



Academic Senate: Executive Committee

AGENDA

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2026

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 AM

Location: BPA Conference Room 134 and virtual.

Zoom Link: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/88091986667?pwd=GOSakqXvulfaZihtNxTsAFBYwWqAJs.1>

Members: M. Danforth (Chair), D. Solano (Vice-Chair), D. Thien (Provost), C. Lam (ASCSU Senator), N. Michieka (ASCSU Senator), T. Tsantsoulas (AAC Chair), L. Kirstein (AS&SS Chair), A. Grombly (BPC Chair), Z. Zenko (FAC Chair), and K. Van-Grinsven (Senate Analyst).

Guest: E. Adams, Interim AVP

1. Call to Order
2. Announcements and Information
 - A. Course Coding Changes, Title 5 and WASC Faculty Co-Chair Working Groups – E. Adams, AVP for Academic Operations and Dean of Academic Programs **(Time Certain: 10:10 AM)**
 - B. Spring General Faculty Meeting – Friday, January 30 (handouts)
 - i. Agenda updates
 - ii. Review faculty feedback
 - C. Fong and Fetterly Award Committee (handout)
 - D. Spring 2026 Guests
 - i. EC Guests
 - ii. Senate Guests
 - a. J. Watkins – Center for Accessibility and Essential Needs
 - b. K. De Young – Facilities
 - iii. Annual Reports to Senate
 - a. FTLC, GECCo, GRaSP, UPRC, URC (?), etc.
3. Approval of Agenda **(Time Certain: 10:05 AM)**
4. Approval of Minutes
 - A. January 20, 2026 (handout)
5. Continued Items **(Time Certain: 10:30 AM)**

- A. AS Referral Log (see BOX folder; handout)
 - i. AAC (T. Tsantsoulas)
 - ii. AS&SS (L. Kirstein)
 - iii. BPC (A. Grombly)
 - iv. FAC (Z. Zenko)
 - B. Provost Report (D. Thien) **(Time Certain: 10:45 AM)**
 - i. Status of:
 - a. Academic Administrator Searches
 - b. Academic Administrator Reviews
 - C. Reports and Recommendations
 - i. Criteria for Proposing New Schools Taskforce (handout)
 - D. ASI Resolution: SB 104 ASI and Shared Governance (Hold; waiting for ASI's revisions) (handout)
 - E. Policies on Approval of Course Coding Changes (handout)
 - F. Calendar Committee – A. Grombly, BPC Chair
 - G. **Amended** “Statements of the Senate” Process and Formal Policy for General Faculty to bring a resolution to the Senate – EC (handout) **(Time Certain: 11:00 AM)**
6. New Discussion Items ~~(Time Certain: 11:00 AM)~~ **Amended**
- A. Elections and Appointments- D. Solano
 - i. Exceptional Service Award- Applications Due February 2, 2026, 5 pm
 - ii. Election closing for Senate Chair; next open call for Senate Vice-Chair
 - B. Items from Advising Council
 - i. OnBase vs. Runner Connect
 - ii. CSU-wide Degree Audit and Planner Tool – AS&SS and (?)
 - a. uAchieve (software the Chancellor's Office has chosen)
 - iii. Faculty advising holds
 - C. Development of a Senate Recording Retention Policy for recordings that are intended to develop Minutes
 - D. ASI Requests – AS&SS and AAC (?) (handout)
 - i. Office Hours
 - ii. Reporting Grades
 - E. Updates to the Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) Membership and Description – AAC, AS&SS and FAC (?) (handout)
 - F. Handbook and Bylaws Project – EC (handout)
 - G. Proposed updates to 308.2.4 Emeriti Privileges and Public Announcement (handout)
 - H. **Amended** Dean's List policy – AAC (?) (handout)
7. Agenda Items for Senate **(Time Certain: 11:15 AM)**

Academic Senate Meeting – Spring 2026

Thursday, January 30, 2026

Agenda
10:00 AM – 11:30 AM

Location: Dezember Leadership and Development Center, Room 409-411

Zoom Link: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/84669370314?pwd=gmLoywwMxQR4k7G0hUhv25vs0N8xr8.1>

Senate Members: Chair M. Danforth, Vice-Chair D. Solano, CSU Senator C. Lam, CSU Senator N. Michieka, AH Senator T. Tsantsoulas, AH Senator M. Naser, BPA Senator D. Wu, BPA Senator S. Sarma, NSME Senator L. Kirstein, NSME Senator A. Stokes, SSE Senator Z. Zenko, SSE Senator S. Roberts (alt. for Spring 2026 K. Henderson), AV Senator K. Holloway, At-Large Senator H. He, At-Large Senator A. Grombly, At-Large Senator A. Hays, At-Large Senator A. Lauer, At-Large Senator T. Salisbury, At-Large Senator R. Dugan, Lecturer Electorate Senator D. Horn, Senator H. Gonzalez – Staff Representative, Senator A. Reyes – ASI President, VP AA & Provost D. Thien, Senator J. Dong – Dean Representative, and Senate Analyst K. Van Grinsven.

Guests: President Harper

- I. Call to Order and Tejon Tribal Land Acknowledgement
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - a. December 4, 2025 (handout)
- III. Announcements and Information
 - a. President's Report – V. Harper (**Time Certain: 10:10 AM**)
 - b. Elections and Appointments – D. Solano (handout)
 - c. Upcoming Events: (handouts)
 - i. Spring General Faculty Meeting – January 30, 2026
 1. 8 am – 2 pm; Student Union MPR and Virtual
 - ii. CSUB Strategic Plan Town Hall – February 4, 2026
 1. 11 am – 12:30 pm
 2. Student Union MPR
 - iii. AV Campus Strategic Plan Town Hall – February 6, 2026
 1. 11 am – 12:30 pm
 2. Zoom information: 612 886 7903
 - iv. **Amended** Spring Budget Open Forum, President's Open Forum, and Committee on Professional Responsibility Town Hall
- IV. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:05 AM**)
- V. Reports
 - a. ASI Report – Senator Reyes (handout)

- b. Provost's Report – D. Thien (handout) **(Time Certain: 10:25 AM)**
- c. ASCSU Report – Senators Lam and Michieka (handout)
- d. Staff Report – Senator Gonzalez (handout)
- e. Committee Reports:
 - i. Executive Committee – Vice-Chair Solano (handout)
 - ii. Standing Committees:
 - 1. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) – Senator Tsantsoulas (handout)
 - 2. Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS) – Senator Kirstein (handout)
 - 3. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) – Senator Grombly (handout)
 - 4. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – Senator Stokes, FAC Vice-Chair (handout)
- f. CFA Report – T. Salisbury, CFA Bakersfield (handout)

VI. Resolutions **(Time Certain: 10:30 AM)**

- a. Consent Agenda: No items.
- b. Old Business:
 - i. RES 252618 – Special Review Committee for Anthropology – AAC and BPC (handout)
 - ii. RES 252614 – Minor in Creative Writing – AAC and BPC (handout)
 - iii. RES 252615 – Computer Science Cybersecurity Concentration– AAC and BPC (handout)
 - iv. RES 252610 – Unit RTP and PTR Composition- Handbook Change – FAC (HOLD)
- c. New Business:
 - i. RES 252620 – Transitioning to Online SOCIs-Handbook Change – FAC (handout)
 - ii. RES 252621 – Department Chair Terms-Handbook Change – FAC (handout)
 - iii. **Amended** RES 252622 – Academic Advising Structure Is an Academic Endeavor – AAC and AS&SS (handout)

VII. Open Forum **(Time Certain: 11:15 AM)**

VIII. Adjournment

8. Adjournment



GENERAL FACULTY

meeting

SPRING 2026

AGENDA

Continental Breakfast
(Sponsored by Provost Thien)

8:00 am

OPEN SESSION

Welcome Address – Dr. Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair
President's Remarks and Q&A – Dr. Vernon B. Harper Jr.
Provost's Remarks and Q&A – Dr. Deborah Thien
Break

8:20 – 8:30 am
8:30 – 9:15 am
9:15 – 10:00 am
10:00 – 10:15 am

FACULTY ONLY SESSION

Faculty Ombudsperson – Dr. Aaron Hegde

10:15 – 10:30 am

Committee on Professional Responsibility – Dr. Nate Olson

10:30 – 10:45 am

Overview of Faculty Concerns from RSVPs –
Dr. Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair

10:45 – 11:00 am

Open Forum – Dr. Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair

11:00 am – Noon

Lunch (Sponsored by Provost Thien)

Noon – 12:30 pm

CFA Updates – Dr. Tracey Salisbury, CFA President

12:30 – 12:45 pm

Instructional Materials Accessibility Deadline –
Chris Diniz, Associate Vice President & Chief Information Officer

1:00 – 1:15 pm

Senate Updates and Upcoming Business:

1:15 – 2:00 pm

Dr. Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair
Dr. Dani Solano, Academic Senate Vice-Chair



Katherine Van Grinsven

**Announcement (Urgent call): Fong and Fetterly Award
Committee**

From: Lori Blodorn
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 11:56 AM
To: Melissa Danforth
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: RE: Fong and Fetterly Award committee

Understood, thanks Melissa. Sorry for the short timeframe. We'll have more lead time next year since we'll know it's coming.

Best,
Lori

Lori A. Blodorn, J.D., SPHR, SHRM-SCP
(she|her)
Vice President, People and Culture
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 37 ADM
Bakersfield, CA 93311
Main: (661) 654-2266
Direct: (661) 654-3206

Human Resources|Employee and Labor Relations|Organizational Excellence|Safety and Risk Management|Civil Rights
and Compliance|Culture and Belonging|Payroll CSUB Careers

-----Original Message-----

From: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 10:36 AM
To: Lori Blodorn <lblodorn@csub.edu>
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: RE: Fong and Fetterly Award committee

Hi Lori,

I'll discuss this with Senate Exec tomorrow morning. Given the tight turn-around, the best we could manage is asking for volunteers. There is insufficient time for a full call cycle if the plan is to meet next week.

Thanks,
Melissa

-----Original Message-----

From: Lori Blodorn <lblodorn@csb.edu>
Sent: Sunday, January 25, 2026 7:22 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>
Subject: Fong and Fetterly Award committee

Hi Melissa,

I've been asked to put together a committee to review submissions for the Fong and Fetterly award to review the nominations from our campus. I am hoping that academic senate can recommend 2 committee members to help us review the submissions and recommend nominees to the president to move forward in each category to the CO. We would need to meet the first week of February to review submissions.

Can you assist me with this?

Thanks,
Lori

Academic Senate Task Force

School Formation Criteria

During Fall 2024, the California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) Academic Senate Executive Committee requested that the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), Budget and Planning Committee (BPC), Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS), and Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) address the issue of school formation criteria. The standing committees elected representatives to an ad hoc task force to create new school formation policies and procedures, with representatives from the AAC, BPC, AS&SS, and FAC.

Since there are no existing policies on new school formation, the task force completed an extensive review of example policies from other California State University (CSU) campuses. The current document represents a consensus recommendation from the task force for a new policy document. We share this document with the standing committees and invite comments and suggestions, if any.

Composition of Criteria for Proposing New Schools Task Force:

Yangsuk Ko (Chair), Amber Stokes (FAC), Debbie Wilson (AS&SS), Heidi He (AAC), Rhonda Dugan (BPC), Deborah Cours (dean representative), and Laura Ann Bishop (staff).

CSU Bakersfield
Policies and Procedures for Establishing New Schools

- I. Policy Purpose
 - A. The process for creating new schools within the colleges should be uniform and transparent.
 - B. A uniform system of school creation shall allow for fair and efficient mechanisms to be in place for interested parties to create schools.
- II. Policy
 - A. Definitions and Operative Terms
 - i. Principal academic sub-units are colleges at California State University, Bakersfield, whose chief primary academic/administrative officers are deans. Departments, schools, and programs are standard terms for units within colleges.
 - ii. Departments and schools are each part of a college, reporting to a college dean. Schools may, but need not necessarily, include more than one department, division, or program, as well as centers and institutes.
 - iii. Academic departments or schools serve as administrative units within the university's respective colleges and are organized around specific fields of academic inquiry and pedagogical outcomes.
 - iv. Departments offer a major, minor, and/or credential, and may offer a certificate. Schools, and any subordinate departments located within the school, will offer majors, minors, and/or credentials, and may offer a certificate.
 - v. Departments are led by department chairs, and schools by directors. In a school with multiple departments, department chairs will report to the school director. Both department chairs and school directors will be selected according to the University Handbook, and report to the dean of a college. The director of a school which has multiple departments from different colleges will report to the dean of the college in which the school is located.
 - vi. Considerations that will normally apply in designation of one or more units as a school include professional accreditation, licensing, or certification requirements for graduates, size of the unit(s) and common practice in higher education of administratively referring to the discipline as a school.
 - B. Purpose of an Academic School
 - i. The purpose of a school is to support the mission of the university by offering academic programs in the disciplines it houses, promoting academic inquiry and critical thinking within and across disciplines, and engaging in disciplinary and interdisciplinary research, scholarship, and creative activities.
 - ii. To qualify as a school, the proposed entity must:
 - 1. Offer a set of academic programs, approved through the appropriate curricular review process (department, college, university, and CSU system levels), that lead to undergraduate or graduate degrees.
 - 2. Ensure to its faculty the rights and responsibilities of Academic Freedom, as defined by the American Association of University Professors, to engage in free inquiry and dissent in both scholarship and instruction. This includes the rights of the school and units within to initiate curricular proposals, to make autonomous decisions on instructional materials, pedagogy, delivery mode, and grading systems/practices. The faculty unit is free to offer its own views and interpretations that may dissent from the received views of either the discipline or in any other arena of society.

3. Be mainly comprised of Unit 3 faculty, who are subject to the rights and responsibilities of the CFA-CSU collective bargaining agreement, the CSUB University Handbook, and other relevant university policies.

III. Formation of New Schools, or Modifications to Existing Schools

- A. A new school may be formed as (1) an entirely new entity, (2) a result of dividing an existing school, (3) a result of combining two or more existing schools, or (4) a result of combining two or more departments from one college or from different colleges into a single school.
- B. Requests to change the structure of an already existing school should usually emerge from the concerns of the faculty, the school director and/or the dean directly involved. However, other individuals of the university may suggest that the faculty examine the effectiveness of the present school structure, especially as part of the Program Review process.
- C. If the change affects more than one college, then more than one dean will be involved, so any references to a dean in this policy statement implies more than one dean if the situation is so indicated.
- D. Collegiality is the fundamental principle upon which the governance of the university rests. At any point in this process, any of the parties involved may consult informally with anyone in the campus community whose contribution seems desirable.

IV. Procedures for Establishing a New School

- A. Initiation of Proposal
 - i. Faculty members, departments, schools, colleges or administrative officers of the university may initiate discussion and consultation processes to consider the establishment of a new academic school.
 - ii. When considering a change in school structure, the relevant faculty, the appropriate college dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA) should engage in considerable informal discussion. These people should solicit advice from other potentially interested parties, possibly including faculty in other departments, schools, or colleges as well as the Academic Senate.
 - iii. When informal discussions appear to have elicited all relevant issues and concerns, the faculty who wish to form the new school should write a proposal that addresses all areas set forth below in New School Proposal: Contents.
 - iv. The initial request should be submitted in writing to the appropriate dean(s). Due to the potential impact on departments/schools/colleges/programs, faculty, staff, and students, the proposal must follow the guidelines and review process set forth below in New School Proposal: Procedure for Review.
- B. New School Proposal: Contents
 - i. Background and Introduction
 1. The exact name of the proposed school and name(s) of individual(s) preparing the proposal;
 2. Description of the consultation process and informal discussions that occurred prior to the submission of the proposal (Initiation of Proposal);
 3. Description of possible consequences for not forming the new school;
 4. Statement of how the proposed school may advance the campus' vision, mission, and goals;
 5. Statement of how the proposed school will better serve the needs of institution, students, faculty and staff; and contribute to the recruitment and retention of a high quality and diverse faculty;

6. Statement of how the proposed school will provide added value or benefits to CSUB, enhance the relationships of the college(s) where the school is housed, including its faculty, students, and the greater community;

- ii. Faculty Composition

Include the following information:

- a. Regardless of whether the proposed school has one or multiple departments, include the name of each department, the name of the department chair, number of faculty in each department including the ranks (lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor), and current college or school affiliation. In the case of school restructuring, also include whether the listed departments will be moved to the new school or jointly appointed between their prior academic units and the new school.
 - b. If the new school is breaking away or drawing members from existing schools/ colleges, list all foreseeable effects that this change would have on other department(s), school(s), or college(s) in terms of name change, number of faculty, support staff, curriculum, operating budget, or space, etc.
 - c. Results of a vote from each college directly affected, including written comments from affected academic program chair(s)/director(s) and faculty. Anonymity, if requested, should be accommodated and respected throughout the process.
- iii. In the case of impacts on schools, colleges or programs with external accreditation, provide the rationale and justification for creating the school that aligns with accreditation requirements.

- C. Budgetary, Financial, and other Resource Considerations

In general, creating the school should be completed in a budget-neutral manner. Release time for the director and staff time for the school office should be covered by reallocation from existing resources within the colleges, departments, and programs involved. The director should be a faculty member on course release, not an administrator.

- D. Planned Implementation and Timeline

- i. The proposed date of implementation and the appropriate timeline for the process of implementation.
- ii. Include important milestones and dates for the development of the school.


- V. New School Proposal: Procedure for Review

The proposal must pass through the following levels of review in the order indicated. The individual(s) at each level review the proposal, consult with others as appropriate, and then either forward it to the next level with a positive recommendation or provide a written explanation of the reasons for withholding approval. If the proposal fails to receive approval at any level, the proposal shall not proceed to the next level of review. The proposers may choose to revise and resubmit to that specific level of review. Any revisions of a proposal shall be communicated with previous levels of review. All levels of review must be documented clearly for subsequent review levels:

- i. The initial proposal must be submitted to the appropriate dean(s) for consultation

and signature(s). The dean(s) shall provide written comments/recommendations to the originator(s) of the proposal.

- ii. The proposal, including responses and revisions based on feedback from the dean(s), shall then be submitted to the P&VPAA, who shall consult with the Council of Deans and provide written comments/recommendations reflecting their own review and feedback from the council.
- iii. The revised proposal, including responses and revisions based on feedback from the dean(s), P&VPAA, and Dean's Council, shall then be submitted to the Academic Senate, through the Executive Committee. If all prior levels of review are deemed to have been satisfied, the proposal shall be forwarded to the Standing Committees for review. Each Standing Committee will review the proposal and provide their comments/recommendations.
- iv. If the revised proposal receives approvals from all prior levels of review, the proposal will then be sent to the full Academic Senate for review and final approval.
- v. The approved proposal shall then be forwarded to the President for their final decision regarding the proposal.

Signature: 
Email: yko@csub.edu


Signature: 
Email: lbishop@csub.edu

Signature: 
Deborah Cours (Dec 9, 2025 16:23:22 PST)
Email: dcours@csub.edu

Signature: 
Email: rdugan2@csub.edu

Signature: 
Email: hhe@csub.edu

Signature: *Amber Stokes*
Email: astokes2@csub.edu

Signature: 
Debbie Wilson (Dec 9, 2025 15:15:27 PST)
Email: dwilson4@csub.edu



SB 104
ASI and Shared Governance

- WHEREAS: The Associated Students, Incorporated (ASI) of California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) is the official representative body, and the voice of CSUB's approximately 11,000 students and is entrusted to represent the best interests of their constituencies; AND
- WHEREAS: The Chancellor's Office passed Coded Memorandum AA-2009-02, the university is responsible for student participants; AND
- WHEREAS: The coded memorandum requires "that associated student body organizations are involved in campus policy development as full participants"¹; AND
- WHEREAS: The coded memorandum also encourages that the "[university] presidents will provide these officially recognized associated student body organizations an opportunity to offer opinions and make recommendations about campus policy and procedures that have or will have an effect upon students"¹; AND
- WHEREAS: The coded memorandum states that there must be "accommodations [made] of the participating students' academic schedules when setting campus committee meetings"¹; AND
- WHEREAS: The CSU Board of Trustees passed the Student Participation in Policy Development resolution² that reaffirms the coded memorandum AA-2009-02; AND
- WHEREAS: The CSU Board of Trustees resolution states that the university "presidents will provide these officially recognized associated student body organizations an opportunity to offer opinions and make recommendations about campus policy and procedures that have or will have an effect upon students"³; AND
- WHEREAS: The California State Student Association (CSSA) Shared Governance Resolution defines shared governance as "the expectation of consistent collaboration among students, faculty, staff, and administration in making decisions that impact the campus and its community"⁴; AND
- WHEREAS: The CSSA also notes that "students are key stakeholders on any university campus and as such are subject to direct and indirect impacts made by university policies, procedures, and decisions"⁴; AND

(cont.)

¹ <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/9823399/latest/>

² <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/resolutions/bot-resolutions-jul2001.pdf>

³ <https://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul01/edpol.pdf>

⁴ <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/resolutions/bot-resolutions-jul2001.pdf>

- WHEREAS: The CSUB Core Values emphasize “promoting active and informed engagement in shared governance of students, faculty, and staff”⁵; AND
- WHEREAS: The CSUB Budget Book defines shared governance as “the collaborative process used to inform and affect decisions related to the university strategic planning and budget advisory committee process and recommendations to the president on the prioritization of available budget resources”⁶; AND
- WHEREAS: The CSUB University Handbook states “the basic concepts of shared governance are crucial to the development of trust and communication among staff, faculty, administration, and students”⁷; AND
- WHEREAS: ASI, and other student leaders, have perceived that their voices during meetings are not appreciated and they are there to “check the box” that a student was present; THEREFORE, LET IT BE
- RESOLVED: That ASI stresses the importance of shared governance and calls for active inclusion of students as equal partners in university policies, procedures, and decisions; AND LET IT BE FURTHER
- RESOLVED: That all campus committees must include a section on shared governance in their governing documents and must clearly outline how students, faculty, and staff participate in the decision-making process; AND LET IT BE FURTHER
- RESOLVED: That a student representative shall sit on every campus committee, and that such student representatives must be appointed by ASI to sit on the committee; AND LET IT BE FURTHER
- RESOLVED: That if the appointed student cannot attend a committee meeting due to an academic schedule conflict, the committee chair shall defer to ASI before the committee meeting takes place so that an appropriate student can be found to ensure that the student voice is captured; AND LET IT BE FURTHER
- RESOLVED: That all campus departments shall include verbiage on their official website highlighting CSUB’s Core Value of shared governance, emphasizing the role of students in policies, procedures, and decision-making; AND LET IT BE FURTHER
- RESOLVED: That CSUB administration, faculty, and staff honor the principles of shared governance by accommodating students’ academic schedules when scheduling meetings and by ensuring full transparent communication regarding decisions that directly or indirectly affects students; AND LET IT BE FINALLY

(cont.)

⁵ <https://www.csub.edu/about/mission.shtml>

⁶ https://www.csub.edu/budget/_files/budgetbook/2018-19/2018-19-UBB-Chapter-9-Glossary.pdf

⁷ https://www.csub.edu/senate/_files/University_Handbook_2024.pdf

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be distributed to the following: University President – Dr. Vernon B. Harper Jr., Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs – Deborah Thien, Vice President for Student Affairs and Strategic Enrollment Management – Dr. Dwayne Cantrell, Vice President for Business and Administrative Services – Dr. Kristen Watson, Vice President for University Advancement – Heath Niemeyer, Vice President of People and Culture – Lori Blodorn, Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach and Special Assistant to the President for External Affairs – James Rodriguez, Interim Director of Athletics – Dr. Sarah Tuohy, and Academic Senate Chair – Dr. Melissa Danforth.

Creation Date: 08.23.25

Approved by the ASI Board of Directors: 8.29.25

Approved by:

Marcos Ramirez

Marcos Ramirez (Sep 12, 2025 20:24:37 PDT)

Marcos Ramirez, Vice President of University Affairs

Antonio Reyes

Antonio Reyes (Sep 13, 2025 20:30:41 PDT)

Antonio Reyes, ASI President

Acknowledgement:

In the spirit of shared governance, and to show that you have read through this resolution and will commit to its contents, please sign below.

Dr. Vernon B. Harper Jr., University President

Dr. Deborah Thien, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dr. Dwayne Cantrell, Vice President for Student Affairs and Strategic Enrollment Management

Dr. Kristen Watson, Vice President for Business and Administrative Services

Heath Niemeyer, Vice President for University Advancement

Lori Blodorn, Vice President of People and Culture

James Rodriguez, Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach and Special Assistant to the President for External Affairs

Dr. Sarah Tuohy, Interim Director of Athletics

Dr. Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 3:31 PM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven
Cc: Danielle Solano
Subject: Re: DNP course coding

Hi Katie,

Let's call it "Policies on Approval of Course Coding Changes". This will cover other situations beyond changing the CS#, like changing the number of units in a class.

And I too had to Google to find the course classification number (CS#) guide, which looks identical to what I recall from Q2S:

https://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/_files/Course_Classification_Numbers.pdf

Once I knew the filename, I was able to find it on <https://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/new-catalogandcurriculum-process-8-12-25.shtml> but not on the older Academic Planning Manual page.

Melissa

From: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csb.edu>
Date: Thursday, September 25, 2025 at 3:11 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>
Cc: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csb.edu>
Subject: RE: DNP course coding

New discussion item for EC? Topic title – course coding?

–

KATHERINE VAN GRINSVEN

She/her/hers
Senate Analyst
Office of the Academic Senate
Direct Line: (661) 654-3128
Office: BDC A 252

California State University, Bakersfield

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

www.csub.edu/senate



Confidentiality Notice - This entire e-mail message (including all forwards and replies) and/or any attachments, are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain proprietary, confidential, or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 2:04 PM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Cc: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>
Subject: Re: DNP course coding

Hi Katie and Dani,

Since we don't have a policy on changing WTUs associated with a course, I told Elizabeth that we'll have to follow prior precedent, which is to have the NSME Curriculum Committee review and approve/deny the request.

We should add discussing if a policy needs to be developed for changing the WTUs associated with a course to the Senate EC agenda. That would be different than auditing/reviewing the current CS#'s to see if they comply with CSU policy, as there could be other reasons to change CS#'s beyond course caps.

Thanks,
Melissa

From: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 at 1:28 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Cc: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>
Subject: RE: DNP course coding

Hi,

The referral only had a link to the BOX folder in the attachments. I opened up the link and it is a pretty large list of documents which were all uploaded in October 2023. The document you shared is dated November 2023, so I don't think it would be in the BOX folder, but I did look and didn't find anything. Here is the link in case you wanted to look:

<https://csub.app.box.com/s/ingu47wfahx5vyxp3kifvolncq30h4q2>

I found the "New Degree Program Proposal Form" (attached). I did see mention of a "Substantive Change Screening Form," but it looks like it was submitted in Summer 2023 (see page 71). I included some screenshots. It doesn't look like it is the same document, which was titled "WSCUC Substantive Change, November 2023." I know there was some back and forth between the subcommittees and the Nursing Department. Maybe it was sent over to AAC or BPC directly, and not uploaded to the folder? If it bypassed me, I would not have uploaded it to the referral folder. I am not sure.

Here are the screenshots from the *CSUB DNP Program Proposal with MOU* pdf:

j. Substantive Change Screening Form:

The WASC Senior College and University Commission Substantive Change Screening Form was submitted in Summer 2023. See [Appendix P](#). If a full Substantive Change Review is required, the proposal will be submitted by no later than November 2023 to provide adequate time for review.

k. Proposed Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) and CSU Degree Program Code.

CSU CIP: 51.3818

CSU Degree Program Code: 12033 Doctor of Nursing Practice

Page 71 of PDF

Appendix P: WSCUC Screening Form



WSCUC Substantive Change Program Screening Form

Directions: Institutions planning to implement new degree programs beginning on or after July 1, 2017 should submit this screening form to WSCUC to determine if a Substantive Change review and approval is necessary prior to implementation. A determination on the necessity of review is made after submission of the form and any further information requested by WSCUC. The form should be submitted to John Hausaman (jhausaman@wscuc.org).

Institution: California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB)

ALO Name and contact information: Dr. Debra Jackson

Date: 7/10/2023

Proposed program name, modality, and CIP code:

Currently, the Department of Nursing (DON) at CSUB offers a Master of Science in Nursing, Family Nurse Practitioner (MSN/FNP) program, which is designed to prepare Family Nurse Practitioners for the region. However, the emerging national standards in Nurse Practitioner (NP) education require a Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degree for all entry level NPs by 2025. Unless CSU Bakersfield transitions its NP program to a DNP degree, our MSN/NP graduates will not be qualified to take national certification examinations and may be unable to compete with other DNP prepared graduates in the professional job market. Elevating our existing MSN/FNP to a DNP program becomes a necessity. The DON is proposing two Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) degree programs:

- Post Baccalaureate Doctor of Nursing Practice Nurse Practitioner (DNP-NP) Program with Family Nurse Practitioner Concentration (DNP-NP).
The purpose of the DNP-NP program is to produce doctorally prepared nurse practitioners to address the critical shortage of primary care providers in the region and to meet the emerging educational and scholarly standards for Nurse Practitioners. This three-year, eight-semester program is designed for registered nurses (RNs) who have a Bachelor of Science (BS) or Master of Science (MS) in Nursing, and who aspire to become doctorally prepared Nurse Practitioners. Currently, our DNP-NP program only offers the Family Nurse Practitioner (FNP) concentration.

KATHERINE VAN GRINSVEN

She/her/hers

Senate Analyst

Office of the Academic Senate

Direct Line: (661) 654-3128

Office: BDC A 252

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 20 BDC

Bakersfield, CA 93311

www.csub.edu/senate



Confidentiality Notice - This entire e-mail message (including all forwards and replies) and/or any attachments, are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain proprietary, confidential, or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 10:49 AM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Cc: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>
Subject: FW: DNP course coding

Hi Katie,

Can you check the referral for the DNP program made to AAC and BPC to see if this document was included?

Thanks,
Melissa

From: Elizabeth Adams <eadams6@csub.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 10:44 AM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>; Tiffany Tsantsoulas <ttsantsoulas@csub.edu>
Cc: Heidi He <hhe@csub.edu>; Jane Dong <jdong2@csub.edu>
Subject: DNP course coding

Hi all,

I had a chance to speak with Dr. He today and it's clear to me that the course forms for the Didactic courses for the DNP were submitted with the incorrect C/S number. If you look at the attached WSCUC substantive change document on p.23, you'll see that they clearly intended those courses to have a 1.5 K factor, which is only associated with C-15.

What I'd like to suggest that either AAC or Senate be briefed on this and asked to approve a correction to the C/S number for these courses so that the faculty teaching them can get the appropriate compensation this term (and to prevent the current APDB errors). If that won't work, I'm open to other idea about how to solve this issue.

Elizabeth

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Monday, December 1, 2025 9:07 PM
To: Mike Kwon; Leslie Kirstein
Cc: ORG-ASIExecutiveVice-President; Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: RE: Agenda Items - Considerations for AS&SS

Hi Mike,

We can put these concerns on the Senate Exec agenda. However, we only have two meetings left, and we'll lose some time from tomorrow's meeting if the president's open forum runs long. I don't see us getting to this item until Spring term given our current backlog of business.

Melissa

From: Mike Kwon <mkwon@csub.edu>
Sent: Saturday, November 29, 2025 12:04 PM
To: Leslie Kirstein <lkirstein@csub.edu>; Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Cc: ORG-ASIExecutiveVice-President <asi-vicepresident@csub.edu>
Subject: Agenda Items - Considerations for AS&SS

Hi, Leslie and Dr. Danforth—

I hope you both had a wonderful holiday break.

At last Friday's ASI Board meeting, students recommended to the Provost that she ask the Deans on the following considerations:

- (1) Office Hours: Is there a way to make sure that faculty are hosting office hours. It is stated in the Academic Handbook that faculty are required to do so, but students have reported that some faculty are not available during their posted office hours. Does each department track when faculty are doing office hours or is it based on a trust system?
- (2) Reporting Grades: Students are concerned that their grades are not being reported in a timely manner during the semester. Students would like to see how they are doing in the class but some faculty are not inputting grades until the very end. Is there information or a requirement on this?

Thank you so much,

MIKE KWON, J.D., M.L.S., M.S.

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Executive Director | Associated Students, Inc.

Office: (661) 654-2741 | Email: mkwon@csub.edu

California State University, Bakersfield

Student Affairs & Strategic Enrollment Management

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 56 SU

Bakersfield, CA 93311

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



“Sometimes we are tested, not to show our weaknesses, but to discover our strengths.”

 *Please consider the environment before printing the contents of this email.*

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: If you have received this email in error, please immediately notify the sender by email at the address shown. This transmission may contain confidential information. This information is intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity to whom it is intended even if addressed incorrectly. Please delete from your files if you are not the intended recipient. Thank you for your compliance.

From: Danielle Solano
Sent: Thursday, December 4, 2025 3:56 PM
To: ORG-AcademicSenateChair; Melissa Danforth
Cc: ORG-AcademicSenateOffice; Katherine Van Grinsven; Rebecca Weller
Subject: Updates to the Distributed Learning Community (DLC) Membership & Description
Attachments: RES 2526XX_Distributed Learning Community.docx

Dear Chair Danforth,

I am forwarding the attached draft resolution on the behalf of the Distributed Learning Community (DLC) which updates the membership and the description of the DLC in the handbook.

The DLC has also discussed developing recommendations for classroom observations of online courses to ensure the quality of online teaching, but decided that this will be a separate resolution (that we intend to hopefully send along with an updated distributed learning policy).

Thank you,

--Dani

Danielle Solano, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
California State University, Bakersfield

Office: SCI II 268
Phone: (661) 654-2785
Email: dsolano@csub.edu

***Schedule an appointment with me on [Runner Connect](#) or [Acuity Scheduling](#)

 [Book time to meet with me](#)



Updates to the Distributed Learning Community (DLC) Membership & Description

RES 2526XX

AAC, AS&SS, and/or FAC

RESOLVED: That the Handbook section in this resolution replace section 203.11.

RESOLVED: That the following changes be made to the University Handbook (additions in **bold underline**, deletions in ~~strikethrough~~).

203.11 Distributed Learning Committee

University faculty have adopted a distributed learning policy for online and ~~flex~~hybrid instruction (Academic Senate Resolution 1213028). The Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) is responsible to monitor for issues that arise with regards to the distributed learning policy and to ~~improve~~ **ensure** the quality of online and ~~flex~~hybrid instruction, including **development of guidance for the certification of faculty wishing to teach online and/or flex hybrid courses.**

The DLC consists of (1) one faculty member from each of the academic ~~colleges~~ schools; (2) ~~one faculty member at-large~~ the Faculty Coordinator of Online Instruction from the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC); (3) the Faculty Director of the FTLC; (4) a student representative from ASI; and (5) one staff member with direct responsibilities related to CSUB's learning management system (ex-officio). Additional members may be appointed as ex-officio members by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, at the recommendation of the current DLC members. **The Faculty Director of the FTLC convenes the first meeting of the year, during which the committee elects a chair.** Faculty members on the committee are expected to have experience with the designing and teaching of online/~~flex~~hybrid courses and **should have received training in** ~~be certified by CSUB for online/flex hybrid instruction.~~ Faculty members are elected in accordance with the election procedures in Sections 202.6 and 202.7 and serve on staggered two-year terms. The student representative will be selected by ASI on an annual

basis. The staff member will be appointed by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs on an annual basis.

As issues with the distributed learning policy arise, the DLC shall either (1) refer the issue to the Academic Senate for development of policy, or (2) develop a policy on a particular issue itself and then refer the proposed policy to the Academic Senate for consideration. The DLC shall report annually to the Academic Senate on online and hybrid instruction trends and issues.

RATIONALE: The Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) policy has not been updated in more than a decade, and the Faculty Coordinator of Online Instruction position has been discontinued. During this period, instructional modalities have evolved substantially. Online and flex teaching are now integral components of many faculty members' regular teaching assignments, and CSUB no longer requires certification for online instruction. These handbook revisions redefine the role and scope of the DLC to reflect current institutional practices.

Distribution List: (update as needed)

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Topic: Handbook and Bylaws Project – EC (See Box folder for handouts)

- A. Updating Schools to Colleges
- B. Updating all references to quarters
- C. Standing Committees Composition:
 - 1. Clarify Handbook language about staff positions being non-MPP staff
 - 2. AS&SS Composition: Associate Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies is not actually listed in the bylaws as an ex-officio member of AS&SS.
 - 3. Update language for administrator positions to allow for designee
 - 4. Review and update the Standing Committees ex-officio positions due to the re-organization of university
 - 5. AAC Composition: Clarify the catalog and PeopleSoft positions with the SASEM re-organization.
- D. Director of Assessment: Review position (Handbook 105.2 and 305.6.)
- E. Council of Academic Deans: Review Composition and name (Handbook 105.2)
- F. Public Affairs Committee: Committee in handbook but not bylaws (Handbook 107.1. Standing Committees of the Academic Senate). Discussion on if we want to create the committee or not.
- G. Review committees listed (Handbook 107)
- H. Update TEAC Description: Currently lists old college names (H&SS, SOE, and NSM) (Handbook 201.5)
- I. Update reference to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs- association with Academic Advising and review other duties (Handbook 104.2.1)
- J. Update position titles in 309.9 (Handbook 309.9)
- K. Update all references to the AVP of Enrollment Management- distinguish the VP of Strategic Enrollment Management from the new AVP of Enrollment Management
- L. Bylaws Section IV.A.4 Annual reports from committees- limit to specific committees?
- M. Changes to bylaws that were approved by previous resolution but never posted (clarifying the edition of Robert's Rules of Order).
- N. Q2S Linger Issues:
 - 1. Deadline issue for stating one's intent to seek promotion to full professor
 - 2. Discussions about whether we should change the Handbook to require classroom observations for tenured faculty.
- O. Section 103.1 Statewide Organization Structure still states 23 CSU campuses- remove number?
- P. Update the Committee on Academic Requirements and Standards (CARS) to the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) - referenced in various places in Handbook



Codifying Procedures for Statements of the Senate and Votes of No Confidence

RES 2526XX

EC

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate approves revisions to the Constitution of the Academic Senate to establish procedures for Statements of the Senate and Votes of No Confidence. Deletions are in ~~striketrough~~, and additions are in **bold and underlined**.

APPENDIX C: CONSTITUTION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Constitution of the Academic Senate

Preamble

The Academic Senate is a body by which the General Faculty exercises its powers as described in Article III, Section 2 of its Constitution. The Academic Senate shall perform all duties consistent with the formulation, adoption, review and revision of recommendations relating to the policies and operations of the University, within the limits prescribed by the constitutions of the General Faculty and the Academic Senate, the policies of the Board of Trustees, and the laws of the State of California.

Article 1 Membership

Section 1 The Academic Senate shall be composed of the following members:

- A. the General Faculty Chair and Vice Chair elected by the General Faculty;
- B. two representatives to the CSU (statewide) Academic Senate elected by the General Faculty;
- C. one lecturer representative to the CSU (statewide) Academic Senate Lecturer Senate Electorate elected by the lecturer faculty;

- a. The Lecturer representative may be full-time or part-time with a time base entitlement of at least 0.6 (e.g., 18 WTUs for the academic year)
- b. The lecturer representative may be elected to the CSU (statewide) Academic Senate
- c. If the Lecturer representative is elected to the CSU (statewide) Academic Senate, then they will serve on the Executive Committee as a representative to the Academic Senate CSU (see Section 2)
- D. two representatives from each College,
- E. one representative from the CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley campus, elected by the respective faculty members of the Antelope Valley Campus
- F. six at-large representatives elected from and by the General Faculty;
- G. the ASI President or designee;
- H. one representative of the Council of Academic Deans selected by the council;
- I. a staff member elected by Staff Forum;
- J. the immediate previous Senate Chair, will serve for a period of one term, *ex officio*; and
- K. the Provost (and Vice-President for Academic Affairs) serves *ex officio* and nonvoting.

Section 2 The Executive Committee shall consist of:

- A. the current Chair;
- B. the Vice Chair;
- C. the Standing Committee Chairs;
- D. the representatives to the Academic Senate CSU
- E. the immediate previous Senate Chair, will serve for a period of one year, *ex officio*; and
- F. the Provost (and Vice President for Academic Affairs) serves *ex officio* and non-voting.

Article 2 Functions and Responsibilities

Section 1 The Academic Senate shall have the following functions and responsibilities relating to university matters not subject to collective bargaining:

A. The Academic Senate shall carry out those responsibilities vested in the faculty by Trustee policy and State law for developing policies and making recommendations to the University President on the following matters:

- 1) criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, awarding of tenure, promotion and evaluation of academic employees including preservation of the principle of peer evaluation and provision for the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions;
- 2) curricular policies, such as admission and degree requirements, approval of new courses and programs, discontinuance of academic programs, and academic standards;
- 3) fiscal policies and budgetary priorities;
- 4) the awarding of grades;
- 5) faculty appointments to institutional task forces, advisory committees, and auxiliary organizations;
- 6) academic standards and academic policies governing athletics.

B. The Academic Senate shall be the primary source of policy recommendations to the University President on decisions related to the following matters:

- 1) establishment of campus-wide committees on academic or professional matters;
- 2) the academic role of the library;
- 3) academic awards, prizes, and scholarships;
- 4) the academic conduct of students and means for handling infractions;
- 5) development of institutional missions and goals.

C. The Academic Senate shall be a source of policy recommendations to the University President on decisions related to the following:

- 1) the academic calendar and policies governing the scheduling of classes;
- 2) policies governing the appointment and review of academic administrators.

- D. The Academic Senate shall organize itself, adopt procedures, and appoint Chairs and members of its standing committees in accordance with its Bylaws.
- E. This outline of functions and responsibilities is intended to provide the essentials for a satisfactory system of shared governance but should not necessarily be viewed as a comprehensive enumeration of those functions and responsibilities.

Section 2 The Academic Senate shall act for the General Faculty to formulate and to recommend policies to the University President or to other appropriate agents. The Academic Senate shall also consider and respond to policy recommendations submitted by individual members, by the General Faculty, or by the University President. The Academic Senate may refer the matter to an appropriate committee for study and recommendation, or it may refer it to the General Faculty. If any matter is referred from any source to the General Faculty and the referred matter is not acted on by the General Faculty due to lack of a quorum, then such matters will be referred to the Academic Senate for final disposition.

Section 3 All members of the General Faculty have the right to attend Academic Senate meetings and may address the Senate with the consent of the Chair, but they shall not vote. Other persons may attend at the discretion of the Academic Senate.

The Academic Senate, upon a two-thirds vote of its members present, may declare a closed session.

Section 4 Any action taken by the Academic Senate is subject to review by General Faculty. Any member of the General Faculty may require such review by (a) filing a notice of Intent to Seek Review with the Academic Senate office no later than five (5) calendar days after a report of the Academic Senate action has been distributed to the faculty and (b) filing a Petition Requesting Review, containing signatures of at least 15 percent of the members of the General Faculty, with the Academic Senate office no later than ten (10) calendar days after a report of the Academic Senate action has been distributed to the faculty. Execution of the Intent and Petition documents as

specified shall result in the conduct of a referendum in which the General Faculty by vote of a majority of those voting may return the action to the Academic Senate for its reconsideration. Reconsideration may also occur if so moved by any of the Senators who voted in favor of approving the resolution(s) subject to review.

Section 5 Actions in the form of recommendations to the University President are forwarded to the President when any one of the following has occurred:

- A. No notice of Intent to Seek Review is received at the Academic Senate office by the fifth calendar day following distribution to the faculty of a report of that action; or
- B. No valid Petition Requesting Review is received at the Academic Senate office by the tenth calendar day following distribution to the faculty of a report of that action; or
- C. A referendum fails to achieve a majority in favor of reconsideration of that action by the Academic Senate. In order to provide for a timely review, actions taken by the Academic Senate shall be reported promptly to the General Faculty.

Section 6 Statements of the Senate

The Academic Senate may adopt Statements of the Senate to express the position, perspective, or concerns of the faculty on matters within the Senate's jurisdiction. These position statements are intended to reflect the opinions of the General Faculty and not expected to be signed by the President and adopted into campus policy.

Statements of the Senate may be initiated by the Executive Committee and shall be placed on the Academic Senate agenda for deliberation and action. Adoption of the Statement of the Senate shall require an affirmative vote of a majority of the Academic Senate members present and voting.

Section 7 Votes of No Confidence

A Vote of No Confidence in a campus or system-level administrator may be initiated in one of the following ways:

1. By the Executive Committee, subject to the approval by a majority vote of the Academic Senate to place the matter on the agenda; or
2. By the General Faculty, through submission of a written petition to the Executive Committee containing the signatures of at least 15% of the members of the General Faculty, subject to verification by the Academic Senate.

If one of the above conditions is met, a Vote of No Confidence shall be considered and voted upon by the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate shall be given a minimum notice of 10 days prior to voting.

Adoption of a Vote of No Confidence shall require an affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the Academic Senate members present and voting. Votes of No Confidence shall be conducted by secret ballot, using a method that ensures accuracy, confidentiality, and integrity of the vote.

Upon adoption, a Vote of No Confidence shall be transmitted by the Academic Senate Chair to the appropriate university administrator(s) and, when applicable, to system-level leadership.

Article 3 Procedures

Section 1 The Academic Senate shall create committees necessary to the performance of its duties and shall establish rules and procedures for these committees.

Section 2 The Academic Senate, by vote of a majority of its total membership, shall adopt all bylaws necessary to the performance of its duties and amend them when necessary. Changes in the bylaws shall not be proposed and voted upon at the same meeting.

Section 3 The Academic Senate shall keep a record of its proceedings and shall distribute copies of minutes to the General Faculty and appropriate administrative officers of the University.

Article 4 Officers

Section 1 The Officers of the Academic Senate shall consist of the Chair, the Vice Chair, and the Senate Standing Committee Chairs. The Chair and Vice Chair shall be elected to serve for two years or until their successors are elected. No member shall hold more than one office at a time, and no member shall be eligible to serve more than six consecutive years in the same office.

Section 2 Chair

- A. The General Faculty Chair, by virtue of election to that office, shall serve as the Academic Senate Chair.
- B. The Chair may receive assigned time commensurate with the responsibilities of the office.
- C. The duties of the Chair shall be as follows:
 - 1) the Chair shall preside at the Academic Senate meetings;
 - 2) the Chair shall also be the Academic Senate Executive Committee Chair;
 - 3) the Chair shall be the liaison between the University President and the Academic Senate.

Section 3 Vice Chair

- A. The General Faculty Vice Chair, by virtue of election to that office, shall serve as the Academic Senate Vice Chair.
- B. The Vice Chair will receive assigned time commensurate with the responsibilities of the office.
- C. The duties of the Vice Chair shall be as follows:
 - 1) in the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair shall preside at the Academic Senate meetings;
 - 2) the Vice Chair shall be a member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee;
 - 3) in the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair shall be the liaison between the University President and the Academic Senate.
 - 4) the Vice Chair shall ensure that comprehensive minutes of the Academic Senate proceedings and actions are prepared.

- 5) as soon as possible after each Academic Senate meeting, the Vice Chair shall ensure that the draft minutes are circulated to all members, alternates, and others as requested.
- 6) After the Senate has approved the minutes, the Vice Chair will be responsible for making them available to all members of the University, and keeping them on file in the Academic Senate Office;
- 7) the Vice Chair shall ensure that minutes contain the names of those present and absent at Academic Senate meetings;
- 8) the Vice Chair shall maintain a list of official committees for which the Senate has responsibility for recommending membership.

Section 4 Standing Committee Chairs

- A. The Academic Senate Standing Committee Chairs shall be elected by the Academic Senate from its membership after the Senate Chair and Vice Chair have been elected.
- B. Standing Committee Chairs will receive assigned time commensurate with the responsibilities of their offices.

Article 5 Term of Service and Recall

Section 1 Term of Service

- A. Senators shall serve for a term of two years (with the exception of the representatives to the Academic Senate CSU who are elected for three-year terms), with terms so arranged that one-half of the Academic Senate shall be elected each year.
- B. Each Academic Senate member, other than the officers, shall identify an alternate in the event the elected member cannot attend a Senate meeting. Standing Committee Chairs will have a representative of their Standing Committee identified as an alternate.
- C. With the exception of the representatives to the CSU Academic Senate, no Senator shall serve consecutively for more than six academic years.

Section 2 Recall

- D. Any Academic Senator or representative to the Academic Senate CSU shall be subject to a recall election by submission of a petition signed by 25 percent of his or her electorate. Alternatively, after an investigation requested by a majority vote of the Senate, the Senate may initiate a recall election by two-thirds vote.
- E. A member of the Academic Senate or representatives to the Academic Senate CSU may be recalled by a two-thirds vote of the electorate.

Section 3 Absences

A Senate member who does not attend or have an alternate attend, without excuse or notification, three consecutive Academic Senate meetings will be replaced by an election by the appropriate constituency.

Section 4 Replacement

Should the Academic Senate Executive Committee determine that an Academic Senator should be replaced because of recall or resignation, or two semesters leave, a replacement shall be elected by the same constituency that elected the Senator, to serve out the remainder of the term. *(Revised 2023—2024)*

Article 6 Agenda

The agenda shall be circulated among the General Faculty at least two days prior to the Academic Senate meeting. Any General Faculty member may transmit topics or proposals to the Senate if the topics are within the Senate's jurisdiction.

Article 7 Meetings

The Academic Senate shall hold regularly scheduled meetings at least twice a month during the academic year while classes are in session except when the Executive Committee determines that the flow of Senate business does not warrant a meeting. Whenever deemed necessary, the Executive Committee may also call special Academic Senate meetings.

Article 8 Academic Senate Committees

Section 1 Standing Committees

- A. Standing committees shall make recommendations to the Academic Senate regarding matters of policy, within the limits prescribed for them by the Academic Senate, and by this Constitution and its bylaws.
- B. The Executive Committee and the Elections Committee shall be sole standing committees established by this Constitution. Other standing committees shall be established in the Bylaws of this Constitution.
- C. All standing committees shall report regularly to the Academic Senate concerning committee activities.

Section 2 Executive Committee

- A. Membership: The Executive Committee shall consist of:
 - 1) the current Chair;
 - 2) the Vice Chair;
 - 3) the Standing Committee Chairs;
 - 4) the two representatives to the Academic Senate CSU
 - 5) the immediate previous Senate Chair, will serve for a period of one year, ex officio; and
 - 6) the Provost (and Vice President for Academic Affairs) serves ex officio and non-voting.
- B. Duties:
 - 1) in addition to its other duties, the Executive Committee shall prepare the agenda for the Academic Senate meetings;
 - 2) the Executive Committee shall interpret the meaning and intent of all articles of the Constitution and Bylaws, subject to approval by the University President;
 - 3) the Executive Committee shall recommend the appointment of Standing Committee members to the Senate for approval;

- 4) during the Fall, and Spring Semesters, whenever classes are not in session, a majority of the Executive Committee members shall act as an Interim Academic Senate. All policy decisions made by this body shall be reported to the next regular Academic Senate meeting for approval. During the Summer Semester the Interim Academic Senate shall consist of the outgoing and incoming Executive Committee members.

Section 3 Elections Committee

- A. Membership: The Academic Senate Vice Chair shall serve as the Elections Committee Chair. The Chair of each School Elections Committee shall serve as a member of the Academic Senate Elections Committee.
- B. Duties: The Elections Committee shall administer all Academic Senate and General Faculty elections using the "single-transferable-vote system," based on preferential voting as described in Robert's Rules of Order.

Section 4 Ad Hoc Committees

- A. Academic Senate Ad hoc committees may be established by the Academic Senate or by the Executive Committee with Academic Senate approval.
- B. The University President may, upon a request from the Academic Senate, select one representative to membership on an ad hoc committee.

Article 9 Amendments to this Constitution

Section 1 Proposal of Amendments

- A. The Academic Senate, whenever a majority of its membership present deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to the Constitution. Proposed amendments shall receive a first and second reading.
- B. Amendments to this Constitution may also be proposed by a petition of 20 percent of the General Faculty.

Section 2 Approval of Amendments

- A. Amendments to this Constitution shall be confirmed by an affirmative vote by two-thirds of the members of the General Faculty voting.
- B. A copy of proposed amendments shall be sent to every faculty member at least two weeks before voting takes place.
- C. Amendments are subject to approval by the University President.

Approved by the Academic Senate May 29, 2008

Amendments Voted on and Passed by General Faculty October 30, 2008

Rationale:

These procedures are intended to clarify and formalize how Statements of the Senate and Votes of No Confidence may be brought forward and considered by the Academic Senate, consistent with principles of shared governance, transparency, and faculty voice. In the absence of explicit procedures, practices for no confidence actions have varied widely across CSU sister campuses and across higher education more broadly. Some campuses rely on ad hoc resolutions, others on general faculty meetings, and others on union-led processes, sometimes with or without clear thresholds, notice requirements, or protections for faculty participation. This lack of standardization can lead to uncertainty, inconsistency, and perceptions of procedural unfairness, particularly when matters of significant institutional consequence are under consideration.

Votes of No Confidence represent an extraordinary expression of faculty concern and, as such, warrant a more rigorous and clearly defined process than routine Senate actions or Statements of the Senate. Requiring initiation by either the Executive Committee or a petition signed by at least fifteen percent (15%) of the General Faculty ensures that such votes reflect a meaningful level of collective concern rather than the actions of a small number of individuals. This threshold mirrors existing language in the Handbook governing faculty-initiated actions, including petitions for review of Senate actions and proposals for constitutional amendments, thereby reinforcing internal consistency. Together with heightened voting thresholds, advance notice, and secret balloting, these procedures balance accessibility with seriousness, protect the integrity of the process, and provide the Academic Senate with a strong, fair, and defensible framework for addressing matters of profound institutional importance.

RATIONALE:**Distribution List:**

President
President's Cabinet
General Faculty
Campus Staff
Campus Students

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2025 4:36 PM
To: Deborah Thien; John Tarjan
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: RE: Potential Resolution on Inclusion of Emeriti Individuals in Social Events

This might also be an ITS issue, in terms of how they build mailing lists from the HR records. They may only pull active faculty into the Faculty and Announcements4Faculty mailing lists.

Melissa

From: Deborah Thien <idthien@csb.edu>
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2025 3:30 PM
To: John Tarjan <jtarjan@csb.edu>; Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csb.edu>
Subject: Re: Potential Resolution on Inclusion of Emeriti Individuals in Social Events

Thanks, John.

I will discuss with the deans.

Best,
Deb

--

DEBORAH THIEN, Ph.D.

she / her / hers

Provost and Vice President
Academic Affairs

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 59 ADM
Bakersfield, CA 93311



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD™



From: John Tarjan <jtarjan@csb.edu>
Date: Friday, December 12, 2025 at 8:01 AM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>

Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>, Deborah Thien <dthien@csub.edu>

Subject: Potential Resolution on Inclusion of Emeriti Individuals in Social Events

I was wondering if a resolution based on the below and attached could be considered by the Senate. I would be more than happy to bring it from the floor if that would be more appropriate.

In the meantime, perhaps the Provost could consider encouraging the academic deans to make this a practice. Thanks. JT

308.2.4 Emeriti Privileges and Public Announcement

Public announcement of any Emeriti awards shall take place during an event suitable to the announcement. The award of Emeriti status shall entitle recipients to the following:

- a. A certificate of award of Emeriti 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.

f1. Invitation to social events to which other members of the unit from which they retired are invited.

The award of Emeriti status may also entitle recipients 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;

Rationale: “Awards are to be regarded as an honor and a continuing commitment of the University to designated faculty members.” (308.2.3) The continued involvement of CSUB emeriti community members in CSUB social activities can bring benefits to both the campus and those individuals.

John Tarjan
Management/Marketing
CSU, Bakersfield
BDC A 209
661-654-2321 (Office)

308.2.4 Emeriti Privileges and Public Announcement

Public announcement of any Emeriti awards shall take place during an event suitable to the announcement. The award of Emeriti status shall entitle recipients to the following:

- a. A certificate of award of Emeriti 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.

f1. Invitation to social events to which other members of the unit from which they retired are invited.

The award of Emeriti status may also entitle recipients 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;

Rationale: “Awards are to be regarded as an honor and a continuing commitment of the University to designated faculty members.” (308.2.3) The continued involvement of CSUB emeriti community members in CSUB social activities can bring benefits to both the campus and those individuals.

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 5:15 PM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: Fw: Dean's List

Another item for the EC agenda.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Elizabeth Adams <eadams6@csb.edu>
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 3:53:00 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>
Subject: FW: Dean's List

Hi Melissa,

We discovered that there's some ambiguity in the way the Dean's List Policy is written (and is being applied). Could EC consider a reference to AAC on this?

The policy in the current catalog reads:

"A full-time, undergraduate student, carrying at least six (6) units of letter-graded work during the semester, who earns a GPA of 3.25 or above in that semester will be placed on the Dean's List."

For a number of years, Dean's list has been awarded to any student with 6 units at 3.25 or above, even if they're not full-time. At minimum, I think the policy needs to be revised to indicate that full-time is 12 units, but I wonder if the 6 units of letter-graded work might be revisited. In addition, most campuses require a 3.5 for Dean's List. Don't know if there's any appetite to change that either.

The endless policy revision must continue (or not).

Elizabeth

From: Jennifer Mabry <jmabry2@csb.edu>
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 at 3:04 PM
To: Karlo Lopez <klopez@csb.edu>, Sonya Gaitan <sgaitan@csb.edu>
Cc: Jane Dong <jdong2@csb.edu>, Elizabeth Adams <eadams6@csb.edu>
Subject: RE: Dean's List

Hi Karlo,

In review of previous semesters, at end of term processing, the system is looking for 6 units of letter graded coursework.

I have Dr. Adams in my office – as we reviewed the catalog language, we believe that there needs to be a review of this policy so that the language can be written more clearly. Dr. Adams will send it to Academic Senate for review. In a quick review of other CSU's, it appears they list their requirement as 12 units of graded classes, and many require a higher threshold of 3.5.

Good catch.

Jennifer

From: Karlo Lopez <klopez@csub.edu>
Sent: Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:50 PM
To: Sonya Gaitan <sgaitan@csub.edu>
Cc: Jennifer Mabry <jmabry2@csub.edu>; Jane Dong <jdong2@csub.edu>
Subject: Dean's List

Hi Sonya,
The Registrar's Office page on the catalog states the following:

Dean's List

A full-time, undergraduate student, carrying at least six (6) units of letter-graded work during the semester, who earns a GPA of 3.25 or above in that semester will be placed on the Dean's List.

Can you please clarify which students qualify for the dean's list; a full-time student (12+ units) or a part time student (6 units)?

Best,

KARLO M. LOPEZ, Ph.D.

Associate Dean
Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry
College of Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering
Office: (661) 654-3450

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 13SCI
Bakersfield, CA 93311

klopez@csub.edu

This message, and any attachments it may contain, is for the named person's use only. It may contain confidential, proprietary, or legally privileged information. No confidentiality or privilege is waved or lost by any mistransmission. If you receive this message and you are not the intended recipient, please delete it and all copies of it from your system, destroy any hard copies of it, and notify the sender. You must not, directly or indirectly, use, disclose, print, or copy any part of this message if you are not the intended recipient.

Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate

January 22nd, 2026

The FAC continues to devote substantial time and careful attention to clarifying the Unit RTP and PTR committee composition and election processes. Based on extensive feedback received from faculty across campus, including perspectives from both small units with limited eligible reviewers and larger units with many faculty and high review volume, the committee is working to develop language that is both contractually aligned and practically workable. Our deliberations are focused on balancing transparency, meaningful faculty participation, independence of review, and workload equity, while also minimizing unnecessary administrative burden where feasible.

At this time, the FAC is not yet ready to advance the Unit RTP/PTR composition proposal to Academic Senate. We are intentionally allowing additional time for the committee to digest the feedback, explore reasonable options, and improve the proposed policies.

The FAC is deeply appreciative of the constructive input and contributions provided to date, which have strengthened the quality of our discussions and draft language. We anticipate bringing forward a completed resolution in the future.

In addition to its ongoing work on Unit RTP and PTR committee composition, the Faculty Affairs Committee approved and advanced several other items:

- The FAC voted to forward resolutions on SOCI Modality and Department Chair/Program Director Term Limits to Academic Senate for First Reading. These resolutions are in response to referrals 2025-2026 36 and 2025-2026 28, respectively.
- The committee also reviewed proposed language addressing Teaching Modality and the role of the Distributed Learning Committee and voted to send this item to the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) for joint consideration, recognizing the shared committee responsibilities in response to referral 2025-2026 19.



Transitioning to Online SOCIs – Handbook Change

RES 252620

FAC

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate approves revisions to the University Handbook regarding the administration of student opinions of curriculum and instruction (SOCIs). Deletions are in ~~striketrough~~, and additions are in **bold and underlined**.

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate shall review the effectiveness of this transition after a period of five years, including analysis of response rates, student feedback, and faculty feedback.

305.4.4 Student Role in the Performance Review Process for Instructional Faculty

Student opinion of teaching by faculty is a required component of the performance review process. The Student Opinion on Curriculum and Instruction (SOCI) shall be the primary instrument used to collect student opinions of teaching.

Although this handbook currently identifies the Student Opinion on Curriculum and Instruction (SOCI) as the primary instrument used to collect student opinions of teaching, this tool is to be considered as only one of many measures used to evaluate teaching; SOCIs should not be given more consideration than the other measures of teaching performance outlined in section 305.4.2.6 (Evaluation of Teaching Performance). Further, the trends in student responses should be the focus of the evaluation of SOCIs as a measure of teaching performance.

The quantitative and qualitative (i.e., open-ended) items included on the instruments to gather student opinions shall be reviewed and open for potential revision every 10 years, or more frequently. More frequent reviews and revisions are at the discretion of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. Any revision process shall include broad consultation from faculty.

Except as limited below, faculty members will administer SOCIs in all sections and place the results of all SOCIs in the RTP (WPAF) File for use by all levels of review.

The requirement for collection of SOCI's may be waived in the following cases.

- A. The requirement for collection of SOCI's may be waived for sections with enrollments of fewer than 6 students or similar situations in which the anonymity of respondents would be compromised and sections in which the primary mode of instruction or the SOCI would not reasonably correlate with instructional methods.
- B. The requirement for collection of SOCI's may be waived for sections in which a faculty member went on leave and was replaced by another faculty member.
 - a. This request shall be honored at the discretion of the replacement faculty member.
 - b. The faculty member on leave shall not be subject to student opinions.

Within these guidelines, department chairs in consultation with their department shall determine which sections are eligible for waiver. Documentation of the department decision to grant a waiver shall be included in each section of the file for which SOCI's are waived.

The SOCI shall be anonymous and identified only by course and/or section. The format of the SOCI provides both quantitative information (ratings of course and instructor attributes) and qualitative information (comments about the course and instructor).

Faculty shall be provided course and/or section summaries of quantitative data. Means and standard deviations shall be provided for individual questions ~~as well as the overall SOCI.~~ Quantitative and qualitative data shall be linked in both online and physical SOCI's. SOCI reports shall be clear such that faculty can associate individual-student comments with individual-student quantitative responses. **Faculty shall also receive a SOCI report even when there are no completed student responses. SOCI reports shall be available to faculty teaching in all terms (Fall, Winter, Spring, Summer). SOCI reports shall be provided to the individual faculty instructors, department chairs, and college deans.**

Some bias in student opinions may be present. Since SOCI's are used in conjunction with other measures to evaluate teaching, the College Dean (or designee) should arrange for training for Unit RTP Committee members to be undertaken before the start of a faculty review. The training should include the following: (1) the purpose of the RTP review process and the responsibilities of Unit Committee members, (2) the identification of possible biases in student responses, and (3) the process to remove biased SOCI's from an evaluation of teaching.

Faculty under review may request that the AVP for Faculty Affairs (or their designee) reviews and removes the SOCI(s) with discriminatory comments and quantitative responses. SOCI(s)

that are received within the prior academic calendar year are eligible for consideration for removal. Requests to remove SOCI(s) must be made 21 days prior to the deadline to submit the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF, commonly called the RTP File) for the next review cycle.

The AVP for Faculty Affairs (or their designee) shall consider the merit of such requests based on many factors, including (but not limited to) the human dignity of the faculty member, the student's role in the performance review process, and the added pedagogical value and relevance of the comments. Regardless of the decision of the AVP for Faculty Affairs (or their designee), the faculty member is encouraged to reflect upon feedback and may submit rebuttals to SOCI comments as part of the performance review process. In all cases, the Unit Review Committee, Department Chair (if applicable), College Dean, University Review Committee, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and President (or their designee) are expected to approach the evaluation of faculty and interpretation of SOCIs with care and professionalism. Ultimately, SOCIs are one component of a broad assessment of teaching performance.

305.4.5 ~~SOCI Distribution~~ Completion Period

The SOCI ~~Distribution~~ Completion Period shall be designated on the Academic Calendar, not to include the examination period. The timeframe for SOCI ~~distribution~~ Completion shall be the same regardless of course modality (e.g., face-to-face, hybrid, online).

In the Fall and Spring semesters, SOCIs ~~distributed~~ completed online shall be available for 10 weekdays. ~~SOCIs distributed in person shall be distributed during one class meeting in the two-week SOCI Distribution Period;~~ SOCIs shall be ~~distributed~~ completed between 14 and 21 days prior to the Last Day of Classes.

In the Summer and Winter sessions, SOCIs ~~distributed~~ completed online shall be available for 5 weekdays. ~~SOCIs distributed in person shall be distributed during one class meeting in the penultimate week of classes.~~ SOCIs ~~distributed~~ completed online shall be ~~distributed~~ completed during the penultimate week of classes.

For face-to-face courses, instructors shall provide a minimum of 30 minutes of scheduled class time for SOCI completion during the designated SOCI completed period. Instructors of face-to-face courses shall leave the classroom during this time in order to promote student privacy and reduce perceived pressure or response bias.

The University shall provide clear guidance and technical support to faculty and students to ensure consistent implementation and accessibility of online SOCIs. The

AVP for Faculty Affairs shall ensure that faculty receive directions on how to access online SOCIs via the Learning Management System so that faculty can encourage student participation. Faculty may encourage their students to complete SOCIs. Faculty members shall administer SOCIs in Accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

RATIONALE: Referral 2025–2026 35 highlights the increasing and unsustainable cost associated with the continued use of paper-based Student Opinions of Curriculum and Instruction (SOCIs). Transitioning to an exclusively online SOCI system represents a fiscally responsible and environmentally sustainable alternative. Online SOCIs are currently available as an option for face-to-face classes, or requirement for online classes, and so online SOCIs are already part of currently accepted practices.

This resolution further seeks to preserve the integrity and effectiveness of SOCI data during the transition to an online modality. A primary concern associated with online SOCIs is reduced student participation when surveys are completed outside of class. By requiring instructors of face-to-face courses to provide structured in-class time and leave the classroom during SOCI administration for at least 30 minutes, this resolution maintains continuity with current paper-based procedures and reinforces established norms that protect student anonymity, minimize perceived pressure, and promote higher response rates.

Additionally, this resolution formalizes the expectation that SOCI reports will be generated and distributed for all instructional terms, including cases in which no student responses are submitted. Providing reports in all circumstances ensures consistent documentation for faculty and prevents gaps in official records. The distribution of SOCI reports to individual faculty, department chairs, and college deans supports transparent and efficient faculty evaluation processes, facilitates completion of Working Personnel Action Files (WPAFs) and periodic evaluations, and ensures that backup records are available when needed.

Collectively, these changes advance institutional efficiency, protect the validity of student feedback, and strengthen the reliability and accessibility of SOCI data for personnel review and continuous improvement.

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
AVP for Faculty Affairs
Academic Senate
College Deans
Dean of the Library
College Associate Deans
General Faculty

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



Department Chair Terms – Handbook Change

RES 252621

FAC

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate approves revisions to the University Handbook regarding the selection and appointment of Department Chairs and Program Directors. Deletions are in ~~striketrough~~, and additions are in **bold and underlined**.

312.3 Selection and Appointment Procedures

The appropriate dean shall request that the department or program faculty vote to recommend one or more persons for the position of chair or director. In addition, the dean shall offer the opportunity for the faculty to convey individual, confidential advice, orally or in writing. The recommendations of the faculty and the dean shall be forwarded by the dean to the P&VPAA by April 1st. The offer of appointment shall specify the criteria, including but not limited to those outlined in section 312.2 above, by which the administration will evaluate the performance of the chair or director. ~~Chairs or directors are expected to serve no more than two (2) consecutive three-year terms.~~

Chairs or directors are expected to serve no more than two (2) consecutive three-year terms in the same role. To promote shared governance, leadership development, and equitable distribution of service, departments and programs shall ordinarily limit service to these two consecutive terms, after which a break in service is expected before an individual may be considered again for the same position. This expectation does not impose a lifetime limit on service; individuals may become eligible to serve again following a break.

However, in cases where no other qualified and willing candidates are available, departments may recommend an exception to the expected term limit. Such recommendations must document (a) the efforts made to identify other qualified and willing candidates, and (b) the unit's rationale for extending the term limit. Any exception requires the approval of both the dean and the P&VPAA.

RATIONALE: This resolution responds to Academic Senate Referral 2025–2026–28, which requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee review existing handbook language governing Department Chair and Program Director appointments and consider whether updates are warranted to ensure greater consistency across Colleges.

The proposed language establishes a clear normative expectation of no more than two consecutive terms, while preserving necessary flexibility through a documented exception process when no other qualified or willing candidates are available. Importantly, the policy does not impose a lifetime limit on service, allowing experienced faculty to return to leadership roles following a break in service. This approach balances institutional consistency with departmental autonomy, supports sustainable faculty leadership structures, and aligns local practices with widely accepted norms in shared governance across higher education.

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
AVP for Faculty Affairs
Academic Senate
College Deans
Dean of the Library
College Associate Deans
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Academic Advising Structure Is an Academic Endeavor

RES 2526XX

AS&SS, AAC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate affirms academic advising as an academic endeavor and asserts its role in the shared governance of advising policies and practices. Shared governance of academic advising should be carried out through a student-focused collaborative process with Academic Affairs, faculty, students, administrative bodies, and the Division of Student Affairs and Strategic Enrollment Management, in alignment with accreditor expectations where applicable.

RESOLVED: That the Director of Academic Advising should provide annual reports to the Academic Senate and keep the Senate up to date on the state of academic advising.

RATIONALE: With the reorganization of academic advising under the Division of Strategic Enrollment Management and Student Support, there is a need to reaffirm the vital connection between advising and the Academic Senate. As University Handbook sect.103.2.2 states, "CSUB's Academic Senate is a body through which the faculty exercises its members' collective knowledge, experience, and judgement to develop and recommend to the President policies and procedures that ensure the realization of the University's mission." Academic advising of students is fundamental to this mission. Thus, the Academic Senate must continue its practice of developing and recommending policies and procedures pertaining to academic advising, including its structure and supports.

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
VP Student Affairs
AVP & CIO Information Technology Services
AVP Faculty Affairs
AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs

Academic Senate

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

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

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