CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE
AGENDA
Thursday, November 29, 2018
Health Center Conference Room
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

1) Call to Order

2) Approval of Minutes

3) Announcements and Information

    President Zelezny Report and Q&A **(Time Certain) 10:05**

    Budget Forum – December 5, 3:30-4:30, Student Union MPR Room

    Six faculty new hires

    Trustees visit December 12, 2018

    Elections:

    Call for Nominations Academic Senate A&H

    Results of Call for Search Committees: Assoc. Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies

    Result of Election Director of Academic Programs

4) Approval of Agenda

5) ASCSU Report

6) Provost Report

7) Committee and Report Requests

    (Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC are posted on the Academic Senate Webpage)

    a) Executive Committee (A. Hegde)

    b) Academic Affairs Committee (M. Danforth)

    c) Academic Support & Student Services Committee (E. Correa)

    d) Budget & Planning Committee (B. Street)

    e) Faculty Affairs Committee (M. Rush)

    f) Staff Report (K. Ziegler-Lopez)

    g) ASI Report (A. Schmidt)

8) Resolutions – **(Time Certain 10:45 a.m.)**

    a) Consent Agenda

    b) Old Business

        i) RES 181903 – Instructor Initiated Drop Policy <u>Second Reading</u>

        ii) RES 181905– Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution * <u>Second Reading</u>

    c) New Business

        i) RES 181906 – Academic Master Plan 2019-2020 through 2029-2030

9) <u>Open Forum Items</u> **(Time Certain 11:15)**

10) <u>Adjournment</u>

 * Changes to the Handbook

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE
Minutes
Thursday, November 8, 2018
Health Center Conference Room
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Members: D. Boschini (Chair), A. Hegde (Vice Chair), E. Correa, M. Danforth, B. Frakes, R. Gearhart, I. Kasselstrand, C. Lam, A. Lauer, Y. Lee, M. Martinez, J. Millar (Alt.), M. Rush, L. Sakomoto, A. Schmidt, M. Slaughter, B. Street, K. Szick, J. Tarjan, D. Zhou, K. Ziegler-Lopez, J. Zorn (Alt.)

Visitors: L. Zelezny, D. Schecter, V. Harper, D. Jackson, C. Murphy, V. Martin, A. Bryan, M. Harville

1) <u>Call to Order</u>

   D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2) <u>Approval of Minutes</u>

   K. Ziegler-Lopez requested that her statement regarding RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy be added to the record "The advisors have concern being the primary person to add and drop, specifically as it relates to instructor initiated drop policy."   B. Frakes moved to approve the minutes as corrected. E. Correa seconded. Minutes approved.

3) <u>Announcements and Information</u>

   University Advancement V. Martin (handout) **(Time Certain 10:05)** He presented an overview of University Advancement (UA): mission, oversight, and goal of enhancing facilities and programs and providing an outstanding student, faculty, and staff experience. The last two fiscal years have turned from transition to rebuilding. There has been an increase in donors (33%) and total funds raised (32%) over FY 2016-17. UA is 1.82% of the Base Budget Operating Fund Allocation 2017-2018. UA Employment trends for both Staff and Management are relatively flat. The increase in Staff and Management reflect a transfer of UA employees in the Foundation to the UA Stateside fund per Executive Order from the Chancellor's Office. See University Budget Book. Productivity (cash collected) since 2011/2012 was $2.5M. It has improved and declined and then improved again. V. Martin provided details of the trend year to year. In 2016/2017 was a transition year, and

1

now a rebuilding phase whereby 2017/2018 resulted in $5.1M raised. The strategic plan and feasibility study will outline future priorities for development of a comprehensive campaign for fundraising that donors can understand and the impact it has within a timeline. UA doesn't have a Stateside Budget. It's a Foundation Budget: Endowment and Reserves, Gift Received, and other Investments and Rents. UA works with an annual budget of $750K. The Return on Investment (ROI) was $7.44 and the Cost to Raise a Dollar was $0.12, based on a three year average using the formula issued by the Chancellor's Office. Moving forward, UA aims to annualize the budget, conduct a feasibility study, plan for the investiture, 50th anniversary, and ultimately a comprehensive campaign. A question and answer session ensued. A. Hegde asked for itemization of the $750K. V. Martin replied it goes to alumni engagement; stewardship events; publications; managing database; a website module for on-line giving; utilities and overhead; a handful of subscriptions that foster outreach and/or management of funds; the Council for Advancement of Education requires an annual subscription; a site license for resource for philanthropy; events such as the Kern Energy Summit - tables for key leaders, State of the City, County, etc. UA pays for that. The Operating Expense, $111,000 that's what it was last year, and part of the reimbursement (Stateside budget) which doesn't exist any longer. Thus, UA didn't have as much for its annual budget. Now UA receives gift fees (earnings on the balance).   In the future, the lines items will be there. R. Gearhart inquired about the ROI how the cash giving compared with other peer campuses.   V. Martin ordered reports from CSU that compared campuses and an extra for the Academic Senate. CSUB is one of eleven in tier one (peer group) by the number of donors, number of fundraisers, and the money.   CSUB ranks #5 in production (pledges). #4 in gifts received (money in the door).   A. Hegde said it doesn't have anything to do with advancement. V. Martin will give Hegde the exact numbers.   The ROI is a standard calculation of the dollar, from the state and other sources, invested in the CSU system and the effect on the local economy. The calculation by CO does incorporate Advancement. V. Martin will share that equation. D. Boschini said that the CO's calculation would enable us to be on the same page.   There is another formula used for impact on the

2

region. We will bring your information back to the Senate for clarity. She thanked V. Martin and invited him to return in the spring.

ACIP – C. Murphy (handout) **(Time Certain 10:20)** The Academic Council for International Programs (ACIP) offers eighteen different programs. Students can use their financial aid to pay and get credit for their classes if they have chairs who cooperated with course substitutions.   There are faculty opportunities. The annual fall ACIP campus representatives' meeting takes place in Long Beach at the Vice Chancellor office. The spring meeting takes place at a CSU campus. CSUB is the preferred location. D. Boschini suggested that interested parties refer to the written report and to follow-up with C. Murphy.   M. Rush asked if there are masters programs offered. C. Murphy responded that there are 14 Masters Programs, yet not every major is offered in every country.

Elections and Appointments:

Academic Senate A&H – Amy J. Ressler elected to complete term, May 2018-May 2020

Academic Petitions Committee A&H – pending EC appointment November 13, 2018

Canvas Pilot Planning Committee

- A & H – Teresa Fernandez-Ulloa appointed
- BPA - open
- NSME – Andreas Gebauer appointed
- SS&E – Patrick O'Neil appointed

University Program Review Committee – Danielle Solano appointed

Transportation Committee – Jeff Moffitt appointed

Calls for Search Committees to be emailed Tuesday, November 13:

- Associate Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies
- Director of Academic Programs.

President Zelezny to offer a report next AS meeting, November 29. She will speak about the GI Initiative 2025 goals and progress, Strategic Planning Process, and the Capital Campaign plan, activities and timeline.

4) Approval of Agenda

E. Correa moved to approve the agenda. B. Street seconded. Agenda approved.

3

5) ASCSU Report

No report, as J. Millar and J. Tarjan are attending Statewide Academic Senate Plenary.

6) Provost Report

J. Zorn reported on Tutoring: On October 25 she was able to verify that the message was given to the Schools that the tutoring budgets were being cut by 33%. This was a mistaken understanding of the budget. On October 30, V. Lakhani communicated to the Director of tutoring: "As per your conversation with Jennifer on Friday, please inform the tutoring centers in the schools as soon as possible that the budget for tutoring has been fully restored and the schools will receive the same level of funding as the prior year."
J. Zorn then reported on the Grad Check deadline. The grad check deadline was Sept 24. Because it was not listed on the Admissions website until after Sept 24, the deadline was extended to Nov. 30. Students are being notified of this. The website will be changed to not having its own calendar but linking to the academic calendar.

7) Committee and Report Requests (deferred)

(Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC are posted on the Academic Senate Webpage)

a) Executive Committee (A. Hegde)

b) Academic Affairs Committee (M. Danforth)

c) Academic Support & Student Services Committee (E. Correa)

d) Budget & Planning Committee (B. Street)

e) Faculty Affairs Committee (M. Rush)

f) Staff Report (K. Ziegler-Lopez)

g) ASI Report (A. Schmidt)

8) Resolutions – **(Time Certain 10:45 a.m.)**

a) Old Business

i) RES 181903 – Instructor Initiated Drop Policy * Second Reading - M. Danforth took comments from last meeting to AAC and they made added "on official university business" at the end of the first page with respect to students who cannot attend the first day of class. Further, the student needs to notify the instructor of record of official business prior to the first day of class. They also rearranged the first section on the first page regarding the face-to-face classes to make it clear that the instructor has to notify that a drop is pending for both possible face-to-face and on-

4

line cases. The time to add is the day before the MyCSUB record is purged; the Last Day to Add in the Academic Calendar. D. Boschini opened the discussion for questions, comments, and concerns from the floor. K. Lopez is concerned about who processes the administrative drop. M. Danforth replied that AAC felt that it would be too prescriptive for the catalog. It's more of an administrative issue and it is unique for each school. D. Boschini stated that there is an existing policy. Instructors can already drop students. M. Rush spoke against the proposed policy change. If a class has a wait list, it's an administrative issue. The resolution is a pedagogical solution to the administrative issue. There are many confounding factors why a student can't complete the work. It doesn't seem to be a meaningful discerning activity to say that the student can then stay in class. There's also an assumption that those students on the waitlist, and if they are doing the work, they should enter the class. It's unknown whether the student has been on the waitlist for three semesters and finally got in. There's no consideration whether that student is a senior or whether one is adding a freshman. A. Hegde spoke in favor. It speaks to either not attending first day of class, or do not complete the work for the first week of class. From a department view, there are a few classes that get closed within a day or two, also being a program that relies on classes that fill up within hours. It makes it really difficult for students to get in. We need to drop so we can make room for students who have been on waitlist. Especially in the high level classes, the students have to take action. The shift in policy puts the onus on the students to take the responsibility. M. Slaughter agrees that it doesn't mean the student doesn't have agency. The students are very good at emailing instructors and explain why they wouldn't be there. If they know about this policy they have to take ownership of the courses they registered for. She had a class of 45 that filled up by noon, with a waitlist of 45 on the first day. There will be people who will wait until their financial aid goes through and then drop. She's had people who have done all the work and weren't able to add because the other people weren't dropped. They have a lot of circumstances and they also have agency. B. Street in

5

favor. They have agency and should be able to make decisions. Students will be notified before they are dropped.   They will have time to react if they don't want to be dropped.   K. Szick suggested to take out the line of completed work. If someone is not going to show up to biology (which have long waitlists) and don't take the time to let her know why they can't be there, someone else is waiting to come in. The other thing is that the classrooms are full. They don't have a place to sit while on the waitlist. She requests to strike the second line, They do not complete the work for the first week of class. M. Rush agreed with what's been said, yet no one is speaking directly to the issue of one homework assignment given on a particular day. The consequences of not completing the work is the grade on the work. The condition - they do not complete work for the first week - should be removed because it is not pedagogically sound. E. Correa agrees in principal with the resolution. Also, consider the processes. We cannot go about changing policy without having the process clearly defined. M. Danforth clarified that part of the charge to AAC was that the current policy does mention completing assignments in context of on-line courses and there was a question whether it applied only to on-line or also face-to-face courses. Further, it gives the instructor the freedom to use or ignore the policy. D. Boschini pointed out this is an existing policy whereby instructors can drop students. Part of the discussion is whether the changes make it better or worse.   The group didn't have a chance to ask for student point-of-view because the ASI President had to leave early. M. Danforth said that throughout this process, the ASI member participated in the AAC. They acknowledged that they were to balance the rights of the students in the class versus the student on the waitlist who needs to get in the course. The resolution addresses the discretion of the instructor and the protection of the students by more clearly defining their roles and responsibilities.   It aims to solve where there are two groups of students pitted against each other.   M. Rush thinks that there are probably better administrative solutions to this problem than crossing the line to graded assignments in the class. There is priority registration for those students who really need ready the course to

6

graduate. She would rather see those solutions uses. There is the assumption that the in-class has to align with the on-line class. D. Boschini turned to V. Harper (Assoc. VP Academic Programs and an ex-officio member of AAC) as to how the change in policy would play out in Academic Programs. V. Harper replied that he expects to have students appeal being dropped in this matter. It's a faculty policy and Academic Programs (AP) will work with it. He has a small number of students who have appealed to being droppped. D. Boschini stressed that the proper implementation of this policy is to notify students and faculty of the change. It likely will result in an increase of usage of the policy upon going through the implementation steps. K. Ziegler noted that there is a trickle effect when one student gets dropped, then another added and the student can end up dropping another course they're in to they can have that added class. M. Rush would be ok with the resolution if it's not pedagogical. A. Hegde commented that just because people login, that doesn't mean participation. He recommended to spell out that either they attend first day "or" complete assignment. It's up to the instructor whether they assign work. He would be against striking that assignment part out of the resolution. D. Boschini gave the options of voting, amending, or sending it back to committee.   E. Correa requested that the Senate consider to wait until there is a student voice before a decision is made. D. Boschini acknowledged that that was good advice.

ii) RES 181904– Establishment of the Position of University Ombudsperson for Faculty Second Reading - M. Rush reported that the edit from the first reading was to make clear that it's a faculty ombudsperson position. D. Boschini asked if there is discussion for or against that would be productive toward the decision.   All were in favor of the resolution. No opposition. Approved.

iii) RES 181905– Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution * Second Reading – M. Rush explained that the underline is the addition to the University Handbook. There are two changes: 1) the word "faculty" to make it clear, and 2) replacement of "Committee on Professional Responsibility" to the "Academic Senate Executive

7

Committee" with respect to the review of the applications and making a recommendation to the President for the appointment. D. Boschini asked the group to take a moment, since the approval of RES 181905 assumes that RES 181904 Establishment of the Position of University Ombudsperson for Faculty has been approved by the President. L. Zelezny asked for RES 181904 first, and then she will be ready to review RES 181905. Further discussion on RES 181905 defer to the next Senate meeting, November 29, 2018. There is a lot of good will but to work through the resolutions in stages. B. Frakes moved to defer item. M. Slaughter seconded. No opposition to defer item.

9) <u>Open Forum Items</u> **(Time Certain 11:15)**

B. Street worked with T. Davis on the Budget Forum, Wednesday, December 5, 3:30 – 4:30 [Student Union, Multi-Purpose Room]. The Budget Book is available on the Budget Central webpage. D. Boschini requested that everyone look at it. The campus has asked for this. What has been posted appears to be what we hoped to get. This is a good example of Dr. Zelezny's intervention and being instrumental in moving us to this point. Thank you to her leadership, T. Davis for making it available, and to B. Street and A. Hegde. B. Street said that BPC is looking for feedback on first edition; what needs improvement. D. Boschini thanked B. Street for pushing it for this fall and giving a full month notice. It's important to do it now and have discussion on what is happening and what needs to be done. Please attend.

E. Correa's comments are in response to D. Schecter textbook request. She noticed that sometimes we're using same textbooks over & over again, semester after semester. She asked the bookstore if faculty had to constantly provide the same information if we know it's the textbook used semester after semester. They indicated that it is the requirement by law. They also said that they have a textbook on-line program, IncluED. Features are no more adoptions, no worry about missing lists of adoptions, instant access so that students have materials the first day of class, deep discounts for long-term commitments, lower cost to the student and increased engagement. The bookstore asked for the group to put it forward for consideration. A. Hegde informed the group that the bookstore has a master

8

list, so if they don't get a book order, they use the same by default. E. Correa replied that IncluED is less expensive for the students. If they need to return books, and they don't know in advance if it will be used again they lose money. If the bookstore knows in advance that the textbook will be used again, they can make it cheaper for the student. D. Boschini said there are two options: the EC can make referrals or the Senate can make one in this meeting. K. Szick commented that there is a question what the master list is supposed to do. There are some faculty that get on the naughty list and this happens separately from the master list that was created. D. Schecter replied that the master list is not a master order. The ordering process still needs to be done. E. Correa requested a referral to AS&SS because it would benefit everyone. A. Hegde said that in the past, the bookstore used programs and still wanted orders by email. It's a problem in the communication between the faculty and the bookstore. We tried the software and it didn't work, because people submitted through the software and the book source said it has to be through email and other issues where it needs to be referred. D. Boschini made the referral to AS&SS to look into the textbook ordering process and to consider the use of IncluED and make recommendations or bring a resolution. Invite D. Schecter, Bookstore manager, and check in with the Textbook Committee on what they do and how they can be helpful to AS&SS.

10) Adjournment

Moved to adjourn. Seconded.   Adjourned.

 * Changes to the Handbook

9

Academic Affairs Committee: Melissa Danforth/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Rm 328 Research Room
Dates: Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
08/29/18	2018-2019 Referral 02 Change of Membership on AAC and Change in Bylaws	Complete	AAC Memo to Senate – AAC discussed and decided that since AVP of AP represents AA, the Director of AP need not be an ex-officio on AAC. No update to By-Laws needed.			
09/06/18	2018-2019 Referral 03 GITF Hold Proposal	Complete	AAC's feedback was incorporated into the proposal document.			
10/2/18	2018-2019 Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal		AAC, BPC			
10/2/18	2018-2019 Referral 08 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy	Deferred until ASI present	RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy 11/29/18 Second Reading			
11/15/18	2018-2019 Referral 14 Catalog, Degree Audit, and Schedule Builder Technology and Process Integration					

Academic Support and Student Services: Elaine Correa/Chair, meets 10:00am in BPA 134
Dates: Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
10/2/18	2018-2019 Referral 05 Canvas Pilot					
10/2/18	2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee	Referred to FAC	No further action from AS&SS.			
10/9/18	2018-2019 Referral 10 Service Animal and Emotional Support Animal Policy					
11/8/18	2018-2019 Referral 11 Textbook Ordering Process					

Budget and Planning Committee: Brian Street/Chair, meets 10:00am in Student Health Center, Conference Room (HCCR)
Dates: Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
10/2/18	2018-2019 Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal		AAC, BPC			
10/2/18	2018-2019 Referral 09 University Hour		BPC			
11/13/18	2018-2019 Referral 12 Academic Calendar		BPC - Class contact hours can be lost.			

Faculty Affairs Committee: Maureen Rush/Chair, meets 10:00am in SCI III Rm 235 Math Library
Dates: Sept 6, Sept 20, Oct 4, Oct 18, Nov 1, Nov 15, Dec 6, Jan 31, Feb 14, Feb 29, Mar 14, Mar 28, Apr 11, May 2

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
08/28/18	2018-2019 Referral 01 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee		RES 181902 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee Second Reading 10/11/18	10/11/18	10/19/18	
10/2/18	2018-2019 Referral 04 Ombudsperson		RES 181904 Ombudsperson Second Reading 11/8/18	11/08/18		
10/2/18	2018-2019 Referral 04 Ombudsperson		RES 181905 Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution Second Reading 11/29/18			
11/13/18	2018-2019 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change		The committee for consideration of Emeritus awards contacts the Department for their feedback, the info is there, and correct. Look at whether to apply to other awards.			
10/2/18	2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee	Referred to FAC	Referral moved from AS&SS to FAC on 10/30/18.			

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE

Instructor Initiated Drop Policy

RES 181903

AAC

RESOLVED: That the following amendment be made to the existing policy on page 60 of the CSUB Catalog, under "Academic Information:"

Instructor Initiated Drop Policy for Classes with Face-to-Face Meetings

Students who do not attend the first day of class may be administratively dropped from the class. Students who do not complete work assigned for the first week of class may be dropped from the course. Students must be notified by the instructor of record that a drop is pending. Students should communicate any extenuating circumstances immediately to the instructor of record. An instructor-initiated drop should be processed at least one business day before the Last Day to Add in the Academic Calendar. Students from the waiting list who attend the first day of class may be added. Students who are on the waiting list, but do not attend the first day of class, may be dropped from the waiting list. Students who are on the waiting list who complete work assigned the first week of class may be added, by waitlist order.

Instructor Initiated Drop Policy for Online Classes

All students enrolled in ~~on-line~~online courses ~~with waiting lists~~ must log in to the course and complete any assignments or other activities that are required by the instructor during the first week. Students who fail to log in and/or who fail to complete first-week assignments within the deadline may be administratively dropped and must be notified by the instructor of record that a drop is pending. Students should communicate any extenuating circumstances immediately to the instructor of record. An instructor-initiated drop should be processed at least one business day before the Last Day to Add in the Academic Calendar.

Summary Instructor Initiated Drop Guidelines for Both Face-to-Face & Online Classes

Students in both face-to-face and online courses may be dropped from the class and/or the wait-list if either of the following is true:

- They do not attend the first day of class
- They do not complete work for the first week of class

Students on official university business who cannot attend the first day of class due to that business must notify the instructor of record prior to the first day of class. The student must

provide proof of the official university business from the sponsoring program or office to the instructor of record.

Students who are administratively dropped under this policy will be sent an email by the instructor informing them of the drop. Students should not presume they will be dropped by their instructor for non-attendanceunder this policy. Students who have registered for a class, but never attended, should verify whether or not they are officially enrolled via their "myCSUB" account. It is ultimately the student's responsibility to withdraw officially from the class.

It is the responsibility of all wait-listed students (face-to-face and online) to communicate with the instructor concerning readings and assignments that must be completed in the first week of class.

RATIONALE: The purpose of this policy is to ensure a clear understanding of the roles and expectations of both students and instructors. This policy seeks both to allow appropriate discretion to instructors and to protect students by defining the role and responsibilities of instructors for dropping students and ensuring that students are notified that they are being dropped.

The resolution is designed to allow students a reasonable window in which to attend and participate in class, and also to allow instructors to drop students who do not attend and/or complete the work so that other students who hope to add a class may do so.

One business day before the Last Day to Add was chosen as the preferred deadline for instructor-initiated drops because waitlists are purged after this day. The Last Day to Add is typically near the beginning or middle of the second week of classes. This gives the most flexibility for students to notify instructors of extenuating circumstances given the tight turn-around window for proper notification of the student being dropped, processing the administrative drop, and adding students off the waitlist.

Distribution List:

Role of Faculty Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution

RES 181905

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate proposes an addition to the University Handbook under Section 303 Responsibilities of Teaching Faculty, Librarians & Counselors to include a subsection for informal procedures aided by ~~an~~ a Faculty Ombudsperson by which faculty can resolve disputes.

303.8 Alleged Breaches of Professional Responsibility The fundamental purpose of the statement of professional responsibility in Appendix F is to establish a guide for responsible performance that is consistent with the highest ideals of the academic profession. It thus establishes an ideal to which faculty members can and should aspire, rather than a minimum standard to which faculty members must adhere. Hence, the statement is not intended to serve primarily as a reference for disciplinary action. Nevertheless, when cases of gross disregard for principles of professional responsibility occur, the faculty has both a right and a duty to call the breach to the attention of the individual concerned and to expect that the irresponsible behavior will be discontinued.

Most departures from responsible professional behavior are likely to be minor breaches that can be corrected simply by calling the matter to the attention of the person involved. Ordinarily, such matters are handled within the faculty member's academic unit. <u>The faculty member may also consult the ~~campus~~ Faculty Ombudsperson for informal conflict resolution, or may proceed to formal procedures.</u>

If a breach of professional responsibility is alleged that cannot be or is not adequately handled informally within the basic academic unit <u>or with the Faculty Ombudsperson</u>, the matter may be referred to the Committee on Professional Responsibility. Any member of the academic community may refer allegations of unprofessional conduct to this Committee. Such allegations shall be submitted in writing and signed by the person making the complaint.

The procedures described in this section provide a formal process whereby faculty members can resolve disputes regarding professional responsibility without resorting to

a disciplinary process. It is expected that in most instances, the weight of an adverse conclusion by the Committee on Professional Responsibility will bring about a correction of irresponsible behavior.

303.8.1 Committee on Professional Responsibility

Members of the Committee on Professional Responsibility are elected with special attention to the high ethical and professional regard in which their colleagues hold them. The Committee consists of five (5) tenured faculty members, one elected by the faculty of each school and an at-large member elected by the General Faculty. Committee members serve overlapping two-year terms. A committee member who has a conflict of interest in a particular case shall recuse himself or herself. In that instance, the Senate Executive Committee shall appoint a substitute. The appointed member shall represent the constituency of the replaced member.

303.8.4 Ombudsperson

A faculty member is selected with special attention to his/her high regard for fairness and confidentiality, and with a high capability to aid and assist in resolution of concerns and critical situations. The Senate will issue a call for applicants for this position, and the ~~Committee on Professional Responsibility~~ Executive Committee of the Senate will review the applications and make a recommendation to the President for appointment. The Faculty Ombudsperson serves as a source of information and referral, and may act as a neutral 3rd party who takes the point of view of all parties into account. A faculty member will serve a renewable three-year term. This position may serve as a supplement, but not as a replacement, to the University's existing resources for formal conflict resolution. The Faculty Ombudsperson reports directly to the President, and reports to the Academic Senate only for the purpose of identifying patterns or problem areas in existing practices or policies in the faculty community.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN 2019-20 THROUGH 2029-30

RES 181906

EC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to the President the approval of the attached Academic Master Plan.

RATIONALE: Proposing a new degree is a two-stage process: (1) a very brief rationale for the degree is placed on the Academic Master Plan, and if approved by the CSU Board of Trustees, (2) the full degree proposal is developed and approved at the campus and system level.

The attached plan has been prepared by AVP Academic Programs Vernon Harper and reviewed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

No new academic programs are being added to this year's submission.

Distribution List:
President
Provost
AVP Academic Programs

ACADEMIC PLAN
Existing and Projected Degree Programs
201~~98~~ 2019 through 202~~98~~ 3029
California State University, Bakersfield

SCHOOL OR DIVISION AND DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE	EXISTING DEGREE TYPE				EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION YEAR OF PROJECTED PROGRAM (PLANNED FUTURE DEGREE)	ACADEMIC YEAR FOR SCHEDULED PROGRAM REVIEW
	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Other		
School of Arts and Humanities						
Art	BA					~~2017-2018~~2022-2023
Communications	BA					2017-2018
English	BA	MA				~~2016-2017~~2022-2023
History	BA	MA				2021-2022
Music	BA					2019-2020
Philosophy	BA					2021-2022
Religious Studies	BA					2019-2020
Spanish	BA	MA				2018-2019
Theatre Arts	BA					~~2016-2017~~2022-2023
Ethnic and Cultural Studies	BA				2019	TBD
Latina/o and Latin American Studies	BA				2019	TBD
Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies	BA				2019	TBD
School of Business and Public Administration						

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Applied Studies* (pilot)	BS					2016-2017
Business Administration	BS	MBA				2018-2019
Economics	BS					2019-2020
Environmental Resource Management	BS					2019-2020

* Suspended program

Note: Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas

ACADEMIC PLAN
Existing and Projected Degree Programs
2018-19 through 2028-29
California State University, Bakersfield

SCHOOL OR DIVISION AND DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE	EXISTING DEGREE TYPE				EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION YEAR OF PROJECTED PROGRAM (PLANNED FUTURE DEGREE)	ACADEMIC YEAR FOR SCHEDULED PROGRAM REVIEW
	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Other		
Health Care Administration		MS				2020-2021
Public Administration	BA	MPA				2017-2018
Agricultural Business (pilot)	BS					2018-2019
Accounting		MS			2020	TBD
Finance		MS			2020	TBD
Technology Management		MS			2021	TBD
Applied Economics and Analytics		MS			2019	TBD
Logistics and Supply Chain Management		MS			2022	TBD
School of Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering						

	BS					2020-2021
Biochemistry	BS					2020-2021
Biology	BS	MS				2019-2020
Chemistry	BS					2020-2021
Computer Engineering	BS					2017-2018
Computer Science	BS	MS			2019/MS	2018-2019
Electrical Engineering	BS					2017-2018
Engineering Sciences	BS					2017-2018
Geology	BA/BS	MS				2019-2020
Human Biological Sciences (pilot)	BA					2021-2022
Mathematics	BS	*MAT				2019-2020
Natural Sciences	BA					2017-2018

* Suspended program

Note: Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas

ACADEMIC PLAN
Existing and Projected Degree Programs
2018-19 through 2028-29
California State University, Bakersfield

SCHOOL OR DIVISION AND DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE	EXISTING DEGREE TYPE				EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION YEAR OF PROJECTED PROGRAM (PLANNED FUTURE DEGREE)	ACADEMIC YEAR FOR SCHEDULED PROGRAM REVIEW
	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Other		
Nursing	BS	MSN				2022-2023
Physics	BS					2018-2019
Public Health	BS				2019	TBD
School of Social Sciences and Education						
Anthropology	BA	MA				2018-2019
Child Adolescent and Family Studies	BA					2017-2018
Counseling		MS				2020-2021

Program	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Other	Expected Implementation Year	Academic Year for Scheduled Program Review
Counseling Psychology		MS				2018-2019
Criminal Justice	BA					2022-2023
Education		MA				2020-2021
Special Education		MA				2020-2021
Educational Administration		MA				2020-2021
Educational Leadership			EdD			2019-2020
Kinesiology	BS	MS			2020	2017-2018
Liberal Studies	BA					2020-2021
Political Science	BA					2018-2019
Psychology	BA					2018-2019
Social Work		MSW				2021-2022
Sociology	BA	MA				2020-2021

* Suspended program

Note: Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas

ACADEMIC PLAN
Existing and Projected Degree Programs
2018-19 through 2028-29
California State University, Bakersfield

SCHOOL OR DIVISION AND DEGREE PROGRAM TITLE	EXISTING DEGREE TYPE				EXPECTED IMPLEMENTATION YEAR OF PROJECTED PROGRAM (PLANNED FUTURE DEGREE)	ACADEMIC YEAR FOR SCHEDULED PROGRAM REVIEW
	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Other		
Interdisciplinary and Other						
Administration		MS				2021-2022
General Education						2020-2021
Honors						2017-2018
Interdisciplinary	BA	MA				2021-2022

* Suspended program

Note: Underlined programs are nationally accredited subject areas