CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE
AGENDA
Thursday, February 21, 2019
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 Zelezy’s Report and Q&A (Time Certain) 10:05 – 10:20
   • CSU General Counsel welcome – A. Maiorano
   • Trustee visits: L. Norton visits February 27 and Trustee R. Sabalius on April 23
   • CSU Dashboard Workshop – K. Krishnan
   • Elections and Appointments – A. Hegde

4) Approval of Agenda

5) ASCSU Report

6) Interim 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 181905– Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution * Second Reading
   c) New Business
i) RES 181909 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change * First Reading
ii) RES 181910 University Council – Addition Library Member First Reading

9) **Open Forum Items (Time Certain 11:15)**

10) **Adjournment**

* Changes to the Handbook
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE
Minutes
Thursday, February 7, 2019
Health Center Conference Room
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.


Absent: M. Rush

1) Call to Order
D. Boschini called the meeting to order.

2) Approval of Minutes
M. Rees moved to approve minutes from January 24, 2019. M. Danforth seconded.
Minutes approved.

3) Announcements and Information
General Faculty Meeting – February 11, 11:30-1:00, Stockdale Room and Live Steam

Elections and Appointments:
- Search Committee AVP Enrollment Management
  - Brian Street-elected
- Election Academic Administrators Review Committee Dean Antelope Valley
  - Stacy Schmidt - elected
- Election Academic Administrators Review Committee Dean A&H
  - Mustafa Dhada – elected
  - Joel Haney – elected
  - Stephan Campagna-Pinto - elected
- Election Academic Administrators Review Committee Dean BPA
  - Voting ends February 13, 2019 5:00pm
- Election Academic Administrators Review Committee Dean NSME
  - Voting ends February 13, 2019, 5:00 p.m.
- Second Call Nominations Academic Administrators Review Committee Dean SS&E
  - Call ends February 14, 2019, 5:00 p.m.
Call for Nominations ASCSU
- FT Faculty member for a three-year term, May 2019 – May 2022
- Call ends February 14, 2019 5:00 p.m.

D. Boschini reminded the group that information on elections can be found in the University Handbook and Bylaws, located in the Senate website. If there are questions, direct them to your School Elections Committee or A. Hegde, Elections Committee Chair.

4) Approval of Agenda
B. Street moved to have RES 181907 Academic Calendars (New Business) as the first item at Time Certain for Resolutions. J. Tarjan seconded. All in favor of the modified agenda.

5) ASCSU Report
J. Tarjan informed the group that the interim ASCSU meeting is this Friday. J. Millar reported that State AAC meeting next week. Nothing to report now.

6) Interim Provost Report (handout)
V. Harper directed the group to handout, Academic Senate Follow-up Items, page 15. F. Gorham and D. Schecter responded to Blackboard (BB) and SOCI concerns, respectively. B. Chen, (Director, ITS Enterprise Applications) pointed to #2 as the procedure for future terms, and #3 pertains to the current term. B. Chen committed to send a message how to change the student role, if they've been doing work, from waitlist to enroll. V. Harper directed the body to the handout, CSUB Lines of Inquiry Campus Update: Spring ’19 Report. J. Tarjan and Boschini voiced their appreciation on the process and the document. D. Boschini stated that it was an opportunity for us to identify problems, work on them proactively, and that V. Harper’s group listened and put the feedback into recognizable categories to be self-reflective. D. Boschini thanked the steering committee. Summary at http://www.csun.edu/WSCUC/LOIUpdates/index.html

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) President Zelezny gave her report on GI 2025 to the EC, and she will be attending the February 21st Senate meeting to give her report. A. Maiorano, CSU General Counsel, will also be attending. Trustees Larry Norton and
Romey Sabalius will be visiting the campus on February 27 and April 23, 2019, respectively. President Zelezny is in the process of analyzing data from a variety of events. The GI 2025 frames the discussion about the strategic plan. She has been in consultation with S. Rinella, retired VP Administration CSU Fullerton, about the strategic plan process. From the members of the USP/BAC, she will form sub-committees to look at the issues. V. Harper reported on the GI 2025 and shared the Provost Office’s strategies. There is a pilot program involving a group of students whereby the individuals are associated with their specific Advisor, EM contact, and Dean. He presented a chart of Expected and Potential graduates. See EC minutes for details. The Schools have identified students that are short some units. Interim Provost Harper has volunteered to look at whether any courses need to be offered; either Individual study basis or small classes in summer or fall to facilitate graduation. The President mentioned that she doesn’t believe CSUB is a Rural Institution any longer. Due to the campus’ growth and size, CSUB is more of a Regional Comprehensive serving a Metro Area. She will have Dr. Harper look at best practices for such institutions to increase graduation rates for four-year, six-year, and especially transfer students. EC discussed Provost Zorn’s unfinished review. The EC felt that due to precedence, the review would not continue. The EC and the President discussed the rationale of having a Sustainability position as one of the six allocated tenure-track lines. V. Harper to form a committee to determine whether it’s a FT or PT. The President has a work plan for strategic planning. A sub-committee is addressing the CSUB Vision statement. The President will announce the campus Strategic Plan late summer or fall 2019.

b) Academic Affairs Committee (M. Danforth) No update on the Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation referral. The focus was on the Catalog, Degree Audit, and Schedule Builder Technology and Process Integration referral. Ideally, the catalog was updated every two years to have it kick up in fall, people make their updates and submit them to their curriculum committees, move on through campus approvals to be integrated into the system, and then updating to the degree audit. Recently however, the updated catalog has thrown a wrench into the system. Now, people can send
proposals to curriculum committees all the time, and particularly when it comes to
degree requirements, that causes a lot of back-end issues. If one has the 2018-2020
catalog, there are three different sets of degree requirements. The degree audit on
PeopleSoft on MyCSUB hasn’t followed the recently updated catalog, even if they have
rights to the earlier version there’s no easy way for them to incorporate the 2018 v1, or
2018 v2, or 2018 v3. That’s causing a lot of confusion among the students and
evaluators about degree requirements. The committee discussed moving to an annual
catalog and the amount of additional workload it would cause to the parts of campus
that aren’t changing their degree requirements. She will bring the idea to EC because it
may have to go to FAC to discuss workload and implications. By instituting a one year
catalog, it would lessen the burden on evaluations and degree audit, and create
workload issues on other parts of campus to review catalog copy every fall. The
committee is looking at process flows of the annual vs every two years. The system
needs to have exceptions where there is the ability to enter new degree program when
the regular deadlines weren’t met. D. Boschini thanked everyone on AAC because the
catalog copy is an important issue.

c) Academic Support & Student Services Committee (E. Correa) The Campus Pilot moved
from planning to running the pilot without a broader faculty representation. BlackBoard
issues are a recurring theme. Decisions were made by IT in relative isolation and there
is a different perception on when things would start. The protocol should be that before
changes are made, notify the broader constituency, ask for their input, and make
changes based on more than that just a few individuals’ recommendation. The Interim
Provost’s report addresses some of that. AS&SS is waiting for a response to their
recommendations to the Service Animal and Emotional Support Animal policy to
finalizing the issue. The Textbook Ordering Process referral has produced a meeting
with IncluED people and will likely require that D. Schecter attend a future meeting to
discuss the financial viability before the committee can make recommendations.

d) Budget & Planning Committee (B. Street) As reported by M. Danforth, the committees
are still waiting for feedback on the Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation
proposal. RES 181907 Academic Calendar will be presented, today. The BPC had a lengthy discussion on the University Hour survey that went out last fall from ASI. The next discussion is on the logistics of implementing a University Hour. V. Harper’s office will share data on classroom utilization. Then, the committee will look at location(s) and frequency; every month, every week, every day. There are Budget Calendar points that need to be met this spring. Priorities were discussed in BPC and at the Senate. The BPC will be bringing in individuals from University Advancement, and Extended Education and Global Outreach to give their priorities and budgets. He’s requested information from GRASP for the committee. J. Millar asked ASI President A. Schmidt whether students are in a pilot CSUB Hour. A. Schmidt responded that an event was established this year to introduce and further a university hour without having the time officially. J. Millar asked how those two things blend together without seeing all the work being done on the impact to the campus. There will be some determination in the future whether the University Hour is a program versus what university commits.

e) Faculty Affairs Committee (M. Rush) A. Jacobsen reported on behalf of the committee. The committee discussed the Faculty Award process and changes to the University Handbook that would include returning the file back to the unit. The unit is already consulted for some awards but not Faculty Awards. The referral, University Council – Adding Library Member, is still being discussed. The role of Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) is being codified and recommendations are forthcoming.

f) Staff Report (K. Ziegler-Lopez) Staff is requesting an extra GWAR exam this year because by the time advisors see students, the GWAR dates have passed. There are only two exams on the semester system versus three offered during the quarter system. Advisors advise students in spring and the next GWAR exam isn’t offered until early September. When advisors see students in fall, the GWAR exam is the next February. D. Boschini said that has real implications for GI 2025. If they have a conflict, they have to wait a year. A. Hegde asked if students are limited to only two attempts. K. Ziegler has heard of that restriction. There has been an uptake of on-demand exams (test individual). The testing website posts a GWAR policy, but the hyperlink to the policy and sample exam is
not visible for students to access. V. Harper is aware of the problem and has been in conversation with K. Flachmann about increasing the test frequency. He will follow-up on the number of test attempts. D. Boschini stated that students are not aware of the testing rules and they need to have the policy readily available. She thanked Senator Ziegler-Lopez for bringing this to the Senate’s attention.

g) ASI Report (A. Schmidt) ASI is thrilled with the proposed Governor’s Budget of $15 million for the basic needs initiative which provides funding to student housing security, food security, and mental health. There will be legislative visits this month. Lobby Core is planning meetings to strengthen relationships with legislators before heading up to Sacramento with President Zelezny. Senator Schmidt is going to a CSSA meeting to interview next year’s Student Trustee candidates for the Governor appointment. ASI is going forward with a Wishing Tree Project. It’s an annual gift to the graduating class. The intent is to partner with the Alumni Association at graduation to commemorate students entering the next step in life.

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

a) New Business

i) RES 181907 Academic Calendars Summer 2019 through Summer 2020 First Reading

BPC proposed that a task force is needed for the purpose of getting approval of the calendar before December. Several suggestions were made for the task force. D. Boschini advised the group that the Senate may need to approve the resolution based on start and stop dates and then issue a revised, corrected copy. V. Harper said that the dates in the middle are highly inter-related to financial aid, EM, etc. D. Boschini said that the thesis date can be narrow conversation. The advising dates is a bigger conversation involving EM and considering the consequences on students in ways we may not know why those dates were chosen. K. Ziegler said that the informal date has been a problem in the past when they’re trying to get a finalized course list, advising has been told that “advising doesn’t start until this date”. That means that meeting with students informally prior to that date runs into the hold issue. Change in the dates and times of the classes advisors discussed with the
students is another issue. V. Harper will investigate the implications on holds and other things highly inter-related to the dates. J. Tarjan motioned to waive the First Reading. J. Millar seconded. Majority in favor. One “nay”. D. Boschini announced the start of the Second Reading. J. Tarjan moved to approve the calendar with the caveat that the BPC has the power to make the changes in accordance to the discussion. M. Martinez seconded. B. Street will put forth the issues to the task force over the coming weeks for long-term changes. D. Boschini thanked K. Ziegler for her advice. D. Boschini called the vote on the calendar with the understanding that BPC will make changes for the sake of the students. Approved unanimously.

ii) RES 181908 WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) Institutional Report First Reading D. Boschini introduced the resolution on behalf of the EC. Their recommendation is to pass it. There were no significant changes from draft #3 and the final version. A. Jacobson moved that the First Reading be waived. B. Street seconded. All approved. Second Reading – All in favor to endorse unanimous. D. Boschini thanked V. Harper for his leadership on the steering committee meetings. They were well organized and the assigning of tasks was skillful, especially the writing. Thanks to all who participated.

b) Old Business
i) RES 181905– Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution * Second Reading This resolution is the follow-up to the resolution that established the request to have an Ombudsperson. The second reading was deferred due to time and information from FAC chair, M. Rush, who was absent.

9) Open Forum Items (Time Certain 11:15)
M. Danforth said there is a rush for the Fall 2019 cohort to get graduated. However the things that are being asked of the Computer Science Department faculty are above and beyond breaking point. There needs to be a greater discussion than just putting on band aids to increase the graduation rate and how the pressure is affecting faculty members. For example, she had a student register late for a class, got on a waitlist of class needed for him to graduate in Spring. The department only has physical equipment for 24 students
and it can’t add another section and there isn’t a faculty member to teach another section. Faculty were asked, yet can’t, do an independent study because there is only enough equipment for 24. Plus there are six on the wait list. Some have accreditation requirements. The Computer Science curriculum is the Computer Science curriculum. There are equipment limitations, lab space limitations, and safety limitations. The structural and resources issues need to get addressed more broadly. J. Tarjan has PT Lecturers who are being asked to increase their caps and are not being consulted about taking on Individual Studies students without compensation. He has been inundated with requests for Independent Study. Someone is asking students to ask for Individual Study. Instead, give us more sections. Give us the faculty lines to accommodate students. Hire more faculty. D. Boschini said that Independent Study is for higher division, discipline-specific, heavy courses and we shouldn’t have PT doing Independent Study for that. V. Harper supports and respects faculty members who have concerns about the academic integrity of their program. The departments have absolute determination whether an Independent Study can be used for a student or different studies to help the students graduate. The Provost’s office is discovering other pathways for students to graduate. If there is an uncomfortable pressure point, bring it to him to take care of it. D. Boschini thanked V. Harper. J. Millar said that Independent Studies was brought up in EC as an option. D. Boschini replied that there will be more discussion. The obvious solution is to hire more faculty, and she will continue to state that more hiring is the solution. B. Street announced that judges are needed for the Student Research March 1, 9:00-2:00 p.m.

10) Adjournment

* Changes to the Handbook
The Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment invites you to:

CSU Data Dashboard for Student Success

WORKSHOP

February 26, 2019
9:00AM-12:00PM
Stockdale Room

Presenters:
Roy Stripling, Director, Chancellors Office, Student Success Dashboard Initiatives
Elka Lanco, Chancellor’s Office, Data Scientist, Student Success Dashboard Initiatives

Explore Reports
Open discussions
Q & A

Light refreshments will be provided

A live stream of this event will be available to faculty at both CSUB Main Campus and Antelope Valley. You can access the livestream via the URL below:

https://www.csub.edu/livestream/ssd/

Space is limited. Kindly RSVP by February 18th to Adrianna Hook - ahook@csub.edu
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

<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>08/29/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 02 Change of Membership on AAC and Change in Bylaws</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/06/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 03 GITF Hold Proposal</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>AAC’s feedback was incorporated into the proposal document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal</td>
<td>Pending feedback</td>
<td>AAC, BPC Pending feedback from advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 08 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>1/24/19</td>
<td>2/1/19</td>
<td>2/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 14 Catalog, Degree Audit, and Schedule Builder Technology and Process Integration</td>
<td>Viewing process flows</td>
<td>Viewing process flows of the annual vs. every two years, workload and implications</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 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

<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>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 05 Canvas Pilot</td>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>Recommendations made. Response received.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee</td>
<td>Referred to FAC</td>
<td>No further action from AS&amp;SS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 11 Textbook Ordering Process</td>
<td>Pending discussion</td>
<td>Pending discussion of the financial viability before the committee can make recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<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>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 07 Interdisciplinary Studies Department Formation Proposal</td>
<td>Pending others</td>
<td>AAC, BPC Pending feedback from advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 09 University Hour</td>
<td>Pending others</td>
<td>BPC Pending classroom utilization data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 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

<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>08/28/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 01 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181902 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee Second Reading 10/11/18</td>
<td>10/11/18</td>
<td>10/19/18</td>
<td>10/23/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 04 Ombudsperson</td>
<td></td>
<td>RES 181905 Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution Second Reading 11/29/18, 2/21/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>RES 181909 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change First Reading 2/21/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee</td>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>Referral moved from AS&amp;SS to FAC on 10/30/18. DLC is being codified and recommendations forthcoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 15_University Council Membership Addition-Library Representative – Handbook Change (105.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>RES 181910 University Council – Addition Library Member First Reading 2/21/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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. The faculty member may also consult the campus Faculty Ombudsperson for informal conflict resolution, or may proceed to formal procedures.

If a breach of professional responsibility is alleged that cannot be or is not adequately handled informally within the basic academic unit or with the Faculty Ombudsperson, 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.
Faculty Awards Process – Handbook Change

RES 181909

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of CSU Bakersfield recommend to the President that the University Handbook be revised as follows:

308  REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR SPECIAL AWARDS AND APPOINTMENTS
The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee (FHAC) is the University-wide committee responsible for reviewing and making recommendations for the granting of honors, awards, and distinctions as specified in this section, except for the Faculty Research Award. Recommendation for the latter is determined by the Research Council of the University. The FHAC consists of five (5) full-time tenured faculty elected by the faculty for two-year terms on a staggered basis. The faculty of the schools of Arts & Humanities, Business and Public Administration, Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Engineering, Social Sciences and Education shall each elect one member and an alternate from their respective school, and one member and one alternate shall be elected at large by the faculty. (Revised 6-28-18)

308.1 Appointment and Review of Endowed Professors
a. Endowed Professorships are positions that may be filled by individuals of various academic rank. Such professorships provide the University with the opportunity to augment faculty salaries in specific disciplines, to establish new field of expertise in specific departments and schools, and to bring nationally and internationally known scholars to CSUB.

b. Appointment procedures for Endowed Professorships shall follow those of regular appointments to faculty positions, with the exception that the search and screening committee shall include the members of the FHAC. The recommendations of the augmented search and screening committee shall be forwarded via the P&VPAA to the President for final action.

c. Faculty holding Endowed Professorships are subject to review on an annual basis in accord with current policies of the Board of Trustees. Review procedures for Endowed Professorships shall normally be those appropriate to the rank of the person being reviewed. It is anticipated that under normal circumstances the annual reviews required by the Board of Trustees shall be of routine nature for faculty holding tenured associate or tenured professor rank. Fifth-year reviews
shall be more extensive and in accord with regular RTP or post-tenure review procedures.

308.2 Emeritus Status
The award of Emeritus status to a retiring or retired faculty member is to be considered an honor bestowed in recognition of meritorious contributions to the University over an extended period. (Revised 2/24/16)

308.2.1 Eligibility
Emeritus status shall be granted to faculty members who, over an extended period of time, have a meritorious record in one or more of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and/or service. Of prime importance is demonstration of a strong commitment to the University, its goals, and general well-being as an academic institution within the community. The awarding of Emeritus status shall not be limited by considerations of rank or status. The Emeritus title shall be appended to the rank or status of the individual at or following the time of retirement. (Revised 2/24/16)

308.2.1b Posthumous Eligibility
A faculty member may be approved for Emeritus status posthumously, whether death is prior to or after separation from employment. (Added 2/24/16)

308.2.2 Nominations
Nominations and all relevant materials for Emeritus awards shall be submitted to the FHAC by any peer or group of peers, preferably from the faculty individual’s department or unit. In all instances, before making a decision regarding a nomination, the FHAC shall obtain documentation that the nominee’s department or equivalent unit considered the nomination and made a collective decision whether to support, oppose, or take no position regarding the nomination. If the nomination does not come from the individual’s department or unit, before making their recommendation to the President, the FHAC shall notify the appropriate department or unit of the nomination. The department or unit may notify the FHAC, in a timely manner, as to whether they endorse the nomination, oppose the nomination, or choose to make no recommendation on the nomination. The FHAC will report the department or unit’s position to the President as part of the materials they submit on that nominee. Nominations should include a supportive summary statement outlining the meritorious contributions. Recommendations may be supplemented by others or the person nominated. Personnel Action Files will not normally be considered during the award selection process. (Revised 2/24/16)

308.2.3 Number of Awards
The FHAC shall provide timely review of all nominations for Emeritus status for faculty members who have retired or for whose anticipated retirement date is within one year of the date of the nomination. Awards are to be regarded as an honor and a continuing commitment of the University to designated faculty members. There shall be no quota or limitation on the number of such awards each year. The committee shall submit all nominations and its recommendations directly to the President in a timely manner. The President shall make the final decision regarding awards. (Revised 6/22/16)
308.2.4 Privileges and Public Announcement
Public announcement of any Emeritus awards shall take place during an event suitable to the announcement. The award of Emeritus status shall entitle the recipient to the following:

a. A certificate of award of emeritus status at an event suitable to the announcement;
b. Listing within faculty roster published in the catalog and appropriate University or CSU system bulletins or announcements;
c. A faculty membership card for purposes of appropriate identification;
d. Library privileges and services ordinarily accorded to faculty;
e. Free parking privileges (issued annually);
f. Continuous access to a University email account.

The award of Emeritus status may also entitle the recipient to the following institutional courtesies or benefits when they are appropriate and available:

g. Timely notice of all General Faculty meetings and events of the University and such other notices as desired;
h. Mail services, including the mailing of appropriate faculty notices;
i. Space for scholarly or other professional pursuits, as available;
j. Access to and appropriate use of campus buildings, including spaces for conference and laboratory facilities;
k. Use of campus recreational facilities with payment of membership fee;
l. Discounts for specified commercial events or programs sponsored by CSUB;
m. Free passes or discounts to University athletics events;
n. Limited use of telephone and Reprographics services; (Revised 2/24/16)

308.3 Annual Faculty Awards for Excellence
The following honors are annually bestowed upon faculty members who have distinguished themselves in areas of teaching, faculty leadership and service, or in research. In addition, the campus nominates faculty for the system-wide Wang Family Excellence Award.

308.3.1 The Millie Ablin Excellence in Teaching Award
The Millie Ablin Excellence in Teaching Award is intended to recognize and encourage excellence in teaching.

308.3.1.1 Selection
A nominee may be chosen annually by the Academic Senate on recommendation of the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee augmented by a student member appointed by the President of the Associated Students.

308.3.2 Faculty Leadership and Service Award
The Faculty Leadership and Service Award has been established by the Academic Senate of CSUB in order to recognize and encourage outstanding contributions by faculty to the principle and practice of shared governance on this campus as well as service to the community and the University service region.
308.3.2.1 Selection
The Faculty Leadership and Service Award nominee may be chosen annually by the Academic Senate on recommendation of the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee.

308.3.2.2 Procedures
a. In the third week of Spring semester each year the P&VPAA shall notify the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee of the timeline for proceeding. The P&VPAA and the Chair of the Academic Senate shall send out a call for nominations. This announcement shall include a deadline for submission and a description of the requirements for nomination. (Revised 06-06-17)

b. Any full-time faculty member of the CSUB faculty is eligible for nomination by administrators, faculty, students, or alumni. No self-nominations shall be accepted. A completed nomination form, the nominee’s current abbreviated vita, and a signed, written statement not exceeding 600 words, summarizing the nominator’s reasons for supporting the nominee shall be submitted. The statement should be concise and factual and confined to issues related directly to matters of shared governance and community service. The criteria for the award, as set forth by the Academic Senate of the California State University, Bakersfield, call for outstanding efforts and service toward collegial governance and service to the community and the university service region. Scholarship, creative activity, and teaching are important but may not substitute for a candidate’s service and leadership. (Revised 06-06-17)

c. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee may, in seeking to make a selection, solicit additional information about the candidate that it deems relevant and necessary to make an informed judgment on a worthy nominee for the award. Materials submitted for consideration and those solicited, as well as all committee deliberations concerning them, shall be held in strict confidence.

d. In all instances, before making a decision regarding a nomination, the FHAC shall obtain documentation that the nominee’s department or equivalent unit considered the nomination and made a collective decision whether to support, oppose, or take no position regarding the nomination.

e. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee may submit the name of its nominee for the Faculty Leadership and Service Award to the Academic Senate for approval. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee is not obligated to forward a nomination if a worthy candidate is not identified.

308.3.3 Faculty Scholarship and Creative Activity Award
The Faculty Scholarship and Creative Activity Award has been established to recognize and encourage outstanding contributions to the principle and practice of research in academia.

308.3.3.1 Selection
The Faculty Scholarship and Creative Activity Award nominee may be chosen annually by the Academic Senate on recommendation of the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee.

308.3.3.2 Procedures
a. In the third week of Spring semester each year, the P&VPAA and the Chair of the Academic Senate shall send out a call for nominations. This announcement shall
include a deadline for submission and a description of the requirements for nomination. *(Revised 06-06-17)*

b. Any full-time faculty member of the CSUB faculty is eligible for nomination by administrators, faculty, students, or alumni. A nomination must include the nominee’s most current abbreviated vita accompanied by a signed, written statement not exceeding 600 words, summarizing the nominator’s reasons for supporting the nominee. The statement should be concise and factual. The ONLY criteria for the award shall be outstanding research or creative achievement.

c. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee may, in seeking to make a selection, solicit additional information about the candidates that it deems relevant and necessary to make an informed judgment on the worthiness of the nominee for the award. Material solicited and submitted for consideration, as well as all committee deliberations, shall be held in strict confidence.

d. **In all instances, before making a decision regarding a nomination, the FHAC shall obtain documentation that the nominee’s department or equivalent unit considered the nomination and made a collective decision whether to support, oppose, or take no position regarding the nomination.**

e. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee may submit the name of its nominee for the Faculty Scholarship and Creative Activity Award to the Academic Senate for approval. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee is not obligated to forward a nomination if a worthy candidate is not identified.

### 308.3.4 Promising New Faculty Award

The Promising New Faculty Award has been established to recognize exemplary achievements in teaching, research, scholarship, creative activities, and/or service among all full-time, tenure-track faculty (or Assistant Professors). *(Added 06-06-17)*

#### 308.3.4.1 Selection

The Promising New Faculty Award nominee may be chosen annually by the Academic Senate on recommendation of the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee. *(Added 06-06-17)*

#### 308.3.4.2 Procedures

a. In the third week of Spring semester each year, the P&VPAA and the Chair of the Academic Senate shall send out a call for nominations. This announcement shall include a deadline for submission and a description of the requirements for nomination. *(Added 06-06-17)*

b. Any full-time, tenure-track assistant professor of the CSUB faculty is eligible for nomination by administrators, faculty, students, or alumni. No self-nominations shall be accepted. A completed nomination form, the nominee’s current abbreviated vita, and a signed, written statement, not exceeding 600 words, summarizing the nominator’s reasons for supporting the nominee shall be submitted. The statement should be concise and factual and confined to issues related directly to the contributions, achievements, and currency as articulated in criteria for selection. The criteria for the award, as set forth by the Academic Senate of the California State University, Bakersfield, call for the following:
Contribution: The primary criterion is outstanding, demonstrated, significant contributions to teaching, research, scholarship, creative activities, and/or service.

Achievement: There must be evidence that the nominee has performed work of superb achievement as demonstrated by publication or artistic production and evaluation by peer review.

Currency: Nominees shall be scholars who are current with developments and findings in their field and in the use of effective pedagogy. *(Added 06-06-17)*

c. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee may, in seeking to make a selection, solicit additional information about the candidates that it deems relevant and necessary to make an informed judgment on the worthiness of the nominee for the Promising New Faculty Award. Material solicited and submitted for consideration, as well as all committee deliberations, shall be held in strict confidence. *(Added 06-06-17)*

d. **In all instances, before making a decision regarding a nomination, the FHAC shall obtain documentation that the nominee’s department or equivalent unit considered the nomination and made a collective decision whether to support, oppose, or take no position regarding the nomination.**

e. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee may submit the name of its nominee for the Promising New Faculty Award to the Academic Senate for approval. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee is not obligated to forward a nomination if a worthy candidate is not identified. *(Added 06-06-17)*

308.3.5 Outstanding Lecturer Award
CSUB is committed to providing encouragement and supporting outstanding teaching achievements by full-time lecturers. The Outstanding Lecturer Award has been established to honor a full-time lecturer for excellence in teaching effectiveness and service to the CSUB campus community. *(Revised 06-06-17)*

308.3.5.1 Selection
The Outstanding Lecturer Award nominee may be chosen annually by the Academic Senate on recommendation of the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee. *(Added 06-06-17)*

308.3.5.2 Procedures
a. In the third week of Spring semester each year, the P&VPAA and the Chair of the Academic Senate shall send out a call for nominations. No self-nominations shall be accepted. This announcement shall include a deadline for submission and a description of the requirements for nomination. *(Added 06-06-17)*

b. All full-time lecturers (as defined by the CSU collective bargaining agreement) with one or more years of full-time teaching at CSUB are eligible to receive the Outstanding Lecturer Award
provided they are teaching full time in the year of the award application. The following criteria shall be used:

Teaching Effectiveness: The principal criterion for receiving this award shall be a sustained record of outstanding teaching across multiple terms as evidenced by:

- Summaries of student evaluations and sample comments from students
- Active participation in curriculum development or improvement, assessment, pedagogical improvement, innovation, or integration of high impact practices into teaching
- Peer observations of teaching.

Service: Engaging in service to the campus and/or contributions beyond classroom teaching that benefits students. Examples may include involving students in research, scholarship or creative activities; conducting extra-curricular activities with students; leading field trips; advising student clubs or organizations; and mentoring/advising students.

Currency: Nominees should be current with developments and findings in their field and in the use of effective pedagogy. (Added 06-06-17)

c. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee may, in seeking to make a selection, solicit additional information about the candidates that it deems relevant and necessary to make an informed judgment on the worthiness of the nominee for the award. Material solicited and submitted for consideration, as well as all committee deliberations, shall be held in strict confidence. (Added 06-06-17)

d. In all instances, before making a decision regarding a nomination, the FHAC shall obtain documentation that the nominee’s department or equivalent unit considered the nomination and made a collective decision whether to support, oppose, or take no position regarding the nomination.

e. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee may submit the name of its nominee for the Outstanding Lecturer Award to the Academic Senate for approval. The Faculty Honors and Awards Committee is not obligated to forward a nomination if a worthy candidate is not identified. (Added 06-06-17)

RATIONALE: To make clear the expectation that the FHAC will consult with departments or programs with regard to the veracity of information put forth for an award nominee in order to help ensure the integrity of all such awards at CSU, Bakersfield.
RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of CSU Bakersfield recommend to the President that the Dean of the Library be included among the Deans as a member of the University Council.

RATIONALE: Because the President wants it, and the Dean said okay.