is the increase in sections due to GL 2025 funds. Students across the university, many of which are expected to graduate, have increased availability of course sections.
- The schedule for 2017-18.
- What are the expected outcomes for students based on additional course sections added to the schedule for 2017-18.
- In which colleges on your campus was institutional capacity addressed?

How many additional course sections were added to the schedule for 2017-18?

C. Additional Course Sections:

This reduction reflects the number of courses that faculty and student opinion of advising on campus. Faculty and students have identified a number of courses that were previously included in the advising system, but were not measured or reported. The 2017-2018 AVM campuses.

During the 2017-2018 AV, the campus undertook the process of evaluating professional advising. What other activities were added with the intent to improve advising?

How many additional new academic advisors were hired?

B. Advisors or Advising Activities:

Institutional reality support this goal. The number of available sections, the number of new faculty rows, and the number of new academic advisors can be expected to improve. The number of new full-time equivalent tenure-track faculty.

A. Faculty Hiring: Please tell us how many (and new full-time equivalent tenure-track faculty) beyond FY 2017-18, are hired in FY 2017-18?

Replacement (were hired based on recruitments in FY 2017-18)
## Academic Affairs Committee: Melissa Danforth/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Room 100

**Dates:** Sept 5, Sept 19, Oct 3, Oct 17, Oct 31, Nov 14, Dec 12, Jan 30, Feb 13, Feb 27, Mar 12, Mar 26, Apr 9, April 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 20 Continuous Enrollment Course</td>
<td>Withdrawn 8/27/19</td>
<td>AAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There won’t be anything for the Senate to act on until the subcommittee issues their report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 01_Distributed Learning</td>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>Define committee charge and process of determining whether a class is taught online or hybrid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology</td>
<td>AAC</td>
<td>Address the Program rationale, Existing support resources for the proposed program, and additional support resources required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Support and Student Services: Elaine Correa/Chair, meets 10:00am in BPA 134

**Dates:** Sept 5, Sept 19, Oct 3, Oct 17, Oct 31, Nov 14, Dec 12, Jan 30, Feb 13, Feb 27, Mar 12, Mar 26, Apr 9, April 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 05 Canvas Pilot</td>
<td>Carried over</td>
<td>AS&amp;SS Chair to request that Canvas Pilot Committee provide a report by Oct 1 referencing viability of adoption based on the result of compiling positive and negative factors and description their decision process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 03 ASI Executive Director as Ex-Officio Non-Voting Member of Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&amp;SS) - Bylaws Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS&amp;SS 2019-2020 Referral 03 ASI Executive Director as Ex-Officio Non-Voting Member of Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&amp;SS) - Bylaws Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 12– Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS&amp;SS Policy alignment: University Handbook, and Catalog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Approved by Senate</td>
<td>Sent to President</td>
<td>Approved by President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 02 Faculty Workload – One WTU Defined</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 05 SOCIs for Summer Courses</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 06 Faculty Award for Scholarship – Handbook Change</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Resolve discrepancy in award process – RCU and FHAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Refer to RES 121329 Procedures for Honorary Doctorate Nominations and Selection REVISED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 09 Faculty Membership on Search Committee for the Provost &amp; VP of AA – Handbook Change</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>The qualification requirements of faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 11– New Regulations on Consensual Relationship - Handbook Change</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Changes to University Handbook 303.13 to address new regulation from Chancellor’s Office (CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Affairs Committee: Mandy Rees/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Rm 235 Math Library**

**Dates:** Sept 5, Sept 19, Oct 3, Oct 17, Oct 31, Nov 14, Dec 12, Jan 30, Feb 13, Feb 27, Mar 12, Mar 26, Apr 9, April 30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 04 Proposal for a Masters in Kinesiology</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>Address the Program rationale, Existing support resources for the proposed program, and additional support resources required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 07 Academic Calendar – Spring and Fall Semester Breaks</td>
<td>BPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

DATE:       June 6, 2018
TO:         Ruby Alvarez, OSRR
FROM:       Deborah Boschini

SUBJECT:    STUDENT MISCONDUCT TASK FORCE

On May 15, 2018 the Academic Senate Executive Committee approved your appointment to the Student Misconduct Task Force.

Accompanying this letter please find the Student Conduct Administration Structure document containing a report and flow chart from the Student Conduct Review Committee 2007-2008 to help you with your task.

Members of the Student Misconduct Task Force are to select the chair of their committee and schedule their own meetings. Other members are Janet Millar, Counselor; Maria Palaiologou, Ombudsperson; Nate Olson, Ethics Across Campus; Mary Slaughter, A&H; BJ Moore, BPA; Maureen Rush, NSME; and Edie Warkentin, SSE.

I want to thank you personally for your willingness to commit time to the very important issue of academic integrity, including
  • Various roles
  • Reporting violations
  • Sharing information and
  • Implementing policy.

Your voice and concerns are important to the university community as are those of the units you represent.
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE

STUDENT CONDUCT PROCESSES: GRADE VIOLATION ALLEGATIONS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to the President that the process, as described in the attachment be adopted.

RATIONALE: In the fall of 2007 a Student Conduct Review Committee was formed in order to clarify and align campus policies and procedures related to student conduct violations at CSU, Bakersfield. The following members participated on the committee throughout the academic year in an effort to ensure that critically involved constituencies across the university (including representatives from each of the four schools, administrative units, and the Academic Senate) shaped and informed this discussion. The committee members were:

John Dirkse AVP Academic Programs and Dean of Graduate & Undergraduate Studies
Anne Duran Faculty, School of Humanities and Social Science
Kathleen Gilchrist Faculty, School of Natural Sciences and Math.
BJ Moore Faculty, School of Business and Public Admin.
Manny Mourtzanos Dean of Student Life
John Stark Representative, Academic Senate
Shelley Ruetas Vice President for Student Affairs
Anthony Van Reusen Faculty, School of Education

The task of the committee was framed over time as it identified the interests and needs of the various constituencies. The committee met at least every two weeks, as a committee of the whole or in smaller task groups to:

- Understand the implications of Title 5: California Code of Regulations, Section 41301 – Standards for Student Conduct
- Review Executive Order 970
- Share the history of student conduct processes at CSUB
- Clarify the roles and responsibilities of the faculty and of Student Affairs
- Design a student grade appeal process, and to
- Develop a recommendation for a Academic Affairs Review Process at CSU, Bakersfield
The committee recommended the attached process as one that respects the rights and responsibilities of all campus constituencies.

The process was reviewed by all appropriate standing committees of the Academic Senate in the spring of 2008.
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS REVIEW PROCESS MAP

STEP 1
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
(Faculty)

The faculty member awards a grade or assigns "RD".

If an alleged violation of the University policy occurred, the faculty member completes a Reporting Form.

The faculty member informs the student of the allegation(s), shares evidence, and discusses the appeal process. The student is provided a copy of the Reporting Form which highlights the grade appeals process, rights and responsibilities of students, and the grade assigned. The faculty member should keep original documents, evidence and supporting materials for their records. If possible, the student signs the form and keeps a copy for his/her record.

The faculty member sends a copy of the Reporting Form and supporting evidence to:
- Student
- Department chair/Dean
- Academic Affairs Review Committee
- Dean of Student Life

STEP 2
STUDENT DECISION
(Student)

After receiving confirmed notification from the faculty member, the student is given 10 working days to appeal the assigned grade.

If appealed, proceed to Step 3 (Academic Affairs Review).

If not appealed:
- Assigned grade is upheld
- Additional sanctions are applied (if deemed necessary) by:
  - Appropriate academic school, department, or program (adhering to their own documented policies and procedures for reviewing appeals and applying sanctions, as approved by the Provost)
  - Dean of Student Life (EO 970)

STEP 3
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS REVIEW
(Academic Affairs Review Committee)

Academic Affairs Review Committee reviews the evidence and facts (adhering to their own documented policies and procedures for such reviews, as approved by the Provost).

Academic Affairs Review Committee sends their findings to:
- The student
- The faculty member who reported the incident
- The appropriate academic school, department or program
- Dean of Student Life

STEP 4
Grade Assignment & Additional Sanctions
(Faculty, Academic Program, and Dean of Student Life)

1 (a): The faculty completes the grading process, as necessary (either uphold or modify the grade originally assigned).

1 (b): The appropriate academic school, department or program applies sanctions, if deemed necessary (adhering to documented policies and procedures for reviewing appeals and applying sanctions, as approved by the Provost).

1 (c): Dean of Student Life applies additional sanctions, if deemed necessary, adhering to E.O. 970.
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS REVIEW PROCESS MAP

STEP 1
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION
(Faculty)

The faculty member informs the student of the allegation(s), shares evidence, and discusses the appeal process. The student is provided a copy of the Reporting Form which highlights the grade appeals process, rights and responsibilities of students, and the grade assigned. The faculty member should keep original documents, evidence and supporting materials for their records. If possible, the student signs the form and keeps a copy for his/her record.

The faculty member sends a copy of the Reporting Form and supporting evidence to:
- Student
- Department chair/Dean
- Academic Affairs Review Committee
- Dean of Student Life

STEP 2
STUDENT DECISION
(Student)

After receiving confirmed notification from the faculty member, the student is given 10 working days to appeal the assigned grade.

If appealed
Proceed to Step 3 (Academic Affairs Review)

If not appealed

- Assigned grade is upheld
- Additional sanctions are applied (if deemed necessary) by:
  - Appropriate academic school, department, or program (adhering to their own documented policies and procedures for reviewing appeals and applying sanctions, as approved by the Provost)
  - Dean of Student Life (EO 970)

STEP 3
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS REVIEW
(Academic Affairs Review Committee)

Academic Affairs Review Committee reviews the evidence and facts (adhering to their own documented policies and procedures for such reviews, as approved by the Provost)

Academic Affairs Review Committee sends their findings to:
- The student
- The faculty member who reported the incident
- The appropriate academic school, department or program
- Dean of Student Life

STEP 4
Grade Assignment & Additional Sanctions
(Faculty, Academic Program, and Dean of Student Life)

1 (a): The faculty completes the grading process, as necessary (either uphold or modify the grade originally assigned)

1 (b): The appropriate academic school, department or program applies sanctions, if deemed necessary (adhering to documented policies and procedures for reviewing appeals and applying sanctions, as approved by the Provost)

1 (c): Dean of Student Life applies additional sanctions, if deemed necessary, adhering to E.O. 970
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE

STUDENT CONDUCT PROCESSES: GRADE VIOLATION ALLEGATIONS IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to the President that the recommendations of the Student Conduct Review Committee described below be implemented in AY 08/09.

Recommendation One:
Define the composition and guidelines of the Academic Affairs Review Committee and create forms needed by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to implement the process developed by the respective units. (Responsible Unit: Academic Senate)

Recommendation Two:
Ensure that all departments create appropriate program policies and procedures for handling appeals and applying additional sanctions, which will be submitted to the Office of the Provost for review to ensure consistency. (Responsible Unit: Academic Deans)

Recommendation Three:
Develop a CSU, Bakersfield administrative policy and procedure to describe the Student Conduct Grade Violations Allegations Policy and that the responsibility for implementation, evaluation, and revision of the Academic Affairs Review Committee process is maintained and approved by the Office of the Provost. (Responsible Unit: AVP for Academic Programs)

Recommendation Four:
Collect the data from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs on Academic Integrity, Student Code Violations and grade appeals, aggregate and analyze the data and report yearly to the Provost and to the Vice President for Student Affairs. (Responsible Unit: Institutional Research).

Recommendation Five:
The yearly report be analyzed and evaluated by the appropriate administrators, department chairs, and program leaders, so that an assessment can be made about teaching and learning needs for their respective areas. (Responsible Unit: Provost and VP for Student Life)

Recommendation Six:
The information regarding student code violations be incorporated into the CSU, Bakersfield accreditation processes and assessment processes.
Academic Affairs Review Committee – Purpose, Structure and Procedures

A. Purpose, Scope and Functions of AARC:
   - AARC will review academic-related cases (such as academic performance) but will not review cases related to professional standards. Academic grade grievances based upon allegation of discrimination will be excluded.
   - AARC will review cases and provide a summary of “findings” from their review. These findings are provided to appropriate offices for consideration, grade assignment, and/or disciplinary sanctions (if necessary).
   - The AARC will provide suggestions and recommendations to faculty regarding best practices, if applicable.

B. Committee Membership/Composition: Possible committee composition may include:
   - Faculty members from each school
   - Two (2) students selected by ASI
   - Involvement of Ombudsperson
   - Ad-hoc members on a case to case basis (e.g. Athletics, Information Technology department, Library)

C. Committee Policies and Procedures (Manual). (also to be reflected in the University Handbook for Faculty, and Student Conduct Brochures)

D. Inclusive and Exclusive Factors: Identify the nature of issues to be reviewed (or excluded from review) by the AARC

E. Principles for Determination: Student bears the burden of proof

F. Development templates, forms, and sample letters

G. Record Custody: Identify a central office for record keeping of the student grievance complaints and outcomes

H. AARC Evaluation and Reporting: Identify evaluation and reporting methods of the grievance outcomes to the Academic Senate
   - Recommended findings/outcomes
   - Recommendations to faculty re: best practices
MEMORANDUM

TO: Debbie Boschini
    Chair of the Academic Senate

FROM: BJ Moore
    Chair of the BPA
    Assessment Review and Curriculum Committee

DATE: March 20, 2018

RE: Academic Integrity Violation Issues

C: Jenny Zorn
    Provost and VPAA

I write at the request of the BPA Assessment Review and Curriculum Committee (ARCC) to bring to your attention concerns ARCC has with both the structure and processes now in use regarding the reporting and management of academic violations. These concerns arose during a meeting with Ms. Ruby Alvarez, the Director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR) held to discuss the escalating violations within the School.

Issues:

The OSRR reports to the VP for Student Affairs. No formal link to Academic Affairs is currently in place. One reason for this structure is to address residence hall issues. Both residence hall and academic violations have increased;

No aggregate data base has been established nor are data shared. Faculty report a violation and no action is reported back to the faculty member. Faculty across programs and across the University have no knowledge when a student is a repeat offender. Course by course violations do not necessarily result in University level action;

Responsibility for designating a violation consequence is assumed by the OSRR to be in the hands of the faculty member for each course incident. No clear protocol exists for actions at the Department or University level. Faculty have been expecting University action in addition to course action; and
Most faculty in BPA were unaware of the Violation Reporting Form. Consistent use of this form might provide a data base for tracking incidents and trends and enhance problem solving. When I form is received the OSRR Director might inform the faculty member that a previous report had been received. “Need to Know” is supported in cases of repeated offenders.

The BPA Assessment Review and Curriculum Committee has recommended the following actions for the School:

- All instances of integrity violations must be reported. The form is to be used and a copy sent to the Associate Dean and to the OSRR Director;
- Continue the exam monitoring program “Examity” and make it available to all BPA faculty;
- Faculty are encouraged to include the violation penalty in the course syllabus;
- A list of students with a violation history is to be kept in the BPA Dean’s Office;
- The Associate Dean is to inform the Chair when a repeat offense occurs;
- BPA will consider a professional ethics statement for each degree program; and
- Aggregate data by semester be analyzed reported to the BPA ARCC.

However, the adoption of the above practices at the School level will not address most of the concerns. One avenue to explore might be the separation of the OSRR into two units to address academic affairs and residential violations separately. Another suggestion is that Academic Affairs consider this issue as a “closing the loop” project in regard to our assessment and quality improvement activities, as a shared governance venture involving the Academic Senate, Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

Finally, on behalf of the BPA ARCC I thank Director Alvarez for her collaborative nature and the Executive Committee for considering this issue. Both Ruby and I are available to provide information and experience as the problem solving continues.
STUDENT COMPLAINT AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

The policy and procedures specified herein deal only with individual student complaints and/or grievances against the actions and/or decisions of faculty, academic administrators, or staff professionals. The complaints and/or grievances may concern but are not restricted to

- an assigned final course grade,
- administration of records,
- admission to a program, or
- requirements for program completion

Group grievances are not permitted. Complaints and/or grievances will not involve allegations of dishonesty or abuse of professional responsibility as such allegations fall strictly under formal University disciplinary proceedings. Procedures for redress of grievances must protect the respondent against unsubstantiated and false charges of bias or unfairness. Therefore, in a grievance there is a presumption that procedures have been fairly followed. It is the responsibility of the grievant to demonstrate otherwise. The final responsibility for assigning or changing a student’s record rests solely with the faculty, academic administrators, or staff professional.

ARTICLE I – Definitions

Section A:

1. “Complaint” is defined as any unwritten dispute arising with a student under terms of Article II. A “Complaint” may be any point of issue between a student and faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional, in which a student feels an abridgement of academic rights or benefits has occurred.

2. “Grievance” is defined as a written dispute arising with a student under terms of Article II. A “Grievance” is a difference, presented in writing, that may arise between a student and faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional, with respect to, but not necessarily limited to:

   a. violation of established academic policies and regulations: defined as those policies and regulations outlined in the respondent’s course syllabus, the University’s current Catalog, and/or the University’s current Class Schedule. (e.g., examination policies, advisement policies, registration procedures, etc.) The violation must have resulted in a direct and adverse impact on the Grievant’s student record.

   b. Clerical error: A “clerical error” means an error made by the faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional, in reviewing, estimating, evaluating, or posting student records.

   c. Prejudicial evaluation: For prejudicial evaluation to be present, the faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional must have applied a different
standard to the Grievant than applied to other students in the same situation. Also, the action must have adversely impacted the Grievant’s student record.

d. Capricious evaluation: For capricious evaluation to be present, the faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional must have changed the standards of evaluation during the semester. Since changes in evaluation standards can and do occur during a semester, the change must have occurred abruptly and without apparent reason (e.g., two days after the mid-term examination and without prior discussion, the faculty member declares there will be a series of short quizzes). Finally, for capricious evaluation to be present, the Grievant has to show that the change had a direct, singular, and adverse impact on the Grievant’s student record.

3. “Grievant” is defined as the individual lodging the complaint and/or grievance.

4. “Respondent” is defined as the faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional most directly responsible for the alleged action(s) and/or decision(s) resulting in the complaint and/or grievance.

ARTICLE II – General Provisions

Section A:
It is the desire of the University that any Grievance be handled in a timely manner. The Grievance procedures must adhere to the time deadlines stated in the grievance procedures.

Section B:
This document is not intended to inhibit the resolution of a problem in any satisfactory informal way.

Section C:
At any point in these grievance proceedings the Grievant may move to withdraw the Grievance or accept a solution.

Section D:
The Ombudsman may be consulted by the Grievant at the earliest opportunity. Deadlines may be extended at the request of the Ombudsman to the relevant School Dean or the Academic Vice President (e.g., if the Grievant is in a course of the respondent the following semester, an extension may be granted).

Section E:
The University has a strict policy of zero tolerance of actual or implied violence. If at any time a Grievant engages in harassment or intimidation, the grievance will immediately become a disciplinary matter to be dealt with by campus security.
Section F:
Complaints and/or Grievances may be brought against the actions and/or decisions of faculty, administrators, staff in admissions, records, financial aid, counseling, placement or other student service offices for failure to adhere to written campus policies or for procedures or actions that constitute arbitrary, capricious, or unequal application of those procedures.

Section G:
A complaint and/or grievance may be initiated on the basis of a claim of: (refer to Article I for definitions)
(1) Violation of established academic policies and regulations
(2) Clerical error
(3) Prejudicial evaluation
(4) Capricious evaluation

ARTICLE III – Complaint Procedures

Section A:
Before resorting to grievance, a student shall exhaust all complaint procedures herein at the department level. Grievance procedures, as outlined in Article IV, should not be invoked until the complaint has been thoroughly addressed at the department level.

Section B:
The student shall first address the complaint to the concerned faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional most directly responsible for the alleged action(s) and/or decision(s) resulting in the complaint. Complaints shall be initiated within one semester, excluding summer, of the incident giving rise to the complaint. If the complaint cannot be resolved by the student and faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional, the student should meet with the Department Chairperson/Director to discuss their complaint.

Section C:
If the student and the Department Chairperson/Director cannot resolve the complaint, the student should meet with the appropriate school or departmental Dean to discuss their complaint.

Section D:
If the complaint is still unresolved after this point, the student may then, and only then, file a written grievance as outlined in Article IV. In no case should the informal resolution of a complaint take longer than one semester (excluding summer) and formal grievances must be initiated within one semester of the incident giving rise to the grievance.
ARTICLE IV - Grievance Procedures

Section A:
Before a student may invoke the grievance procedures specified herein, they shall first exhaust all complaint procedures as outlined in Article III. In no case should the informal resolution of a complaint take longer than one semester (excluding summer) and formal grievances must be initiated within one semester of the incident giving rise to the grievance.

Section B:
A student may initiate formal grievance procedures by filing a Student Grievance Form with the Office of the Academic Vice President, or designee, within a period of two (2) weeks following the date that the complaint procedures were concluded, as indicated by the relevant Dean.

Section C:
Upon receiving a written notice of grievance, the Academic Vice President shall inform the Presiding Officer of the Grievance Review Board, the Ombudsman, and the appropriate Dean of the School or Department, in which the grievance occurred, of the grievance. The Grievance Review Board Presiding Officer shall verify that the student has complied with all procedures outlined in Article III.

Section D:
At any point in these formal grievance proceedings the Grievant may move to withdraw the grievance or accept an informal solution.

ARTICLE V – Grievance Review Board

Section A:
Be it that grievances may encompass both academic and non-academic issues, the Grievance Review Board shall be composed of seven persons: the Presiding Officer, three full-time faculty members, at least two of whom shall be tenured members of academic departments, one full-time student-service professional staff members, and two full-time students.

Section B:
The Presiding Officer shall be the Dean of Academic Programs or his/her designee. He/she shall be responsible for ensuring that all procedures are followed in the seating of the Review Board and in the conduct of its hearings and deliberations. The Presiding Officer shall vote only in case of a tie. The Presiding Officer shall also insure that all participants in each hearing are officially notified of the confidential nature of the hearing and all information and data presented therein.

Section C:
The Grievance Review Board shall be a standing committee, with board members selected each academic year. At the beginning of each academic year, the Presiding Officer shall draw two names from the pool of currently enrolled full-time students, three names from the pool of full-time faculty at least two of whom should be tenured members of academic departments, and one name from the pool of
full-time student-service professional staff. Administrative-level Faculty and staff personnel will be excluded from the pool. University policy regarding definitions of full-time faculty, staff members, administrators, and students shall apply. Upon selection, if a faculty, staff, or student declines to serve, another name shall be drawn in their place. Once the position is accepted, it will be for the duration of the academic year.

Section D:
After the regular Board members are selected, alternates shall be drawn using the same method. Three full-time faculty, one full-time student-service professional staff, and two full-time students shall be selected as alternates.

Section E:
Any board member, other than the Presiding Officer, may be permanently replaced with an alternate during the academic year:

1. if faculty or staff - are no longer employed by CSUB as a full-time employee;
2. if a student - are no longer enrolled full-time or if placed on academic probation in any semester during the academic year of service.
3. If absent from any scheduled meeting of the Grievance Review Board, in which member notification and availability were confirmed, then the Presiding Officer may permanently remove that member from the board at his/her discretion.
4. If deemed to be exhibiting inappropriate behavior via a consensus vote of all remaining members of the board.

Section F:
If a board member is replaced with an alternate, then the Presiding Officer shall immediately draw another name from the appropriate pool to fill the vacant alternate position.

Section G:
A quorum shall consist of all current members of the Grievance Review Board, excluding alternates.

Section H:
All hearings shall be closed. The Grievant and the Respondent shall each have the right to have the Ombudsman present as a non-participant observer at the hearings. Attendance shall be limited to the Grievant, the Respondent, the Ombudsman, witnesses, if any, while giving evidence, and the Review Board. Since this is not a legal action and grievant has ultimate legal recourse, attorneys shall be excluded.

Section I:
Formal grievance hearings shall not be held during the Summer or Christmas breaks unless Grievant, Respondent, entire Board, and witnesses agree. Every effort shall be made to resolve the grievance within the term filed.
Section J:
The Presiding Officer shall inform all parties to the grievance of the time, date, and location of the hearing, names of the presiding board members, as well as decisions on other matters that may affect the hearing.

Section K:
Both the Grievant and the Respondent then have two working days after the date of notice of presiding board members in which they may each request to the Presiding Officer up to one board member be temporarily replaced with an alternate due to cause. The Presiding Officer shall immediately grant or deny such requests, and these decisions shall be final for all purposes. Those temporarily excused for cause shall regain their positions once the Review Board’s proceedings for that specific grievance have concluded.

Section L:
The Board shall normally convene within fourteen (14) working days from notice of grievance. The Presiding Officer shall be responsible for meeting with the Board at an appropriate time before the beginning of the hearing to familiarize the members with the procedures, as outlined in Article XI.

Section M:
The content of the proceedings in a grievance hearing is confidential, and the Board recommendations resulting there from shall not be made public by any participant in the hearings. In the event these matters should become public, the University, as are appropriate, may make such public statements. This policy of confidentiality shall not preclude such discussion of the case by the opposing parties as may be necessary to prepare for the hearings.

Section N:
Subject to Section O below, both the Grievant and the Respondent may offer evidence and call witnesses, with the Grievant doing so first.

Section O:
Within the guidelines established by these procedures, and subject to overrule by a majority of Board members, the Presiding Officer may establish necessary rules for the conduct of the hearing, including decisions involving procedural issues.

Section P:
Any relevant evidence shall be admitted and the Presiding Officer shall have the discretion to rule out evidence if in his/her judgment such evidence is essentially repetitious or irrelevant.

Section Q:
During the course of the proceedings the Grievant and the Respondent shall not discuss the case with members of the Review Board outside the hearings. If, in the judgment of the Board either Grievant or
Respondent has harassed or attempted to intimidate the other or any Board member, the Board may initiate disciplinary procedures. (See Article VIII below)

**Section R:**
Both parties may make an opening statement. The Grievant has the burden of proof, and shall demonstrate by a preponderance of evidence that he/she was directly wronged by the action that gave rise to the Grievance. After the opening statements, both parties shall answer questions the Board may have regarding the case. Both parties may then question each other, as well as all witnesses. Any documents submitted as evidence shall be made available by the Presiding Officer to both parties.

**Section S:**
The Grievant or Respondent may sign a waiver allowing the Board to have access to confidential information pertinent to the case. However, the rights of privacy of third parties (such as other students in the course who are not involved in the case, or other faculty who may teach similar courses) shall be respected.

**Section T:**
The Grievant and Respondent may request information from each other concerning the case. The Grievant, for example, may request a class list with student names and an overall grade distribution, but in no circumstance will the grades given to specific students in the course, or student identification numbers, be released without their written permission. Moreover, the Board shall not have access to, nor consider, records of testimony about previous academic performance of the Grievant in other courses or in prior grievances.

**Section U:**
The Board shall not have access to nor consider records of testimony about the previous use of sanctions by the Respondent nor previous instances of grievances.

**Section V:**
A tape recording of the hearing shall be kept and filed in the Office of the Academic Vice President. It shall be retained for two calendar years, and then shall be erased. The tape recording is to remain confidential.

**Section W:**
Each party may present a closing statement with the Respondent going first. Any closing statements shall be limited to the evidence presented. There shall be no questioning of the parties during or after the closing statements.
ARTICLE VI – Grievance Review Board Decisions & Ad Hoc Assessment Committee

Section A:
The decision of the Board must be consistent with campus and CSU policy. The Presiding Officer shall notify the Grievant, Respondent, and the appropriate administrator of the Board’s finding.

Section B:
If the Board found that a legitimate grievance has occurred, the Presiding Officer shall request the Respondent to reconsider the grieved action in light of the Board’s finding. If the Respondent agrees, he/she shall make the appropriate corrective action within seven (7) working days after notification of the Board’s finding.

Section C:
If the Board recommends the change but the Respondent refuses, the Presiding Officer shall convene an ad hoc Assessment Committee composed of two faculty or two staff members whose field of expertise is appropriate for suitable evaluation. The Presiding Officer shall be a non-voting member of the Assessment Committee. The Presiding Officer shall inform the Respondent of the decision reached by the Assessment Committee.

Section D:
If the Respondent refuses to comply with the decision of the Assessment Committee, he/she shall notify the Presiding Officer within seven (7) working days after receiving notice of the committee’s decision.

Section E:
In the event the Respondent refuses to comply with the decision of the Assessment Committee, the Presiding Officer shall refer the matter to the University’s President for final resolution.

ARTICLE VII – Appeals

Section A:
Either the Grievant or the Respondent may appeal the finding of the Grievance Review Board, but the Respondent may not appeal the decision of the Assessment Committee. The party wishing to appeal the finding of the Grievance Review Board must deliver a written appeal to the Presiding Officer, with copies to the opposing party. This appeal shall be delivered to the Presiding Officer within fourteen (14) working days from the date of the receipt of the finding of the Grievance Review Board.

Section B:
The only grounds for appeal are:

1. Substantial departure from the procedures established in this document so as to seriously prejudice the outcome of the hearing;
(2) Prejudicial treatment by the Grievance Review Board.

Section C:
The appeal document shall specify the following:
   (1) That it is an appeal;
   (2) The name and current address and telephone number of the person making the appeal;
   (3) The reasons for the appeal and the facts supporting those reasons.

Section D:
The Presiding Officer may bring final resolution to the grievance by either electing to reject the appeal based on lack of evidence, or by referring the matter to the University’s President. The Presiding Officer’s decision to either reject, or refer, the appeal shall be final for all purposes. If referred, the President’s decision shall be final.

ARTICLE VIII - Grounds for Disciplinary Action

Section A:
Students and faculty are subject to disciplinary action if they knowingly make false statements or act in any other way with malicious intent within the provisions of this document.

Section B:
The Presiding Officer of the Review Board shall immediately bring all such cases before the appropriate disciplinary bodies for review.

ARTICLE IX - Procedures for Reporting

Section A:
At the end of the academic year the Presiding Officer of the Grievance Review Board shall report to the Academic Senate the number of cases heard and the disposition of each case.

ARTICLE X - Procedures for Revision

Section A:
These procedures are subject to change by majority vote of the Academic Senate. The President is responsible for ensuring that any revisions conform to Executive Order No. 320 of the Office of the Chancellor.

ARTICLE XI – Proceedings Orientation

Section A:
The Presiding Officer of the Review Board shall conduct an orientation prior to the commencement of proceedings to be attended by all Board members, the Grievant and the Respondent.
Section B:
During the orientation, the following shall be reviewed:
   (1) The scope of allowable grievances as outlined in Articles I and II.
   (2) The rules governing the proceedings as outlined in Articles V and VIII.
CSUB ACADEMIC RELATED STUDENT VIOLATION PROCESS

STEP ONE: Academic Affairs

A) The faculty member identifies an instance of academic misconduct and schedules a meeting with the student within ten days of the discovery.

B) The faculty member informs the student of the allegation(s), shares evidence, and discusses the sanction for the violation with regard to the assignment grade and/or course grade. In the case of a professional degree program, an action by the degree program may also be recommended. If the issue concerns an online course, or distance from the campus is problematic, a phone call or an online video conference should be used.

(C) When the faculty member is convinced that a violation of University policy has occurred, the Academic Integrity Violation Reporting Form (AIVRF) is completed. The student is informed that an assignment grade cannot be grieved. However, the assignment grade will affect the course grade, which can be grieved. If possible, the student signs and keeps a copy of the AIVRF form. If the student refuses to sign, the faculty member indicates such on the form and initials the notation.

(D) The faculty member sends a copy of the AIVRF and the supporting evidence to the student and notifies the Director of the OSRR and the appropriate administrator who will be handling the course grievance process, if initiated. This would include the Chair of the Department/Director of the Program as well as the Associate Dean of the School.

(E) At the end of the course, the faculty member enters the grade the student earned. At this point, the student may initiate the academic grade grievance process (see attached CSUB policy: Student Complaint and Grievance Procedures).

STEP TWO: Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities

A) At CSUB, the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities is charged with implementing CSU Executive Order 1098 regarding violations of the Student Conduct Code. Student academic violations are incorporated into the annual OSRR report.

B) Starting in Fall 2019, OSRR will be using Maxient, a software program that will track student misconduct, including academic violations.

STEP THREE: Aggregation of Data and Reporting

A) At the end of an academic year, the Director of the OSRR will prepare a report for Academic Affairs to include statistics that allow faculty and
academic administrators to address and continuously enhance the culture of integrity at CSUB. The process can include the following statistics

- Number of violations (for School and Department)
- Number of students with repeat violations
- Types of violations
- Number and types of sanctions
- Number of academic grievances upheld
- Number of appeals dismissed

B) A copy of the report will be sent to the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Provost, and the Associate Dean for Graduate and Undergraduate Studies.

C) The OSRR will also prepare a report for the Chancellor’s Office and send it to the AVP for Student Affairs.

Approved by the Task Force Aug. 30, 2019