



# ACADEMIC SENATE

## CSU BAKERSFIELD

### Academic Senate: Executive Committee

#### Agenda

TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2025

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

**Location:** BDC 134- BPA Conference Room

**Zoom link:** <https://csu.zoom.us/j/84413121414?pwd=bGl6cVtVHjZcDQyaWVzYjQvVU04dz09>

**Members:** M. Danforth (Chair), D. Solano (Vice-Chair), J. Rodriguez (Interim Provost), A. Hegde, C. Lam, N. Michieka, J. Deal, T. Tsantsoulas, D. Wu, Z. Zenko and K. Van-Grinsven (Senate Analyst).

1. Call to Order
2. Announcements and Information
  - a. January 31 – Spring General Faculty Meeting
  - b. February 4 – Extra EC Meeting scheduled; President Harper will attend
3. Approval of Agenda (Time Certain: 10:05 AM)
4. Approval of EC Minutes
  - a. January 21, 2025 (handout)
5. Continued Items
  - a. AS Referral Log (handout)
    - i. AAC (J. Deal)
    - ii. AS&SS (T. Tsantsoulas)
    - iii. BPC (D. Wu)
    - iv. FAC (Z. Zenko)
  - b. Interim Provost Update (J. Rodriguez)
    - i. Arts and Humanities Dean Search
    - ii. Arts and Humanities Associate Dean Search
    - iii. Paper SOCI inquiry
  - c. RES 242514 – Interim Time Place Manner Policy ([handout](#))
6. New Discussion Items (Time Certain: 10:45 AM)
  - a. New Items over Winter Break
    - i. Class Cancellations

- ii. Request for Consultant Data for the ASCSU ([handout](#))
  - iii. Program Discontinuation/ moratorium – AAC and FAC? (handout)
- b. CSU Generative AI report and professional ethics ([handout](#)) – AS&SS? and FAC?
- c. Work group for CSUB Communications Standards ([handout](#))
- d. Data Governance Committee ([handout](#))
- e. Elections and Appointments (D. Solano)
  - i. Spring 2025 Call Timeline
  - ii. Review of committees' activity (HOLD; Senate Office compiling list)
- f. Handbook and Bylaws Project; create taskforce or consent agenda resolutions?
  - i. Updating Schools to Colleges
  - ii. Updating all references to quarters
  - iii. 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.
  - iv. Director of Assessment: Review position (Handbook 105.2 and 305.6.)
  - v. Council of Academic Deans: Review Composition and name (Handbook 105.2)
  - vi. 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.
  - vii. Review committees listed (Handbook 107)
  - viii. Update TEAC Description: Currently lists old college names (H&SS, SOE, and NSM) (Handbook 201.5)
- g. RTP – FAC
  - i. Unit Review Committee Procedures ([handout](#))
  - ii. PAF Insertion/deletion
    - 1. Handbook Section 301.6.4 "Correction of Materials in the PAF" has current procedures
- h. Double-Major Policy: Timeline for Declaring ([handout](#)) – AAC
- i. Faculty concerns about SSD Testing – AS&SS
- j. ASCSU Interruption Practice Policy (AS-3551; [handout](#))
- k. Additional SOCI Concerns discussed at Senate; see minutes from December 5, 2024 (handout)
  - i. SOCI Waivers for combined sections
  - ii. SOCI Administration when instructor goes on leave during the semester
  - iii. SOCI Task Force on preamble and content of SOCI instrument
  - iv. RTP committee training with respects to SOCIs (handout)
- l. Department Formation follow-up (HOLD follow up w/ Academic Programs)
- m. Resolution on CCC baccalaureate degrees [AB 927, SB 895] – EC (HOLD)
- n. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) follow-up – BPC (HOLD 3/18/2024)

7. Agenda Items for Senate Meeting (Time Certain: 11:15 AM)

## Academic Senate Meeting – Spring 2025

Thursday, January 30, 2025

Agenda

10:00 AM – 11:30 AM

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

**Zoom Link:** <https://csub.zoom.us/j/89047995676?pwd=VEdFQVJkZTk5UUVzblQyNDR4UkZrUT09>

**Senate Members:** Chair M. Danforth, Vice-Chair D. Solano, Senator A. Hegde, Senator C. Lam, Senator N. Michieka, Senator T. Tsantsoulas, Senator M. Naser, Senator D. Wu, Senator S. Sarma, Senator L. Kirstein, Senator A. Stokes, Senator Z. Zenko, Senator S. Roberts, Senator K. Holloway (virtual), Senator H. He, Senator A. Grombly, Senator E. Correa, Senator J. Deal, Senator R. Dugan, Senator T. Salisbury, Senator J. Cornelison, Senator E. Pruitt, Interim Provost J. Rodriguez, Senator J. Dong and Senate Analyst K. Van Grinsven.

**Guests:** President V. Harper

- I. Call to Order and Tejon Tribal Land Acknowledgement
- II. Approval of Minutes
  - a. December 5, 2024 (handout)
- III. Announcements and Information
  - a. President's Report – V. Harper **(Time Certain: 10:10 AM)**
  - b. Elections and Appointments – D. Solano (handout)
  - c. Events:
    - i. January 31 – General Faculty Meeting, 8:00 AM – 1:00 PM, MPR
    - ii. March 17 – Spring Budget Forum; **time and location TBD**
- IV. Approval of Agenda **(Time Certain: 10:05 AM)**
- V. Reports
  - a. Interim Provost's Report – J. Rodriguez
  - b. ASCSU Report – Senators Lam and Michieka **(handout)**
  - c. ASI Report – Senator Pruitt
  - d. Staff Report – Senator Cornelison
  - e. Committee Reports:

- i. Executive Committee – Vice-Chair Solano (handout)
- ii. Standing Committees:
  - 1. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC)– Senator Deal (handout)
  - 2. Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS)– Senator Tsantsoulas (handout)
  - 3. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) – Senator Wu (handout)
  - 4. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – Senator Zenko (handout)
- f. CFA Report – Senator Salisbury (handout)

VI. Resolutions **(Time Certain: 10:35 AM)**

- a. Consent Agenda:
- b. Old Business:
  - i. RES 242510 – Process and Timeline of SOCI Administration – FAC and AAC (handout) (Hold; in committee for revision).
  - ii. RES 242514 – Interim Time Place Manner Policy (handout) (Hold; in committee for revision)
- c. New Business:
  - i. RES 242509 – Search and Screening Procedures for Administrators – FAC and BPC (handout)

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

VIII. Adjournment

8. Adjournment



# ACADEMIC SENATE

CSU BAKERSFIELD

## General Faculty Meeting – Spring 2025

Friday, January 31, 2025

8:00 AM – 1:00 PM

Location: Student Union MPR and Hybrid

Zoom Link: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/87136606842?pwd=jknmtrhkpjprsy5hdj5gi6lq3pklfz.1>

### Agenda

Continental Breakfast 8:00 AM  
*(Sponsored by Interim Provost Rodríguez and catered by Hodel's Country Dining)*

Welcome Address – Dr. Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair 8:20 AM

### **\*Open Session\*** (8:30 – 10:00 AM; hybrid)

President's Remarks– Dr. Vernon B. Harper Jr. 8:30 AM

Interim Provost's Remarks– Dr. James L. Rodríguez 8:50 AM

Q&A with the President and Interim Provost 9:10 AM

Break 10:00 – 10:15 AM

### **\*Faculty Only Session\*** (10:15 AM – 12:00 PM; in-person only)

CFA Update – Dr. Tracey Salisbury, CFA President 10:15 AM

Upcoming Senate Business – Dr. Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair 10:30 AM

Elections and Appointments – Dr. Dani Solano, Academic Senate Vice-Chair 10:45 AM

Open Forum – Dr. Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair 11:00 AM

Lunch 12:00 – 1:00 PM  
*(Sponsored by Interim Provost Rodríguez and catered by Hodel's Country Dining)*

**2024-2025 Academic Senate: Referral and Resolution Log**

Date	Referral	Status	Committee/s Charged	Action	Resolution	Handbook/Bylaws Change	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
9/3/2024	2024-2025 #06 Sixth-year Lecturer Review – Handbook Change	Taskforce has been formed; IP	FAC	Purpose and outcome(s) of the Sixth-year Lecturer Review, etc. <i>Carry over referral 2021-2022 #41 Sixth-year Lecturer Review – Handbook Change</i> <b>Carry over referral:</b> 2023-2024 #03 Sixth-year Lecturer Review – Handbook Change <b>Update:</b> FAC Drafted memo and recommendations - included in Senate Agenda packet 9/26/2024. Task Force for Periodic Evaluation created- EC appointed members 11/12/2024; first meeting 12/2/2024		Handbook Change			
9/3/2024	2024-2025 #08 Faculty Hiring Prioritization- Position Control	With committee	BPC	Discuss the administration's commitment to the hiring of tenured and tenure-track faculty to match the growth trends of student enrollments and the demographic make up of the student population, and to match or exceed growth in administrative positions (MPPs). <b>Carry over referral:</b> 2023-2024 #36 Faculty Hiring Prioritization- Position Control					
9/3/2024	2024-2025 #09 Need for an Academic Testing Center	With committees	AS&SS and BPC	Whether there is a need for the campus to have an Academic Testing Center to assist with proctoring exams and perhaps full-fledge entrance testing. Consider resources needed and what the structure might be to meet the needs of faculty and students. <b>Carry over referral:</b> 2023-2024 #31 Need for an Academic Testing Center					
9/13/2024	2024-2025 #10 Time Blocks	With committee	BPC	The need to reconsider Time Blocks for classes. During discussion, consider how to address meeting patterns that are not visualized in RES 1314059, whether the 50 minutes M/W/F time blocks are sufficient for pedagogical reasons, overlap between current time blocks of different types, effects of time blocks on space utilization. <b>Carry over referral:</b> 2023-2024 #04 Time Blocks and Space Utilization					
9/13/2024	2024-2025 #11 Space Utilization	With committee	BPC	The need to reconsider space utilization tactics; consider Assessment of space utilization such as highly used time blocks, poorly used time blocks, classes scheduled outside of time blocks, classes scheduled in non-classroom spaces, etc. Impact of space utilization on approval of future buildings, policies regarding classes scheduled outside of time blocks, and policies to encourage broad use of time blocks and higher space utilization. <b>Carry over referral:</b> 2023-2024 #04 Time Blocks and Space Utilization					
9/16/2024	2024-2025 #13 Reconsideration of the Role and Structure for the Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR)	With committee	FAC	Reconsideration of the role and committee structure for the Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR) including the role CPR plays in the new Faculty Affairs Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation (DHR). The composition of CPR given the new Faculty Ombudsperson.		Handbook Change 303.8			
9/16/2024	2024-2025 #14 SOCI Process	With committees	AAC and FAC	Review the statewide report on the status of student evaluations in the CSU system. <b>Carry over referral:</b> 2023-2024 #35 Administering SOCI		Possible Handbook Change			
9/16/2024	2024-2025 #15 Timeframe of SOCI Administration	With committees	AAC and FAC	Discuss the differences between paper and online SOCI administration considering: timelines and changes to the Academic Calendar. <b>Carry over referral:</b> 2023-2024 #35 Administering SOCI. <i>Update: FAC memorandum included in Senate packet 9/26/24 and sent to Brian Chen and Chris Diniz, ITS.</i>		Possible Handbook Change			
10/11/2024	2024-2025 #18 Revision of RES 232431 Search and Screening Procedures for Administrators	RES IP	FAC and BPC	Revision of RES 232431 Search and Screening Procedures for Administrators addressing whether to add use of search firms, add language regarding exceptions, and add an option for university to retreat. RES 232431 Passed in Senate; not approved by President. EC discussed with President Harper in EC on October 8, 2024.	<b>RES 242509</b> Search and Screening Procedures for Administrators (1st reading scheduled for 12/5/2024)	Handbook 309			
11/14/2024	2024-2025 #20 New Certificate Proposal: Nursing PG-NEC Certificate	With committees	AAC and BPC	Review the proposed new certificate, Post Graduate Nurse Educator Certificate submitted by the Department of Nursing.					
12/3/2024	n/a	RES IP	EC	Resolution on the Interim Time, Place and Manner Policy	<b>RES 242514</b> Resolution on TMP (1st reading scheduled for 12/5/24)				
1/15/2025	2024-2025 #22 Proposal for Elevation of a Concentration to Degree- BA in Ethnic Studies		AAC and BPC	Review the proposal for the elevation of a concentration to a degree in the Bachelor of Arts in Ethnic Studies					
1/15/2025	2024-2025 #23 Bylaws and Handbook Changes in Response to ASCSU Constitution Ratification		FAC	Propose changes to the bylaws, constitution and appendix to identify a process for the selection of the lecturer electorate representative, including identifying if that individual is elected, to have seat on the CSUB Senate.		Handbook/Bylaws Change			
1/15/2025	2024-2025 #24 Administrator Search Committee Composition – Handbook Change		FAC	Review and address the issues in the University Handbook section 309.5 Composition of the Search and Screening Committee for Administrators. During discussion, consider clarification of the language to determine which of the search and screening committee compositions is associated with each administrator position, specifics of the the composition of the search and screening committees including the addition of a department chair to the provost search committee, specification of a dean as one of the administrator appointments for the provost and dean search committees and that the staff and administrator appointments be someone from within Academic Affairs, or related area.		Handbook 309.5			
1/22/2025	2024-2025 #25 Academic Advising Structure and Report		AS&SS	Consider drafting a resolution stating that Advising remains an academic endeavor under the purview of the Academic Senate, even though it has been reorganized under the Division of Strategic Enrollment Management and Student Support and determine a feasible extension for the due date for the report from the Interim Director of Advising as required by Resolution 222316.					



## **Resolution on the Interim Time, Place, and Manner Policy**

**RES 242514**

EC

**Preamble:** Recognizing the foundational role of academic freedom, free speech, and free expression in the pursuit of knowledge, the California State University, Bakersfield Academic Senate affirms the intrinsic value of these principles in fostering a rigorous, vibrant academic community. As a public institution dedicated to inquiry, innovation, and the free exchange of ideas, it is the duty of this University to ensure that its policies reflect and uphold the highest standards of the First Amendment, without imposing undue restrictions that undermine these values.

**Whereas** academic freedom is essential for advancing knowledge and fostering an environment where diverse perspectives can be explored without fear of censorship, retaliation, or restriction; and

**Whereas** the First Amendment protects free speech, free expression, and inquiry, serving as a vital safeguard for intellectual exploration in a democratic society; and

**Whereas** the First Amendment guarantees the right to peaceful protest, a fundamental component of free expression that allows individuals to advocate for change, voice dissent, and contribute to societal discourse in ways that are both lawful and essential to democracy; and

**Whereas** restricting the manner of use and availability of public spaces on campus, including paved pedestrian walkways and lawns on University property, the Administration Quad, the Administration Lawn, Alumni Park, the Antelope Valley Building 100 Lawn, the Don Hart East Lawn, the Harvey Hall Plaza, the Icardo Center Lawn, the Red Brick Road, the SCI III Lawn Area, the Student Recreation Center Lawn, The Student Union Park, and other public spaces, to certain available times is often restrictive to free speech and free expression; and

**Whereas** new restrictions on academic freedom or freedom of speech on California State University campuses must be negotiated through shared governance before they may be implemented in keeping with the recognition of all parties of the importance of Section 3561(b) of HEERA, which states:

“The Legislature recognizes that joint decision-making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of such institutions;” and

**Whereas** The CSU [Interim Time, Place, and Manner Policy](#) is not effective for Union represented employees until after the meet and confer process is completed; and

**Whereas** time, place, and manner policies, while sometimes intended to maintain campus order, often place excessive limitations on academic and intellectual freedoms, stifling spontaneous discourse, restricting access to diverse perspectives, and fostering an environment that is inconsistent with the ideals of higher learning and free expression; and

**Whereas** time, place, and manner policies are often restrictive on free speech, creating an environment that is often perceived as censorious, which conflicts with the University's mission to promote open dialogue and intellectual exploration; and

**Whereas** the current, CSU [Interim Time, Place, and Manner Policy](#) is vague, especially in its implications around the wearing of masks, suggesting that the intent behind mask-wearing can be both known and defined without presenting any clear rationale for how intent is determined; and

**Whereas** vague policies, along with broad interpretations that can criminalize otherwise lawful behaviors, create an environment that poses risks to students, faculty, and staff—particularly those from minoritized backgrounds, who may experience heightened vulnerability and exposure to misinterpretation or punitive action; and

**Whereas** an open, engaged University community, accessible to all, including students, faculty, staff, and the public, is essential to the mission of a public institution, fostering a culture of openness that mirrors the society it serves;

**Resolved** that the California State University, Bakersfield Academic Senate affirms the University's commitment to uphold the principles of the First Amendment, ensuring that policies, practices, and regulations prioritize the broadest possible freedoms of speech, expression, and inquiry, as fundamental to the mission of higher education; and

**Resolved** that any University policies that impose time, place, and manner restrictions on speech, expression, or public assembly be re-evaluated to ensure they do not infringe upon the rights protected by the First Amendment, nor inhibit the spirit of academic freedom; and

**Resolved** that the California State University, Bakersfield Academic Senate rejects any policy that seeks to restrict speech, expression, or inquiry beyond the protections guaranteed under the First Amendment, and commit instead to fostering open dialogue and intellectual diversity on campus; and

**Resolved** that the California State University, Bakersfield Academic Senate reaffirms its commitment to creating an environment that is inclusive, open, and accessible to all members of the campus and wider community, rejecting vague or restrictive policies that deter free expression, lawful assembly, or peaceful dissent; and



**Resolved** that this resolution be widely disseminated across campus to reaffirm the University's commitment to these guiding principles and to educate all members of the CSUB community on the essential importance of free speech, academic freedom, and the values of open and engaged dialogue.

**Distribution List:**

President  
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs  
VP Student Affairs  
AVP Faculty Affairs  
AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs

---

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

**Katherine Van Grinsven**

---

**From:** Melissa Danforth  
**Sent:** Monday, January 27, 2025 10:54 AM  
**To:** Katherine Van Grinsven  
**Subject:** New EC agenda item on program discontinuation/moratorium

Hi Katie,

Please add the review and possible revision of the Senate involvement in the moratorium/discontinuation policy to the EC agenda. Here is the current policy as posted on Academic Program's website:

[https://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/files/Policy\\_on\\_Discontinuance\\_of\\_Academic\\_Degree\\_Programs.pdf](https://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/files/Policy_on_Discontinuance_of_Academic_Degree_Programs.pdf)

The policy does not clearly state how the Senate is given a "written" notification/request, and I think it should be clear that it needs to be a proposal submitted for the normal referral/resolution process, and that an email or memo is insufficient. The 14 day timeline in the policy should also only start after Senate has passed a resolution, not 14 days from Academic Programs submitting a proposal. I've also received a request from lecturers that they be added to the list of faculty members notified, and that they have the ability to object to the request.

This is rather urgent, so put it as a new sub-item under item 1 on the new discussions (after Dani's and Nyakundi's requests) for potential referral out to AAC and FAC.

Thanks,  
Melissa

--

Dr. Melissa Danforth  
Pronouns: she/they  
Chair, CSUB Academic Senate  
PI, CSUB's S-STEM Scholarship Program  
Professor of Computer Science  
Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering/Computer Science  
California State University, Bakersfield  
Website: <https://www.cs.csub.edu/~melissa/>

## **CSU BAKERSFIELD POLICY ON DISCONTINUANCE OF ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAMS**

The following policy statement describes the procedures and requirements under which an academic degree program can be considered for discontinuance at California State University, Bakersfield. Program discontinuance is a seldom used but important component to the long-range planning of the University. It affords the University a deliberate process of program evaluation, and when done well, produces substantial consensus regarding the future direction of the department, school and/or university. Program discontinuance is not an appropriate procedure for addressing short-term financial crises or personnel problems. It is an appropriate process for evaluating the relevance and vitality of specific programs where substantial doubts exist as to the program's future viability and responsiveness. Normally, these doubts will be raised first by the faculty directly responsible for the program or will arise out of the normal program review process.

Six criteria govern decisions regarding discontinuance of an existing academic degree program. In each instance, strategies to strengthen or modify the program shall receive first and serious consideration as alternatives to discontinuance.

- (1) The overall quality of a program is an essential factor in decision making. There are many forms of supporting evidence that lead to conclusions regarding overall quality. For example, evidence of excellence in teaching, academic program reviews, accrediting agency reports, reputation within the discipline (including published surveys) and reputation across the campus, evidence of faculty and student scholarship, timeliness of the curriculum, currency of the faculty, and efforts to mentor and involve students in intellectual and creative pursuits attest to qualitative achievements.
- (2) Centrality of a program to the University is another consideration. This criterion basically addresses whether the University might fulfill its mission were this program to be eliminated.
- (3) Need is an important consideration. Both internal and external factors determine need. Internal considerations are related to the University's mission. It is the mission of California State University, Bakersfield, to be a comprehensive university which offers a variety of degree programs in the liberal arts and professions. Also, the instructional contributions of a degree program to other programs are important. External factors include the needs of our regional population, the clientele we serve, and to some extent, current student demand.
- (4) Diversity is an important criterion when considering program discontinuance. Faculty, students, and a curriculum which reflects diversity contribute to our ability to create this environment and better model a changing population.

- (5) Degree program size is a consideration. To be effective a degree program must have a sufficient number of faculty to provide a reasonable exposure to the discipline and a sufficient number of students to insure the integrity and continuity of the curriculum.
- (6) Cost and resource generation are appropriate criteria. In determining cost the following factors are useful: student/faculty ratio, factors that determine resource generation, program administration costs, anticipated future outlays, and a judgment about maximum utilization of resources. When appropriate, the ability to generate outside revenue can be balanced against cost factors.

#### Initiation of Program Discontinuance Procedures

A written request for the review of an academic program for the purpose of determining whether program discontinuance is warranted may be made by any one of the following parties:

- (1) the Chair of the degree program with the written approval of a majority of the tenured and probationary faculty in the program or, in appropriate instances, the program committee;
- (2) the Dean of the school in which the program is housed;
- (3) the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, but only in regard to an undergraduate program;
- (4) the Dean of Graduate Studies, but only in regard to a graduate program;
- (5) a majority vote of the Academic Senate; or
- (6) a majority vote of the University Program Review Committee.

Such a request shall be submitted in writing to:

- (1) the Vice President for Academic Affairs;
- (2) all Deans involved in the administration of the program;
- (3) the Academic Senate; and
- (4) all tenured and probationary faculty who teach in the program.

The letter making this request must clearly indicate the specific reasons for the suggested program discontinuance. If within 14 calendar days\* of receipt of this letter by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, none of the individuals or parties listed in (1) through (4) above (i.e., the Vice President for Academic Affairs, any Dean involved in the administration of the program, the Academic Senate by majority vote, or any tenured or probationary faculty member who teaches in the program) has objected to the proposed discontinuance in writing to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, a recommendation for discontinuance will be sent to

the President. If within 14 calendar days of receipt of the letter requesting program discontinuance at least any one of those parties has objected to discontinuance, then the following procedures must be followed before a recommendation for program discontinuance can be made to the President.

“Calendar days” exclude the Summer break and the breaks between quarters wherever the term is used in this document.

#### Appointment of a Special Review Committee

Within 14 calendar days of receipt of a letter objecting to a proposed program discontinuance from one of the parties listed above, the Senate Executive Committee in consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall appoint a Special Review Committee to conduct a special program review focused on issues related to potential discontinuance. The committee shall consist of:

- (1) six tenured faculty: one selected by the faculty who teach in the affected program, three from different units within the same school as the program in question, and one from each of two schools different from that of the program in question;
- (2) the Dean of the school in which the program is housed, who will serve as a nonvoting member; and
- (3) the Dean of Undergraduate Studies or the Dean of Graduate Studies, as appropriate, who will serve as a non-voting member for a program included in his or her administrative responsibilities.

#### Minimum Requirements for the Special Program Review

As a minimum, this review shall include:

- (1) direct, personal consultation with all current full-time faculty members who have taught courses in the program within the last two academic years;
- (2) an opportunity for students presently enrolled in the program to provide both written and oral statements regarding the proposed program discontinuance; and
- (3) an open forum, announced publicly at least 14 calendar days in advance, in which the University community at large has a chance to express its views.

The review shall address the following points:

- (1) an evaluation of the academic quality of the program (as described under criterion #1, P. 1);

- (2) an analysis of the cost and resource generation, over time, of the program;
- (3) study of enrollment trends over the past ten years, present enrollment in the program, and projected future enrollment;
- (4) consideration of alternatives that might increase the quality and/or student enrollment in the program, as needed;
- (5) consideration of alternatives for providing additional financial support for the program, as needed,
- (6) assessment of specific community needs served by the program;
- (7) assessment of the favorable and unfavorable impact that discontinuance of the program would have on other degree programs, other campus activities, and the curricular priorities and mission of the University;
- (8) study of the possible impact of program termination on faculty in that program and evaluation of possible on-campus faculty transfers which might occur, based on faculty skills, training, and desire as well as campus need; and
- (9) consideration of the impact discontinuance of the program would have on students presently enrolled.

A maximum of 45 calendar days will normally be allowed for the work of the Special Review Committee. Upon completion of its review, the Special Review Committee shall make a written report and recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. This report must include the opportunity for minority reports from the Special Review Committee. The Senate Executive Committee shall forward the report for review by the Academic Affairs Committee and the Budget and Planning Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall forward the report to the appropriate Dean(s) and the affected department for review.

A maximum of 30 calendar days will be allowed for review of and rebuttal to the written report by the committees, Dean(s) and affected department. A copy of this report and any written rebuttals or statements should then be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs for final review. The Academic Senate normally will make its recommendation to the President regarding the program discontinuance no later than 60 days after receiving the recommendation of the Special Review Committee.

### CSU Program Discontinuance Procedures

If the President decides that program discontinuance is warranted, the campus will follow these procedures required by EP&R 79-10 regarding review by the Chancellor of program discontinuance proposals:

- (1) The campus President shall inform the Chancellor of the proposed discontinuance.
- (2) The Chancellor will review the proposal for system-wide effects with the advice from whatever groups he/she deems appropriate, and may request additional information from the campus if needed for this review.
- (3) The Chancellor will ordinarily provide comments on all such proposals within 30 days and will inform the President of any system concerns so that these may be considered in the final decision.
- (4) The President will not take any administrative action leading to the de facto or official discontinuance of an academic program before the Chancellor has commented on the proposal.

In the event the President's final decision is official discontinuance of an academic program, a cut-off date shall be announced immediately beyond which no new students, including transfer students, will be permitted to enter the program. All students currently listed by the Registrar as participants in this program shall receive written notification of the program discontinuance no more than 15 days after the official announcement by the President.

Plans and alternatives shall be developed to allow currently enrolled students to complete a degree program. Students currently enrolled in the program should be given the opportunity to provide both written and oral statements regarding the alternatives available. These alternatives may include:

- (1) completion of the program requirements by a certain date in order to receive the specified degree from this University;
- (2) completion of a closely related program offered by this campus;
- (3) completion of a similar program, if any, offered by other institutions within the California State University system; and
- (4) use of substitutions to meet this campus's requirements for the program.

The President, in consultation with appropriate administrators and faculty committees, shall make every effort to assist in the placement of faculty members displaced by program discontinuance in other appropriate programs or activities in the University or on other campuses in the California State University system.

Normally, an academic program shall continue to serve its current students for at least three full quarters following the official announcement of program discontinuance by the President. During this transition period, course offerings should be designed to assist students in the program to complete the program requirements.

Notice that the program has been discontinued will be sent to all advisors, units, and agencies involved in advising or providing information regarding academic programs on this campus.



## TIMELINE FOR PROGRAM DISCONTINUATION

- I. Letter received by the Vice President for Academic Affairs requesting degree program discontinuation.

### **14 Calendar Days\* After Receipt of Letter**

- IIA. If no party as listed above has objected in writing to the proposed discontinuation, a recommendation for discontinuation will be sent to the President.
- IIB. If any party as listed above has objected in writing to the proposed discontinuation, the procedures for program discontinuation as outlined in this document must be initiated.

### **Within 14 Calendar Days After Receipt of Written Objection**

- III. Special Review Committee must be appointed with procedures outlined above.

### **Within 14 Calendar Days Advance Public Notice**

- IV. An open forum must be held in which the University community at large can express their views.

### **Within 45 Calendar Days After Appointment of Special Review Committee**

- V. Special Review Committee must submit its completed report and recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

### **Within 30 Calendar Days After Receipt of Special Review Committee Report**

- VI. All reviews of rebuttals to, and general statements regarding the Special Review Committee report must have been submitted in writing to the Senate Executive Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

### **Within 60 Calendar Days After Receipt of Special Review Committee Report**

- VII. The Academic Senate must make its recommendation to the President regarding program discontinuance.

"Calendar days" exclude the Summer break and the breaks between quarters wherever the term is used in this document.

## Topic: Request for Data for the ASCSU

**From:** [Di Wu](#)  
**To:** [Nyakundi Michieka](#); [Melissa Danforth](#)  
**Cc:** [Senate Executive Committee Group](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Request for Data for the ASCSU (FYI - we will be gathering data from all 23 campuses)  
**Date:** Monday, December 23, 2024 2:53:00 PM

---

Thank you, Nyakundi. Wishing you and your family happy holidays! You're absolutely right—I doubt such information would be readily available to the public. It's highly likely that Thom Davis would need to provide the details.

[@Melissa Danforth](#), since this request is coming from the ASCSU, I was wondering if it might be possible for either you or the entire EC or perhaps the two of us (whichever works best) to draft a formal business memorandum to Thom, requesting the disclosure of the information along with a proposed timeline.

Happy holidays to everyone!

Thanks,

Di

---

**From:** Nyakundi Michieka <nmichieka@csub.edu>  
**Sent:** Sunday, December 22, 2024 2:35 PM  
**To:** Di Wu <dwu2@csub.edu>  
**Cc:** Senate Executive Committee Group <executivecommittee@CSUB.onmicrosoft.com>  
**Subject:** Request for Data for the ASCSU (FYI - we will be gathering data from all 23 campuses)

Hi Di,

I'm writing to encourage you to help us gather data about how campus and chancellor's office funds are being spent on outside consultation firms. In Faculty Affairs (of the ASCSU), we believe the money may be being misspent, that existing campus expertise among our faculty could be utilized to do the work, especially in a time of such budget retrenchment. This survey will help us determine whether or not this is a problem, and highlight the ways in which our campus budgeting processes could be more transparent.

We understand that you may not know the answers to these questions and that you may have to ask your CFO, or faculty on campus budget committees. Could you report back to us by our January meeting about your progress in getting answers to these questions?

Thank you so much and Happy holidays!

Nyakundi M. Michieka

Vice-Chair, Faculty Affairs Committee of the ASCSU  
Associate Professor, Department of Economics

California State University, Bakersfield

**Topic:** CSU Generative AI report and professional ethics

**From:** [Melissa Danforth](#)  
**To:** [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)  
**Subject:** Generative AI request for EC  
**Date:** Friday, October 4, 2024 2:25:05 PM

---

Hi Katie,

I received a request by a faculty member who wishes to remain anonymous. They'd like EC to discuss whether the campus should develop a policy for faculty use of generative AI for grading student work.

This somewhat aligns to the systemwide generative AI committee report at <https://genai.calstate.edu/csu-generative-ai-committee> although they were more focused on compliance (e.g., not violating FERPA) instead of professional ethics.

That report was part of the motivation for ITS wanting to form governance structures, and it might inform the faculty survey, so it does add more dimensions to the referrals to AS&SS, but this concern doesn't directly fall under the existing AS&SS referrals.

Can you add this to the new items in the EC agenda as "CSU Generative AI report and professional ethics"?

Thanks,  
Melissa

--

Dr. Melissa Danforth  
Pronouns: she/they  
Chair, CSUB Academic Senate  
PI, CSUB's S-STEM Scholarship Program  
Professor of Computer Science  
Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering/Computer Science  
California State University, Bakersfield  
Website: <https://www.cs.csub.edu/~melissa/>

**From:** [Melissa Danforth](#)  
**To:** [Richard Nelson](#); [Deborah Cours](#); [Jane Dong](#); [Alicia Rodriguez](#); [Luis Vega](#); [Sandra Bozarth](#); [Elizabeth Adams](#)  
**Cc:** [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Request - Work group for CSUB communications standards  
**Date:** Thursday, October 24, 2024 12:27:41 PM

---

Hi Richard,

Similar to how the adoption of Canvas went through the Academic Senate in 2019/20, this discussion should also involve Senate. We'll add it to the Executive Committee agenda to see which standing committee(s) should be involved.

Thanks,  
Melissa

---

**From:** Richard Nelson <rnelson16@csub.edu>  
**Date:** Thursday, October 24, 2024 at 11:10 AM  
**To:** Deborah Cours <dcours@csub.edu>, Jane Dong <jdong2@csub.edu>, Alicia Rodriguez <arodriquez@csub.edu>, Luis Vega <lvega@csub.edu>, Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>, Sandra Bozarth <sbozarth2@csub.edu>, Elizabeth Adams <eadams6@csub.edu>  
**Subject:** Request - Work group for CSUB communications standards

Colleagues,

I'm writing to ask if you would like to be part of, or would like to designate someone to participate on your behalf, in a group that will ultimately recommend standards for communication across the campus.

Currently the campus uses multiple forms of communication which can become costly and distracting when trying to manage so many different forms of communication. For example, there are Zoom Video/Phone/Chat, Teams Video/Chat, Slack Chat, standard email, and Canvas. Many of the aforementioned products also integrate with Canvas.

I've attached a "draft charter" for this group hereto. All of this is open and up for discussion/changes.

If you believe I've missed anyone who should be included, please feel free to forward or reply with names and I'll be sure to include them.

Thank you in advance,

**Richard (Richie) Nelson**

Director of IT Support Services & Reprographics

Information Technology Services

(661) 654-3522

[rnelson16@csub.edu](mailto:rnelson16@csub.edu)



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
**BAKERSFIELD**

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

<https://twitter.com/itscsub>

# Working Group Charter for Communication Standards

## Purpose:

The purpose of this working group is to evaluate and recommend communication standards for the CSUB campus. The focus will be on usage, best practices, cost efficiency, and integration into the campus learning management system, Canvas.

## Objectives:

1. Assess the current communication tools used on campus, including Zoom, Teams, Slack, MS Outlook, and Canvas.
2. Identify best practices for communication in an academic setting.
3. Evaluate the cost efficiency of each communication tool.
4. Recommend a standardized set of communication tools that integrate seamlessly with Canvas as well as provide for exceptions based on unique needs.
5. Develop guidelines for the effective use of the recommended communication tools.

## Scope:

The working group will focus on:

1. Evaluating the usage and effectiveness of current communication tools.
2. Identifying and recommending best practices for communication.
3. Analyzing the cost efficiency of communication tools.
4. Ensuring integration with Canvas.
5. Providing a comprehensive report with recommendations to the campus leadership.

## Membership:

The working group will consist of representatives from various departments, including IT, academic staff, administrative staff, and student representatives. The committee will be chaired by a committee member appointed by vote of the charter membership.

## Responsibilities:

1. Conduct surveys and gather data on the current usage of communication tools.
2. Research best practices in communication within academic institutions.
3. Analyze the cost implications of each communication tool.
4. Develop a set of recommendations for communication standards.
5. Present the recommendations to the campus administration for approval.

## Meetings:

The committee will meet monthly to discuss progress and findings. Additional meetings may be scheduled as needed.

## **Topic:** Data Governance Committee Structure

**From:** [Melissa Danforth](#)  
**To:** [Christopher Diniz](#)  
**Cc:** [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Data governance committee  
**Date:** Monday, December 9, 2024 9:49:34 AM

---

Hi Chris,

Temporarily, until Senate Exec can discuss this, I'll serve as the faculty representative.

I'm CCing Katie so she can add this to the Senate EC agenda for Spring.

Thanks,  
Melissa

---

**From:** Christopher Diniz <cdiniz@csub.edu>  
**Date:** Monday, December 9, 2024 at 9:41 AM  
**To:** Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>  
**Subject:** Data governance committee

Hi, Melissa,

One of the things that I was tasked with towards the beginning of taking on the role as interim AVP/CIO was establishing a charter for a data governance committee. The data governance committee is in response to a WASC finding, originally identified a few years ago. I got the charter approved by the cabinet, and initially, we would ask each college for a representative. However, the other CSUs usually add a faculty representative from the academic senate. I know that the Academic Senate is now on break, but I would like to see what your thoughts are on bringing in a faculty representative from the Academic Senate or if I should go to each college.

Charter:  
<https://csub.box.com/s/oy6ftr3v2w3ggg6jv1bnaayxocfsby5u>

Thank you,

Christopher Diniz, MBA  
Associate Vice President &  
Chief Information Officer  
Information Technology Services  
(661) 654-3431

**California State University, Bakersfield**



## **Data Governance Committee (DGC)**

*Adopted TBD*

---

### Intent

The intent of the Data Governance Committee (DGC) is to be a cross-functional group as chartered by and reporting to the Data Governance Advisory Council (DGAC). Committee members shall be actively engaged in contributing knowledgeable perspectives regarding data governance, data quality management, metadata management, data access and privacy, data standards, and data literacy. The primary focus is to establish and sustain data standards and procedures and make recommendations to the DGAC consistent thereto.

### Purpose

The purpose of the DGC is to support the Associate Vice President/Chief Information Officer, Associate Vice President, IRPA/Chief Assessment Officer, and key functional committees in creating and sustaining a best-in-class data environment that: is secure, accurate, valid, accessible, and that people are properly trained on its use in support of the mission, vision, values and strategic plan of California State University, Bakersfield.

### Objectives

The objectives of the DGC are to make data governance recommendations to the DGAC that:

1. Establish and communicate a best-in-class vision for data management that supports the University's mission and goals.
2. Define data standards and architecture for university data.
3. Define roles and responsibilities for specific aspects of data management.
4. Address security, risk and compliance related to such needs/opportunities.
5. Establish/reaffirm needs/opportunities policies and procedures as appropriate.
6. Define needs/opportunities implementation timelines.
7. Determine needs/opportunities resource costs required to fulfill the recommendation(s)

### Membership

The membership of DGC shall consist of the following or their respective designee:

1. Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer (Co-Chair) – Chris Diniz
2. Associate Vice President and Chief Assessment Officer (Co-Chair) – Monica Malhotra
3. Information Security Officer – Doug Cornell
4. University Controller – Finance (CFS) Heather Macaulay
5. Director of Accounting and Reporting, Student Financial Services – Student Financial – Christina Orozco
6. Assistant Vice President of Enrollment Services – Admissions and Student Records – Jennifer Mabry
7. Assistant Director of Enrollment Systems & Academic Operations – Admissions – Sonya Gaitan
8. Director of Enrollment Management Systems– Academic Advising – Tommy Holiwell
9. Associate Vice President for Grants, Research and Sponsored Programs – Isabel Sumaya
10. Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Administrative Services – HR and LCD – Lori Blodorn
11. Director of Financial Aid and Scholarships – Financial Aid – Chad Morris
12. UA representative – Alumni CRM – TBD
13. EEGO representative – CRM - TBD
14. Faculty representative – Academic Senate Chair – Melissa Danforth
15. Student representative - TBD
16. Liaisons (non-voting)
  - o Deputy Chief Information Officer – Brian Chen

### Meeting Schedules

The meetings of the DGC shall be at least monthly during the academic year with additional meetings scheduled as requested by the DGC Chairs.

**Katherine Van Grinsven**

---

**From:** Melissa Danforth  
**Sent:** Monday, September 23, 2024 3:34 PM  
**To:** Zachary Zenko; Danielle Solano  
**Cc:** Katherine Van Grinsven  
**Subject:** RE: FAC Referral Request

Hi Zack,

Katie will add this to the agenda, although I'll note that at our current rate of tackling EC business and length of the EC agenda, it'll likely be the end of the semester before we get to this.

And my unit elects different committees to distribute the load across the tenured faculty, so that each tenured individual doesn't have to review as many files. As a younger department, we have had a lot of people to review in recent years, so that helps manage the workload.

We're also really two departments in one administrative unit, so we tend to have an "engineering" committee for the ECE faculty and a "computing" committee for the CMPS faculty. I imagine other blended departments with sufficient tenured faculty in each discipline might take a similar approach. And if the budget situation gets truly dire, we might have more blended departments in the future.

Melissa

---

**From:** Zachary Zenko <zzenko@csu.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 23, 2024 3:25 PM  
**To:** Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csu.edu>; Danielle Solano <dsolano@csu.edu>  
**Cc:** Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csu.edu>  
**Subject:** FAC Referral Request

Dear Melissa and Dani,

I'd like to request that the FAC takes up a referral to clarify the procedures of electing a Unit RTP Committee. It has come to my attention that different units handle this very differently, and the handbook is not clear on this.

Specifically, I believe the FAC should consider:

1. Whether all interested tenured faculty should be automatically considered for the election, or whether the size of the committee should be determined first.
2. Clarifying whether one Unit RTP Committee should be formed per unit, and then consistent for all faculty in that Unit (unless there are unique considerations, such as the additional member requested by the faculty member under review).

This is not an urgent priority, but I wanted to put it on your radar as I know that different faculty have approached me asking about these processes.

Thank you,  
Zack

**ZACHARY ZENKO, PH.D., FACSM, PAPHS**

He/Him/His  
Associate Professor  
Graduate Program Director, [MS in Kinesiology](#)  
Department of Kinesiology  
(661) 654-2799  
Office: EDUC 149  
[Zoom Link](#)

**Fall 2024 Office Hours**

Mondays and Wednesdays: 2:20 pm to 3:50 pm  
Thursdays: 1:45 pm to 3:45 pm  
By appointment

**California State University, Bakersfield**

Mail Stop: 22 EDUC  
9001 Stockdale Hwy  
Bakersfield, CA 93311

**Essentials of Exercise and Sport Psychology: An Open Access Textbook**



CALIFORNIA STATE  
**BAKERSFIELD**

I am a proud member of the California Faculty Association; if you are not already a proud member of CFA, [join here](#).

**From:** [Melissa Danforth](#)  
**To:** [Yize Li](#); [Danielle Solano](#)  
**Cc:** [Tracey Salisbury](#); [Sarana Roberts](#); [Zachary Zenko](#); [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Resolution regarding Removing Memo in Faculty's PAF  
**Date:** Sunday, August 25, 2024 11:07:06 AM

---

Hi Yize,

An email to the Senate chair is sufficient for referring a concern to the Executive Committee. I'm Ccing Katie so she can add this to the EC agenda.

Thanks,  
Melissa

---

**From:** Yize Li <yli11@csb.edu>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 25, 2024 9:11 AM  
**To:** Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>; Danielle Solano <dsolano@csb.edu>  
**Cc:** Tracey Salisbury <tsalisbury1@csb.edu>; Sarana Roberts <sroberts21@csb.edu>; Zachary Zenko <zzenko@csb.edu>  
**Subject:** Resolution regarding Removing Memo in Faculty's PAF  
**Importance:** High

Dear Melissa and Danielle,

It was nice seeing both of you at the General Faculty Meeting on Friday. Thank you very much for organizing the meeting, especially the Q&A session with President and Provost and the open forum.

After asking my question regarding memo in Faculty's PAF, a number of colleagues chatting with me. Some of them thought that a most straightforward solution would be talking with the Academic Senate to see whether a resolution regarding removing memo in Faculty's PAF after 3 years could be developed and passed.

As shared during the Q&A session, the rationales are:

- (1) A reprimand letter is removed from Faculty's PAF after 3 years. A memo is an informal letter which could be a result of retaliation or arbitrary action, so it does not make any sense if a memo stays in Faculty's PAF for more than 3 years.
- (2) A memo in Faculty's PAF could have serious impact to faculty's career and professional reputation, especially for faculty being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion (including range elevation for lecturers).

I am Ccing this email to CFA President Tracey Salisbury, Vice President Sarana Roberts, and Faculty Rights Chair Zachary Zenko. Sarana and Zachary attended and presented in

the General Faculty Meeting, and Tracey participated in earlier discussions regarding administrators' placing memo in Faculty's PAF. They can probably provide more relevant information, including genders and races of faculty members whose PAF include memos that were placed by administrators.

This is my first time bringing up an issue officially to the Academic Senate, so I am not quite sure about the exact procedure. If I need to complete any paperwork or send this email to all members of the Academic Senate, please advise. Please also feel free to forward this email to other senators.

Best Regards,  
Yize

Yize Stephanie Li, PhD  
Professor of Physics  
Department of Physics and Engineering  
California State University, Bakersfield

**From:** [Janine Cornelison](#)  
**To:** [Melissa Danforth](#)  
**Cc:** [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Senate Recommendation  
**Date:** Monday, September 23, 2024 10:52:35 AM  
**Attachments:** [Outlook-California.png](#)

---

Thank you, Melissa.

We want a specific policy like Long Beach. We are seeing so many students who have completed one major, they are ready to graduate, decide to add a second major. In those conversations, a majority of the time, students tell us they are not ready to leave. Since there is no policy indicating when a student is allowed to declare, we submit the declaration of major. We need a policy that indicates a timeline for declaring.

Advisors have had countless conversations with Dr. Harper regarding this, especially when he asks us why we aren't "getting the students graduated?"

**JANINE CORNELISON, M.S.**  
Academic Advisor  
College of Arts and Humanities  
(661) 654-2221

[www.csub.edu/ah/studentcenter](http://www.csub.edu/ah/studentcenter)



---

**From:** Melissa Danforth <[mdanforth@csub.edu](mailto:mdanforth@csub.edu)>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 23, 2024 10:26 AM  
**To:** Janine Cornelison <[jcornelison1@csub.edu](mailto:jcornelison1@csub.edu)>  
**Cc:** Katherine Van Grinsven <[kvan-grinsven@csub.edu](mailto:kvan-grinsven@csub.edu)>  
**Subject:** RE: Senate Recommendation

Hi Janine,

We will add this to the Exec agenda once we get further information from Dr. Adams about systemwide policy. Do note that the Exec agenda is already packed, and we might not get to this specific item until closer to the end of the term.

A point of clarification though. We do have a Double Major policy in the catalog (<https://catalog.csub.edu/policies-procedures/academic-policies/undergraduate/academic-affairs-academic-programs/>):

"Double Majors

Students graduating with a double major are required to complete all components of each major, including the Senior Seminars. Although double-counting of courses from one major to the other is possible, the student must accumulate a minimum number of unduplicated units in each major. For the BA major, the minimum is 24 semester units; for the BS major, the minimum is 36 semester units.”

How specifically are the advisors wishing this policy to be updated?

Thanks,  
Melissa

---

**From:** Janine Cornelison <jcornelison1@csub.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 23, 2024 10:11 AM  
**To:** Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>  
**Cc:** Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>  
**Subject:** Senate Recommendation

Dear Senate Chair,

I hope this message finds you well. On behalf of the professional academic advisors, I am writing to formally request the development of a comprehensive double major policy for our campus.

Currently, our campus is one of only six within the system that does not have a specific policy regarding double majors. As a result, we have observed a growing number of students opting to pursue multiple majors, which has, in many cases, led to extended periods of enrollment and the postponement of their graduation. While we encourage academic exploration, the absence of clear guidelines can lead to challenges in advising and an overall delay in students' progress toward degree completion.

To assist with this effort, I have attached examples of the current double major policies from other campuses within our system. These can serve as a useful reference and starting point for developing our own policy. A well-defined double major policy would help to ensure that students are making informed decisions about their academic paths, while also promoting timely graduation. Such a policy could outline criteria such as credit requirements, eligibility, and time-to-degree limits, providing clarity and consistency for both students and advisors. We believe it will enhance the academic experience for our students and contribute to the overall efficiency of our institution.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need anything else from me.

Thank you.

**JANINE CORNELISON, M.S.**  
Academic Advisor  
College of Arts and Humanities

**From:** [Elizabeth Adams](#)  
**To:** [Melissa Danforth](#)  
**Cc:** [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Double majors  
**Date:** Monday, September 23, 2024 3:48:35 PM

---

Hi Melissa,

There isn't a systemwide policy on double majors, but the general guidance in the past has been that double majors should not cause a student to extend their time to degree by very much. That guidance was issued during a time (and has not been updated since) when many campuses were over-enrolled and they were enforcing the "forbidden four" policy including exclusion of lower division transfer and second bacc admits. Now we're in a very different landscape.

All that said, the feds do limit the number of units a student can exceed the basic degree requirements to 20% of the total in awarding aid. In other words, they'll usually cut off aid at 150 units for a 120 unit degree. That 150 unit upper limit is usually the guiding principal behind various campuses allowing up to 140ish units to complete the second major (Humboldt, LB, LA, MB, Northridge).

The only policies from the CO are the minimum units for majors (BA: 24, BS: 36) and the requirement that we award all the earned degrees at the same ceremony. (Same degree, two majors like B.A. in English and Psychology or different degrees different majors like B.A. English and B.S. Computer Science).

The double counting thing is up to the campus, especially vis a vis minors. There are campuses that allow overlap with minors, but won't allow majors and minors in the same field. That tends to help students in interdisciplinary majors get a minor.

I think the 24/36 unit thing does make sense for double majors to ensure the quality and integrity of the degree (a WASC thing).

Always happy to discuss this kind of thing at length.

Elizabeth

---

**From:** Melissa Danforth <[mdanforth@csup.edu](mailto:mdanforth@csup.edu)>  
**Date:** Monday, September 23, 2024 at 10:28 AM  
**To:** Elizabeth Adams <[eadams6@csup.edu](mailto:eadams6@csup.edu)>  
**Cc:** Katherine Van Grinsven <[kvan-grinsven@csup.edu](mailto:kvan-grinsven@csup.edu)>



**Subject: Double majors**

Hi Elizabeth,

The Senate Office received a request to consider updating the double-major policy for CSUB. The requestor included the attached document with policies around the system, but I think that information was gathered from the campus catalogs, rather than looking at systemwide policies. For example, impacted campuses may have more restrictive policies than unimpacted ones.

Is there a systemwide policy on double majors and/or maximum units attempted, perhaps as related to the campus's impactation status?

Relatedly, another complaint Senate frequently hears is the CSUB policy on double-counting courses between two majors or between the major and the minor.

Specifically for double-majors, the catalog says: "Although double-counting of courses from one major to the other is possible, the student must accumulate a minimum number of unduplicated units in each major. For the BA major, the minimum is 24 semester units; for the BS major, the minimum is 36 semester units."

And for minors, the catalog says: "The 12 units (normally four 3-unit courses) used in a minor cannot be drawn from those used to satisfy the major requirements. However, in the case of majors requiring extensive lower division cognates (e.g., Business Administration), students may count one of the cognate courses as one of the four required in the minor."

Is there a systemwide policy on double-counting courses between two majors and/or between the major and minor?

Thanks,  
Melissa

--

Dr. Melissa Danforth  
Pronouns: she/they  
Chair, CSUB Academic Senate  
PI, CSUB's S-STEM Scholarship Program  
Professor of Computer Science  
Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering/Computer Science  
California State University, Bakersfield  
Website: <https://www.cs.csub.edu/~melissa/>

---

CSU Campuses with No Double Major Policy

- Bakersfield
- Chico
- East Bay
- Sacramento
- San Bernardino
- San Marcos – No double major policy, but does have an excess unit policy

---

Channel Islands

**Multiple Majors**

- Students may declare more than one major. If all majors completed lead to the same degree, BA or BS, they will all appear on the diploma. If the majors lead to different degrees, the policy on double degrees applies. Double counting of courses shall conform to the policy in Senate Resolution 34-01.

---

Dominguez Hills

**Double Major or Minor**

- A student may complete an additional minor or second major. Units used to satisfy the requirements for an additional major or minor cannot have been used in the first major or minor. The student shall declare the second major or minor at the time the Application for Graduation is filed and have the appropriate advisement form submitted. Whenever a double major is used to satisfy graduation requirements, the upper division courses must not overlap. The completion of an additional major or minor will be noted on the official transcript. A student who completes requirements for two majors under a single degree, BA or BS, may have both majors recorded on the diploma. A student who completes two majors leading to different degrees, for example, philosophy (BA) and public administration (BS), must declare one major as the degree major, in order to determine the appropriate degree to be awarded and notation for the diploma. A student will not be granted two diplomas and two degrees, as distinguished from two majors, at the same time. Note: The residency requirement for a second major is the same as for the primary major: 12 upper division units at CSU Dominguez Hills.

---

Fresno

**Double (Concurrent) Major Requirements**

- Undergraduate students may desire to complete the requirements for more than one major at the time of completion of the baccalaureate degree (i.e., graduate with a double major). All requirements for each degree must be met. When students apply for graduation, they must designate which is the primary degree major. Minimum requirements and exceptions for double majors are as follows:
  - Double B.A. majors must include a minimum of 24 units exclusive of the other major, 12 of which must be upper-division.
  - Double B.S. majors must include a minimum of 36 units exclusive of the other major, 18 of which must be upper-division.
- Units may be double-counted for both majors above 24 mutually exclusive units (12 upper-division) in B.A. programs and 36 units (18 upper-division) in B.S. programs.
- Courses in General Education may be used to fulfill major or minor requirements.
- Students may not earn a special major as a double major.
- One Degree with More than One Major and/or Minor: Two majors leading to the same baccalaureate degree (such as a B.A. or B.S.) do not constitute separate baccalaureate degrees. Only one degree and one diploma will be awarded. Only one application fee is required for one degree, regardless of the number of majors and minors. A student may earn a maximum of two majors and two minors so long as all work can be completed within 144 units.
- Graduating with Two Degrees: A student may be awarded more than one baccalaureate degree (such as a B.A. & B.S., B.S. & B.F.A., etc.) at the same time provided that requirements of all degree programs have been completed. Students who complete two different baccalaureate degrees must apply for all degrees in a single degree period by submitting separate applications simultaneously. A fee is required for each application submitted. Students who concurrently complete the requirements for two baccalaureate degrees will be acknowledged on separate diplomas for each degree earned.
- Note: Students may not pursue a baccalaureate and master's degree concurrently.

Fullerton

**Multiple Majors and Second Baccalaureate Degrees**

- Within the units required for the baccalaureate, it is possible for a student to complete the requirements for more than one major within one degree (for example, a B.A.) when the additional major is within the same degree (in this case, another B.A.). At least 24 units, including 12 at the upper-division level, in each Bachelor of Arts major, or 36 units, including 18 at the upper-division level, in each Bachelor of Science major, must be applied exclusively to the respective major and may not be used to meet requirements in other majors. The student shall declare the additional major with the appropriate department no later than the beginning of the student's final year of study.
- The completion of additional majors will be noted at the time of graduation by appropriate entries on the academic record and in the commencement program.
- Students seeking two bachelor's degrees concurrently (i.e., in two different degree programs such as B.S. and B.A.) may qualify for graduation with the approval and recommendation of the faculty upon completion of the following:
  - minimum of 60 units in residence (30 units for each degree);
  - minimum of 48 upper-division units among the 60 residence units mentioned above;
  - a minimum of 12 upper-division units in residence in courses offered by each of the major departments in which the two degrees are being sought; and
  - all requirements in major fields of study, general education, scholarship (minimum grade-point average), and all other minimum unit requirements.

Humboldt

**Second Major (Double Major)**

- Students may earn a bachelor's degree with two majors by completing the requirements for both programs. Although both majors appear on the permanent record, the student receives one degree.
- Students may declare and complete a second major only if they meet the following criteria:
  - Declare second major before earning 90 units; and
  - Demonstrate that they can graduate with both majors completed in fewer than 140 total units.
  - Students who choose to complete a second major and cannot complete the required courses in less than 140 units may submit a request for an exception to the department chair and college dean.

Long Beach

**Declaring a Second Major**

- Students may be allowed to complete the requirements for two baccalaureate programs concurrently in accordance with the Timely Graduation Policy. Students wishing to add a second major must meet the major-specific criteria for the new major as defined in Major Specific Declaration Requirements for CSULB Students.
- While students are encouraged to pursue their academic interests, all degree objectives (e.g., majors, minors, certificates) must be completed within 120% of the units allowed for the primary degree as stipulated in CSULB's Timely Graduation for Undergraduate Students policy. Students must declare all degree objectives before reaching 90 units.
- Also note that CSULB's Academic Progress Rules for Undergraduate Programs policy stipulates that if any one of a student's three GPAs is below 2.5, the student must have the approval of their primary major advisor to add any additional degree objectives. Please note that students whose major GPA is near or below a 2.0 are unlikely to be allowed to pursue additional degree objectives until they have improved their major GPA.
- Before the student satisfies the specified criteria, the student should meet with the department academic advisor to discuss the possibility of adding the additional major. If the major advisor supports the request, the advisor will electronically submit the request to Enrollment Services. Be aware that additional information may be requested to ensure compliance with the policies mentioned above prior to processing the request. One diploma will be issued reflecting both majors. A course, or courses, may be used to satisfy the individual requirements of both majors, without limit, as long as the required pattern of course work is completed for each major.

Los Angeles

**Changing your Major or Declaring a Second Major**

- Students may change their major or add a second major if they will be able to complete their baccalaureate degree in no more than 120% (144 units for a standard 120-unit program) of the units required by their primary degree program, including a second major or any minors. Undergraduates may declare up to (a) two majors without a minor (b) one major and two minors.
- If you are considering changing your major or declaring a second major, be aware that you must meet any major-specific criteria in the new major. To determine whether your desired major has major specific criteria, see the list of Major Specific Declaration Requirements. You can check how your academic course work applies to the proposed new major's admission requirements or degree requirements by creating a 'What-if Report' available in the 'Academics Section' of the GET Student Center. If you want to see your progress towards meeting the admission requirements, select the 'pre-major' code under the Area of Study drop down, such as Pre-Criminal Justice. If you want to see all of the degree requirements for the major, select the actual major in the Area of Study drop down such as Criminal Justice.
- Once you have satisfied the specified criteria, meet an advisor from the College Advising and Student Success Center to explore the possibility of changing your major. If the advisor supports your request, the advisor will electronically submit your request to Enrollment Services. Be aware that additional information may be requested to insure compliance with the policies mentioned above prior to the processing of the request.
- Note: Due to special requirements, PaGE and Second Baccalaureate students are not allowed to change their degree objective nor are they eligible to declare additional bachelor-level majors or minors.

Maritime Academy

**Declaring Double Major Procedures**

- Students interested in completing double majors must follow the procedures detailed on the "Application for Double Major" form and meet the minimum standards provided therein. Application for a double major will take into consideration numerous factors including, but not limited to, student academic progress, space restrictions, competitive standards, and time to degree completion.
- Requirements of double majors include:
  1. Each of the two majors must consist of a minimum of 36 non-overlapping major units.
  2. A student who began at Cal Maritime as a freshman must complete coursework for both degrees within five academic years.
  3. A student who began at Cal Maritime as a transfer or second baccalaureate student must complete coursework for both degrees in no more than four years.
  4. The second major of a double major may not be an impacted major.
  5. Approval of double majors is not guaranteed.
  6. Double majors, if granted, are considered conditional and subject to change if: a student fails to meet academic requirements in the first or second major; a student has a change of academic and/or disciplinary status; or, a student fails to enroll in the approved courses as outlined by academic advisors each term for each major.
- In accordance with CSU Executive Order 971, if a student has completed the requirements for two or more majors leading to the same baccalaureate degree, those majors shall be acknowledged on the diploma. If a student has completed the requirements for two or more majors leading to different baccalaureate degrees, those degrees and the completed major or majors leading to each degree shall be acknowledged on the diploma. If more than one major or degree is to appear on the diploma, the student shall be consulted regarding the order in which the student prefers the degree(s) and major(s) to appear.

Monterey Bay

**Declaring a Second Major**

- Students may declare a second major (i.e., double major) only if they can complete both the requirements for both majors within 144 units. Students must have a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.5 to add additional degree objectives, unless approved by the advisor for their current primary academic program. Students may not declare a second major after completing the requirements of their first major.
- Student requests to declare a second major must be approved by the advisors of both majors. If the student seeking to declare a second major has 90 or more earned units, the request must also be approved by the AVP for Academic Programs. All requests to declare a second major must be accompanied by an advisor-approved educational plan demonstrating that the additional major requirements can be completed within 144 units. When a student completes two majors, both majors will be documented on the transcript, and appropriate diploma(s) will be issued.
- For majors leading to a Bachelor of Arts, 24 units (of which at least 12 units are upper-division and taken in residence at CSUMB) shall only be used for fulfillment of the requirements of one major. Units completed in addition to the 24 units may be used for fulfillment of the requirements of the second major (i.e., double counted).
- For majors leading to a Bachelor of Science, 36 units (of which at least 18 units are upper-division and taken in residence at CSUMB) shall only be used for fulfillment of the requirements of one major. Units completed in addition to the 36 units may be used for fulfillment of the requirements of the second major (i.e., double counted).

Northridge

**Adding a Second Major**

- Students may add a second major (double major) only if they can complete both majors within 140 units. Students may not add a second major after completing the requirements for their first major. Student requests to add a second major must be approved by the department chairs of the existing major and the second major. If the student seeking to add a major has 90 or more earned units, the request also must be approved by the associate dean (or college designee) of the new major. All requests to add a second major must be accompanied by a plan demonstrating that the additional major can be completed within 140 units. When a student completes two majors, both majors will be recorded on the diploma. Courses taken to satisfy the requirements for one major may be double counted if they satisfy requirements in the second major.
- Double majors in the same department are permitted unless specifically excluded in the University Catalog.

**Changing Major or Option**

- Students seeking to change majors/options must be able to complete the new major/option within 140 units. Student requests to change a major/option must be approved by the department chair of the new major/option. If the student has 90 or more earned units, the request also must be approved by the associate dean (or college designee) of the new major/option. Requests to change majors/options must be accompanied by a plan demonstrating that the new major/option can be completed within 140 units.

Pomona

**Declaration of Minors and Additional Majors**

- Students may declare up to two minors in addition to their primary major if all academic programs can be completed within 36 units above the number of units required for their primary major. Students must receive the approval of the chair of the department offering the proposed academic program.
- Students may declare one major in addition to their primary major if all academic programs can be completed within 48 units above the number of units required for their primary major. Students must receive the approval of the chair of the department offering the proposed academic program.
- Minors or double majors may be declared at any time in a students' career but students are strongly encourage to declare minors and double majors early in their career. After earning 135 totals units, students may declare a minor or additional major only if they are in good academic standing and have the approval of the chair of the department offering the proposed academic program.
- Credits from transfer units, non-traditional college-level work (including AP, IB, and CLEP examinations, and credit by challenge examinations), and military service in excess of 90 quarter units shall be excluded from the unit count for the purposes of the minor and double major policies.\*
- Students may request exceptions to the minor and double major policy by filing a general academic petition.
- \*Students often have credits from these sources that are not applicable to their Cal Poly Pomona degree program for a variety of reasons, including unfamiliarity with how tertiary education works (especially first generation college students), poor advising at Community College, exploration/change of career direction, credits for sports, etc. The intention of this policy is to count up to 90 quarter units that likely fulfill GE and academic program requirements at Cal Poly Pomona without prohibiting transfer students from minoring or double majoring if they have a large number of units that do not further their Cal Poly Pomona degree.

San Diego

**Multiple Majors**

- Some students may wish to complete up to three majors. In such a case, each major must be declared with the Office of the Registrar, and all requirements for each major must be fulfilled.
- In the case where the same class is required for each major, the class can only be counted towards one of the major requirements. Therefore, you must substitute another class for one of your majors, as approved by your major advisor.

San Marcos

**Excess-Units Seniors**

- Students seeking a first baccalaureate degree who have earned 150 or more units and who have not yet graduated are considered to be “excess-units seniors” (exception: Nursing majors and Integrated Credential Program students are not subject to this policy). The records of such students will be reviewed and advising will be provided in order to facilitate their graduation. This may include such actions as
  - Automatic graduation of students who have met all graduation requirements;
  - Identification of possible course substitutions that would make it possible for students to graduate;
  - Early priority registration for the purpose of being able to register in courses needed for graduation; and
  - Additional advising and the development of a graduation plan that the student would be expected to follow.
- Students choosing to appeal their automatic graduation must submit a Degree Conferral Appeal. The appeal must include a narrative statement elaborating how excess units were accumulated, their educational intent, and completion timelines. The appeal will be reviewed by a committee consisting of Dean or Designee from the College of the student’s major, a designated academic advisor from the student’s major, and an appropriate faculty representative from the student’s academic department/program.
- Students with more than 130 attempted units may only change their majors if the change of major allows for graduation at a date no later than the earliest date possible with the current major. Similarly, students with more than 130 attempted units may only declare additional majors or minors if the additional majors or minors allow for graduation at a date no later than the earliest date possible with the first major. In these cases, approval from a staff advisor in Advising Services will be needed. Exceptions can be granted by an appropriate faculty advisor such as the department chair or designee.

San Francisco

**Double Major**

- With careful academic planning, it may be possible for students to complete two majors. When possible, students are encouraged to complete both degrees without exceeding 120 units. Students who are significantly over 120 units may be monitored and required to meet with an academic advisor to track their degree progress. Students who complete two majors may apply for both degrees in a single commencement by submitting one degree application with approval from both major departments. No additional fee is required for the second application.

San Jose

**Double Major**

- If a student has completed the requirements for two or more majors leading to the same baccalaureate degree (e.g., two B.A. degrees or two B.S. degrees) for the same graduation application period, those majors shall be acknowledged on a single diploma and on the student’s transcripts. Each major, not including courses in preparation for the major, must consist of at least 36 units for Bachelor of Science degree majors, or at least 24 units for Bachelor of Arts degree majors, units that are completely separate and distinct from the other degree. The University has the right to restrict students from pursuing double majors, particularly when resources must be equitably distributed among all students.

## Deliverables:

1. **Assessment Report:** A detailed report on the current communication tools, their usage, and effectiveness.
2. **Best Practices Guide:** A guide outlining best practices for communication in educational institutions.
3. **Cost Efficiency Analysis:** A report analyzing the cost efficiency of current communication tools and potential alternatives.
4. **Integration Plan:** A plan for integrating recommended communication tools with Canvas.
5. **Final Recommendations:** A comprehensive report with recommendations for communication standards.

## Timeline:

The working group will aim to complete its work within six months, with the following milestones:

- **Month 1-2:** Assess current communication tools and identify best practices.
- **Month 3-4:** Conduct cost efficiency analysis and explore integration with Canvas.
- **Month 5:** Develop draft recommendations and seek feedback.
- **Month 6:** Finalize recommendations and submit the report to campus leadership.

## Approval:

This charter will be reviewed and approved by the campus administration.

**ACADEMIC SENATE  
OF  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-3551-21/FA/AEDI (Rev)  
March 17-18, 2022

**ESTABLISHING AN INTERRUPTION PRACTICE FOR THE ASCSU**

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) acknowledge that establishing an environment which values and prioritizes equity, diversity and inclusion requires attention to the impact of our discourse, regardless of intent; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) adopt a Standing Rule of Order – Interruption Statements (Attachment A); and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU adopt a Special Rule of Order -Point of Interruption (Attachment B); and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU urge campus Senates to consider adopting similar policies in pursuit of our joint goals of equity, diversity and inclusion; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Senate Executive Committees, California Faculty Association (CFA), California State Student Association (CSSA), and the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA).

***RATIONALE:** The impact of our words can sometimes be quite different from that intended by the person speaking. This is recognized in a wide variety of policies concerning hate speech (e.g. <https://items.ssrc.org/disinformation-democracy-and-conflict-prevention/classifying-and-identifying-the-intensity-of-hate-speech> and ALA publication <https://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/bate>). An integral part of anti-racism work involves acknowledging those impacts and seeking to minimize the number of occasions where our words reify racial or gender-based narratives. The process of thoughtfully and kindly interrupting the meeting to draw the issue to one another's attention is an effective mechanism for raising the issue without engaging in shaming or blaming – in the vernacular, Calling In rather than Calling Out.*

*The intentionality of our efforts toward equity, diversity and inclusion and to address issues of racism and misogyny are reflected in the following formal statements of this body:*



[AS-3404-19/EX \(Rev\): Creation Of An Ad Hoc Committee To Advance Equity, Diversity And Inclusion Within The Academic Senate Of The CSU](#)

*This resolution urges the creation of a committee to examine ASCSU practices to provide recommendations to the Executive Committee about ways to increase equity, diversity and inclusiveness in the ASCSU. (Approved Unanimously January 23-23, 2020).*

***AS-3404-19/EX (Rev) Rationale:*** *in light of the anti-bias training in which the ASCSU participated during the previous academic year and the interrupting racism training during the first plenary of this academic year, a conversation arose among many senators encouraging a theme of inclusiveness and anti-bias be adopted for the current academic year. It was suggested that one way the ASCSU can advance this agenda is by moving beyond individual actions, interactions and attitudinal changes, but also striving for appropriate changes in institutional policies and procedures. Approved unanimously - January 23-24, 2020*

[AS-3370-19/FA/EX \(Rev\): Request That The ASCSU Schedule An Interrupting Racism Training Session In September 2019](#) - Approved Unanimously – May 16-17, 2019

*The ASCSU encourages the 2019-2020 ASCSU executive committee to allocate sufficient time at the September 2019 plenary for a complete session of the interrupting racism training offered by the California faculty association (CFA), or equivalent training, to help provide an effective learning environment for our students, especially students from historically marginalized communities*

[AS-3518/2022 EX \(Rev\): Increasing the Membership of the Ad Hoc Committee to Advance Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion \(AEDI\) Within the ASCSU](#) - Approved Unanimously January 20-21, 2022

*That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) increase the membership of the ad hoc committee to Advance Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (AEDI). The Committee will consist of at least seven (7) Senators appointed by the Executive Committee, with at least one member from the Executive Committee.*

**Approved – May 19-20, 2022**

## **Attachment A**

### **Standing Rule of Order – Interruption Statements**

All agendas of the ASCSU and its committees shall include the following:

#### **Interruption Practice Statement**

As part of our continuing commitment to an environment where equity, diversity and racial/social justice may thrive, when we experience examples of racial narratives, racism, whiteness or misogyny in our meetings, or as we conduct our business, we will speak up. This means we can interrupt the meeting and draw the issue to one another's attention. We will do this kindly, with care and in good faith. Further, as we engage interruptions we will take an intersectional approach, reflecting the fact that white supremacy, racism and misogyny operate in tandem with interlocking systems of oppression of colonialism, class, cisheteropatriarchy, and ableism, among others.

## **Attachment B**

### **Special Rule of Order – Point of Interruption**

When any communication by any speaker during a meeting involves invidious racial narratives, racism, misogyny, or other forms of bias, any member may raise a Point of Interruption to draw attention to the issue.

#### **Usage**

The concerned member calls out ‘Point of Interruption’. The speaker pauses. The chair recognizes the concerned member and asks them to state the issue. The concerned member gives a polite and brief explanation. The chair returns the floor to the speaker.

#### **Technical details**

This device is a form of Raise a Question of Privilege pertaining to the privileges of the assembly as a whole (§19).

Takes precedence over all other motions, including other Questions of Privilege, except the higher-ranked privileged motions to *Recess*, to *Adjourn*, and to *Fix the Time to Which to Adjourn*.

#### **In order when another has the floor**

A Point of Interruption cannot provide the basis for a Question of Privilege pertaining to the privileges of the interrupted speaker.

## Katherine Van Grinsven

---

**From:** Melissa Danforth  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 23, 2025 11:04 AM  
**To:** Katherine Van Grinsven  
**Subject:** FW: Addition to handbook?

Hi Katie,

Please add this to the EC agenda under the new item we added yesterday for SOCI issues not covered by the current resolution. Make this a new sub-bullet point labeled "RTP committee training with respects to SOCI".

Carol is okay with sharing this email with EC as backup to the item. It was also discussed at the December Senate meeting.

Thanks,  
Melissa

---

**From:** Carol Dell'Amico <cdellamico@csb.edu>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 22, 2025 1:25 PM  
**To:** Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>  
**Subject:** Addition to handbook?

Hi Melissa,

I was encouraged to contact you about this – I'm in the AAC right now and it came up as we were discussing SOCI last semester. I was thinking that a short section that might be added to the Handbook could cover **RTP Committee Members' Responsibilities**—*but I think dept chairs might have a responsibility, too*. Let me explain:

One thing we were talking about was bias in SOCI. A couple of the AAC members said that they were bowled over to hear about some of the comments that had appeared on SOCI and that had been shared with them – about a faculty member being pregnant was one. The couple of comments that struck faculty and that were shared were extremely obvious instances of bias, comments that any sensible committee member would ignore--comments that now would get the whole SOCI form along with its quantitative data thrown out. What was not mentioned until I brought it up was the routine, endemic, "unseen" bias that exists in evaluations of this sort: professors with accents (or rather certain accents), women professors, professors of color – etc. - that is, there are groups whose SOCI can show generally lower scores and less enthusiastic written responses. *Committee members need to be aware of this.* (Yes, certain professors are just stars, but the most of us are just as earnestly good as we can be and potentially subject to biased responses.) The scholarship on bias of this kind is everywhere and has been for a long time. My point? Every SOCI season, it should be the chair's responsibility to remind RTP committee members that these sorts of bias exist—and remind committee members of the Handbook responsibilities, if they come to exist – and chairs could even be expected to SEND out that section of the handbook. Other "responsibilities" that might be listed:

- Members should respond to the contents of the folder **strictly in relation to the departmental criteria** (to guard against the infiltration of agendas or personal hobby-horses).
- Commentary on SOCI should concern itself with relevant **patterns** in student response and never isolated or rare commentary. (We have all wondered at committee letters that managed to find the ONE negative comment and dilate on that, despite all the other gushing responses!).

I wish such a section weren't necessary, but I think it is. We all have or have heard horror stories.

That's my two cents, for now.

Thanks,

Carol

--

Carol Dell'Amico  
English Department  
CSU, Bakersfield  
9001 Stockdale Highway  
Bakersfield, CA 93311