



Academic Senate: Executive Committee

Agenda

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2025

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

Location: BDC 134- BPA Conference Room

Zoom link: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/84413121414?pwd=bGl6cVtVHjZcDQyaWVzYjQvWU04dz09>

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).

- I. Call to Order
- II. Announcements and Information
 - a. Upcoming Forums:
 - i. Special Review Committee for Anthropology Open Forum – Wednesday, April 9
 1. Time: 10 – 11:00 AM
 2. Location: BDC 154B and virtual
 - ii. President's Open Forum – Wednesday, April 23
 1. Time: 9-10:30 AM
 2. Location: Student Union MPR; [Zoom Link](#)
 - b. Amendment: Faculty Honors and Awards Committee (FHAC) Extension request regarding Faculty Awards Recommendations
- III. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:05 AM**)
- IV. Approval of EC Minutes
 - a. March 25, 2025 (handout) (deferred)
 - b. April 1, 2025 (handout) (deferred)
- V. 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. Administrator Searches:
 - 1. Dean for the College of Arts and Humanities
 - a. Webpage: <https://www.csub.edu/dean-search/ah/>
 - 2. Associate Dean for the College of Arts and Humanities
- ii. Academic Administrator Review Committees (AARC)
 - 1. Isabel Sumaya, AVP GRaSP (*confirm that she has chosen not to undergo review)
- c. Budget and Schedule Build **(Time Certain: 11:20 AM)**
- d. Rumor control
- e. Calendar Committee – Composition and faculty representation
- f. Advising Council – Faculty representation
- g. Add “Statements of the Senate” Process to governing documents – EC
- h. Expected Spring Reports to Senate/Campus
 - i. Interim WASC Report – Academic Programs
 - ii. Strategic Plan Report – IRPA
 - iii. Advising Report- Director of Academic Advising (Due: May 12, 2025)
 - iv. Special Review Committee for Anthropology (Due: May 2, 2025)
 - v. GECCo Annual Report
 - vi. Other reports??? UPRC, URC, FAR?

VI. New Discussion Items **(Time Certain: 10:45 AM)**

- a. Discuss potential Faculty Advisor Open Forum
- b. AB 1361 Endorsement (handout)
- c. Elections and Appointments (D. Solano)
 - i. Faculty Ombudsperson Call (confirm need for call and term length)
 - ii. Standing Committee Calls: Qualtrics Links
 - 1. Call for Chairs: https://csup.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_efjP4lUVxf7m3ly
 - 2. Public Dashboard for nominations received:
<https://csup.iad1.qualtrics.com/public-dashboard/v0/dashboard/web/67e1bee3bc0ec70008964d50>
 - iii. Pending Calls: College Appointed positions
 - iv. Review of committees’ activity (HOLD: Senate Office compiling list)
- d. Handbook and Bylaws Project; Summer Project – funding?
 - 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)
- ix. Update reference to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs- association with Academic Advising and review other duties (Handbook 104.2.1).
- x. Update position titles in 309.9 (Handbook 309.9).
- xi. Update all references to the AVP of Enrollment Management- distinguish the VP of Strategic Enrollment Management from the new AVP of Enrollment Management
- xii. Bylaws Section IV.A.4 Annual reports from committees- limit to specific committees?
- e. Department Formation follow-up (HOLD follow up w/ Academic Programs)
- f. Resolution on CCC baccalaureate degrees [AB 927, SB 895] – EC (HOLD)
- g. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) follow-up – BPC (HOLD 3/18/2024)
- h. SOCI Task Force on preamble and content of SOCI instrument (HOLD 3/11/2025)

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

Academic Senate Meeting – Spring 2025

Thursday, April 10, 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.

- I. Call to Order and Tejon Tribal Land Acknowledgement
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - a. March 13, 2025 (handout)
- III. Announcements and Information

- a. President's Report – V. Harper (deferred)
- b. Elections and Appointments – D. Solano (handout)
- c. Events:
 - 1. President's Open Forum – Wednesday, April 23
 - a. Time: 9-10:30 AM
 - b. Location: Student Union MPR; [Zoom Link](#)

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 (deferred)
- 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)
 - a. Memo from ITS regarding Referral 2024-2025 29 (handout)
 - 3. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) – Senator Wu (handout)
 - 4. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – Senator Zenko (handout)
- f. CFA Report – Senator Salisbury (deferred)

VI. Resolutions **(Time Certain: 10:20 AM)**

- a. Consent Agenda: no items.
- b. Old Business:
 - i. RES 242524 – Committee on Professional Responsibility, Revisited – FAC (handout)
 - ii. RES 242525 – Evaluation of Academic Administrators, Part II – FAC (handout)
- c. New Business:
 - i. RES 242527 – Standardizing the Unit RTP Composition Process – FAC (handout)
 - ii. RES 242528 – Updating the Bylaws to Create an Interruption Statement and Add Clarity to Procedures – FAC (handout)
 - iii. RES 242529 – Updating the CSUB Policy on Discontinuance of Academic Degree Programs – FAC and AAC (handout)
 - iv. RES 242530- Class Cancellation Guidelines- AAC and BPC (handout) (*amendment to EC agenda; added to Senate agenda*)
 - v. RES 242531- AB 1361 Endorsement – EC (handout) (*tentative; EC still needs to vote*)

- vi. RES 242532- Support for Cidi Labs Accessibility Checker Software – AS&SS
(handout) *(tentative; AS&SS still needs to vote)*
- vii. RES 242533- Faculty Hiring Prioritization and Funding for Student Services – BPC
(handout) *(tentative; BPC still needs to vote)*

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

VIII. Adjournment

VIII. Open Forum

IX. Adjournment

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 #08 Faculty Hiring Prioritization- Position Control		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). Carry over referral: 2023-2024 #36 Faculty Hiring Prioritization- Position Control					
9/3/2024	2024-2025 #09 Need for an Academic Testing Center		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. Carry over referral: 2023-2024 #31 Need for an Academic Testing Center					
9/13/2024	2024-2025 #10 Time Blocks		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. Carry over referral: 2023-2024 #04 Time Blocks and Space Utilization					
9/13/2024	2024-2025 #11 Space Utilization		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. Carry over referral: 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)	RES IP	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.	RES 242524 Committee on Professional Responsibility, Revisited (2nd reading scheduled for 4/10/25)	Handbook Change 303.8			
9/16/2024	2024-2025 #15 Timeframe of SOCI Administration		AAC and FAC	Discuss the differences between paper and online SOCI administration considering; timelines and changes to the Academic Calendar. Carry over referral: 2023-2024 #35 Administering SOCIs. <i>Update: FAC memorandum included in Senate packet 9/26/24 and sent to Brian Chen and Chris Diniz, ITS.</i>		Possible Handbook Change			
2/3/2025	2024-2025 #26 Class Cancellation Guidelines		AAC and BPC	Address concerns regarding class cancellations: inconsistencies in class section cancellations between colleges, effects of class section cancellations on student graduation progress and retention, developing guidelines for class section cancellation that take in to account exceptions for smaller programs, availability of lab/studio stations and equipment, accreditation requirements, etc.					
2/3/2025	2024-2025 #27 Program Discontinuation/Moratorium Policy	RES IP	AAC and FAC	Review and address the concerns regarding the current program discontinuation/ moratorium policy. Consider: whether lecturers in the program should be added to the list of faculty members notified in writing at the beginning of the process; updating the notification to Senate to be a formal discontinuation proposal instead of "written notification"; clarifying Senate's role in both the notification and approval processes; and updating the timeline for all proposals to align with Senate procedures and timelines.	RES 242529 Program Discontinuation Policy (1st reading scheduled 4/10/25)				
3/13/2025	2024-2025 #31 Academic Policies Housed in the Registrar's Office		AAC	For AAC to discuss shared governance with respect to the academic policies listed under the Registrar's Office section of the campus catalog.					
3/13/2025	2024-2025 #32 Composition of the Academic Review Committees for Associate Deans	RES IP	FAC	For FAC to discuss formalizing their recommendations for the composition of the Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) for Associate Deans into a Handbook change	RES 242525 Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Part II (2nd reading scheduled for 4/10/25)	Handbook			
3/13/2025	2024-2025 #33 Interruption Practice – Bylaws Change	RES IP	FAC	For FAC to discuss adopting an Interruption Practice as recommended by ASCSU Resolution AS-3551-21/FA/AEDI.	RES 242528 Interruption Practice (1st reading scheduled for 4/10/25)	Bylaws; Section 1			
3/13/2025	2024-2025 #34 Unit RTP Committees and PAF Content - Handbook Change	RES IP	FAC	For FAC to review the University Handbook sections related to Unit RTP Committees and the content of the PAF maintained at each Dean's Office.	RES 242527 Standardizing the Unit RTP Composition Process (1st reading scheduled for 4/10/25)	Handbook 305.6.1, 301.6.4			
4/1/2025	2024-2025 #35 ITS Recommendations to move from Ally to Cidi Labs		AS&SS	Review ITS recommendations to move from Ally to Cidi Labs for the accessibility report in Canvas. Consider: the usability of Cidi Labs for accessibility assessment; guidance provided to remediate the accessibility of course materials; recommendations from ITS and FTLC.					
4/1/2025	2024-2025 #36 Clarify ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Procedures		FAC	Clarify ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Procedures. During your discussion, please consider the following: whether non-tenure track, non-teaching faculty can be eligible; what term the elected representative serves on CSUB Academic Senate; encoding the nomination and election procedures in CSUB Senate Bylaws or University Handbook.					
4/1/2025	2024-2025 #37 Academic Degree Policies		AAC	Review the academic policies about double majors and double counting courses. Consider: Timeline for declaring a double major, double counting courses between the major and the minor, and double counting courses between both majors for a double major.					

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Friday, March 28, 2025 11:35 AM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven
Cc: Danielle Solano
Subject: Updates to EC agenda for Tuesday

Hi Katie,

My 11:00am Zoom meeting was with Dr. Cantrell to discuss how Senate and Strategic Enrollment Management can collaborate.

There are a couple of items for Senate Exec to discuss. Please add these to new discussion items, after the resolution on the Kern County medical school extension that was discussed by email.

- Calendar Committee – This committee now spans three divisions (Academic Affairs, Strategic Enrollment Management, People and Culture), so Dr. Cantrell is willing to hand the committee over to Academic Senate (or someone else Senate recommends)
- Advising Council – Dr. Cantrell would like to form a broader advising council that has faculty advisor input. What sort of faculty representation do we want on this committee?

Thanks,
Melissa

--

Dr. Melissa Danforth (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/>



Assembly Bill 1361 of 2025 Endorsement

RES 2425xx

EC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, SU Bakersfield (CSUB) endorses California State Assembly Bill 1361 University of California: School of Medicine in the County of Kern: Feasibility Study.

RATIONALE: Assembly ~~bill~~ Bill (AB) 2357 of 2024, which was passed ~~in~~ by the California State Legislature in 2024, ~~that~~ establishes the University of California Kern County Medical Education Endowment Fund. The proposed legislation ~~ture~~ "would require the University of California, on or before January 1, 2027, to complete a feasibility study, in consultation with local voluntary stakeholders, to determine the steps necessary to establish a University of California medical school in the County of Kern." There is a critical shortage of need for healthcare professionals in underserved regions of California such as Kern County, and establishing a medical school in Kern County will help address this gap need by training the next generation of medical professionals and improving access to healthcare in the our region. Currently, there are no medical schools in Kern County offering Doctor of Medicine (MD) or Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine (DO) programs located in Kern County. The nearest medical school that offers a DO program is the California Health Sciences University College of Osteopathic Medicine (CHSU-COM) in Clovis, which is approximately 110 miles north of Bakersfield. The Academic Senate of CSUB endorses the development of a state medical school in Kern County, which will benefit the community by expanding access to healthcare, and foster future collaborative education and research opportunities with CSUB.

Distribution List:

President

Interim Provost and VP Academic Affairs

Academic Senate

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

VP University Advancement
Interim VP and Chief Financial Officer, Business and Administrative Services
CSUB Associated Students, Inc.
Assemblymember Jasmeet Bains
California State Assembly Committee on Higher Education

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



TO: Dr. Tiffany Tsantsoulas, Chair, Academic Support and Student Services Committee

CC: Dr. Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair; Katie Van Grinsven, ASC; Dr. Jaimi Paschal, Director of Academic Technology and Grants

FROM: Christopher Diniz, MBA, AVP and CIO, Information Technology Services *CD*

DATE: April 4, 2025

RE: Response to Referral #29 – Canvas Course End Date

Dear Dr. Tsantsoulas,

Thank you for your memo dated March 24, 2025, regarding the recent changes to the Canvas course end date for the Spring 2025 term.

We appreciate the feedback and the opportunity to clarify how this change occurred. The modification to the course end date was made through collaboration between two staff members—one from Information Technology Services (ITS) and one from the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC). Both were operating in good faith, believing that aligning the end date with the exam period was the best course of action for the university community. Inadvertently, the date was set to May 20, 2025, one day earlier than the final grade submission deadline of May 21, 2025.

In reviewing this matter, ITS has decided to implement the following changes to strengthen communication and oversight:

1. Leadership for Canvas System Settings and Support

ITS has assigned oversight of Canvas system settings and system-level support responsibilities to our new Director of Academic Technology & Grants, Dr. Jaimi Paschal. Dr. Paschal will serve as the primary point of contact for system-wide configuration changes in Canvas.

2. Change Control and Approval Process

All ITS staff have been directed to receive formal approval from Dr. Paschal prior to implementing any significant system-level changes to Canvas. This new protocol is designed to ensure consistent, well-vetted decisions and reduce the risk of unintended consequences.

3. Ongoing Role of FTLC

Responsibilities related to course-level support and pedagogy will remain with FTLC. We value their expertise and will continue to collaborate closely to support faculty and students.

We fully support the AS&SS recommendation to align the Canvas course end date with the final grades due date and will implement this for the Spring 2025 term and future semesters. Furthermore, ITS is committed to consulting with the Academic Senate in advance of any future changes to Canvas functionality that may affect teaching and learning.

Thank you again for your thoughtful recommendations and continued partnership.

Sincerely,

Christopher Diniz, MBA

Associate Vice President and Chief Information Officer
Information Technology Services

Signature:

A stylized, handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of loops and curves.

Email: cdiniz@csb.edu



Committee on Professional Responsibility, Revised

RES 242524

FAC

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

308.8 Alleged Breaches of Professional Responsibility

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

Most departures from responsible professional behavior are likely to be minor breaches that can be corrected simply by calling the matter to the attention of the person involved.

Ordinarily, such matters are handled within the faculty member's academic unit **or with the Dean**. The faculty member may also consult the Faculty Ombudsperson for informal conflict resolution or may proceed to formal procedures.

If a breach of professional responsibility is alleged that cannot be or is not adequately handled informally within the basic academic unit, **with the Dean**, or with the Faculty Ombudsperson, The matter may be referred to the **AVP for Faculty Affairs, and the faculty member may consult with the California Faculty Association**. ~~Committee on Professional Responsibility. Any member of the academic community may refer allegations of unprofessional conduct to this Committee. Such allegations shall be submitted in writing and signed by the person making the complaint.~~

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

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

303.8.1 Committee on Professional Responsibility Membership

Members of the Committee on Professional Responsibility are elected with special attention to the high ethical and professional regard in which their colleagues hold them. The Committee consists of five (5) tenured faculty members, one elected by the faculty of each school college and an at-large member elected by the General Faculty, **including counselors or librarians.** Committee members serve overlapping two-year terms.

Additional tenured faculty members may be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in an effort to ensure representation of the entire university. All members should achieve the highest professional standards and be examples of excellence.

A committee member who has a conflict of interest in a particular case shall recuse himself or herself. In that instance, the Senate Executive Committee shall appoint a substitute. The appointed member shall represent the constituency of the replaced member.

303.8.2 ~~Augmentation to the Committee for Librarians or Counselors~~

~~When a librarian or counselor is referred, the Committee shall be augmented by a librarian or counselor, respectively, who is elected by the members of the appropriate unit. The role of the librarian or counselor is limited to providing advice and feedback to the Committee regarding specific issues and questions pertaining to the profession. The librarian or counselor does not vote as a member of the Committee.~~

Purpose of the Committee on Professional Responsibility

The Committee on Professional Responsibility serves as a resource and advisory body dedicated to fostering a culture of professionalism, collegiality, and continuous growth among faculty. It balances conflict resolution, faculty development, and professional accountability through proactive engagement, structured guidance, and meaningful collaboration with campus partners.

The Committee on Professional Responsibility is committed to fostering a proactive and supportive faculty development culture by formalizing mentorship processes and enhancing professional development opportunities. The committee will establish structured mentorship programs to help faculty navigate professional challenges and

obstacles, promote collegiality, and support career advancement. Through a strong partnership with partners such as the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center and the Office of Faculty Affairs, the committee will design and implement faculty training initiatives that emphasize inclusive pedagogy, ethical workplace interactions, and effective conflict resolution strategies.

In collaboration with Deans, the California Faculty Association, and other key stakeholders, the committee will develop targeted professional development programs for new faculty, department chairs, and Unit RTP Committees. These programs will equip faculty with the skills and knowledge necessary for success in teaching, research, and service. Additionally, the committee will facilitate workshops and structured dialogue sessions that reinforce best practices in professionalism, faculty governance, and workplace culture. These initiatives are intended to contribute to prevention efforts to avoid Other Conduct of Concern (e.g., understanding and applying policies and procedures governing workplace conduct, recognizing and reducing implicit bias, healthy relationships, effective communication, effective conflict resolution, effective performance management, having difficult conversations). By tracking patterns of faculty concerns and providing structured feedback, the committee will contribute to institutional improvements that promote a thriving and collegial academic community.

303.8.3 Procedures for the Committee on Professional Responsibility

The chair of the Academic Senate shall convene a meeting of the Committee on Professional Responsibility at the beginning of each academic year to issue its charge; revise procedures. The members of the committee shall also elect a chair at this meeting.

Requests for the Committee on Professional Responsibility to ~~act~~ provide service shall be delivered in writing to the chair of the committee. Requests may be made by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the AVP for Faculty Affairs, Deans, and Faculty. The Committee on Professional Responsibility may also work proactively in consultation with the Academic Senate. The Committee on Professional Responsibility is expected to hold at least one Faculty Town Hall per academic year to have an open discussion about the campus climate and future priorities and initiatives. Upon receipt of a request, the chair shall confer with the designated administrator and with the designated representative of the California Faculty Association to identify any issues that require administrative intervention or union representation. After any administrative or union issues have been identified and referred, the chair shall convene a meeting of the Committee on Professional Responsibility, which shall begin an inquiry into the remaining issues, if any. The Committee shall discontinue the inquiry at any time it determines that the facts do not provide sufficient evidence to support the allegation. The Committee may also decide at any time that the case involves only

~~minor matters that properly should be handled by the basic academic unit through informal resolution and so refer it, with or without recommendations.~~

~~If the Committee determines that the facts support the allegation and that the matter cannot be properly resolved by the basic academic unit, the Committee shall conduct an impartial review.~~

~~Following an impartial review, the committee may make one or more of the following recommendations:~~

- ~~a. No further action.~~
- ~~b. Referral to the basic academic unit.~~
- ~~c. Referral for assistance with dispute resolution.~~
- ~~d. Recommendations for change in faculty behavior.~~
- ~~e. Referral to the President or designee.~~

~~If the Committee determines that its recommendations have not been followed, the committee shall refer or re-refer the matter to the President or designee.~~

~~When referring to the President, the committee shall not make recommendations regarding corrective actions. Once the committee has made a referral to the President or designee, the committee has fulfilled its responsibility, and because of rules of confidentiality, the committee will not receive reports of subsequent actions.~~

~~The Committee on Professional Responsibility shall prepare a formal written report of the disposition of each referral it receives. The report shall present the committee's conclusions and the basis for those conclusions. Copies of the report shall go to the individual (faculty member, librarian, or counselor) whose behavior was questioned, to the person(s) requesting committee consideration, and to the committee files. If the Committee refers the matter, a copy of the report shall be forwarded along with the referral.~~

~~Nothing in this section shall be construed to abridge the rights of any faculty member or of the University enumerated in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Faculty Handbook, professional code of conduct, or state or federal laws. Neither shall anything in this section be construed to abridge the responsibility of the Committee to follow up on cases it has reviewed.~~

303.8.4 Annual Reports

303.8.4.1 Report to Senate Chair and Provost

At least two weeks before the last meeting each year of the Academic Senate, the Committee shall meet conjointly with the Chair of the Senate and the Provost to review the committee's work.

303.8.4.2 Report to the Senate

At the last meeting each year of the Academic Senate, the Committee on Professional Responsibility shall submit an annual summary report of its activities. Information that identifies individuals or departments shall not be included in the report.

Rationale:

1. This resolution addresses some redundancies in existing processes.
2. The Faculty Affairs Committee acknowledges that the Committee on Professional Responsibility has not been convened in several years, likely since the creation of the Faculty Ombudsperson.
3. The Collective Bargaining Agreement currently has a statutory grievance process, that has functioned similarly to the Committee on Professional Responsibility. The statutory grievance process "utilizes a Faculty Hearing Committee composed of full-time faculty to make non-binding recommendations to the campus President". This process is very similar to the existing procedures of the Committee for Professional Responsibility.
 - a. See: <https://www.calfac.org/resources/cfa-grievance-and-discipline-appeal-filing-guide/>
 - b. See <https://www.calfac.org/contract-2022-2025/#article-10>
4. The CSU also has a policy on "Other Conduct of Concern", defined as "conduct that does not violate CSU policies or local, state or federal laws and, therefore, does not warrant disciplinary action but that nevertheless negatively impacts the learning, living and working environment of the CSU community".
5. In discussions, the Faculty Affairs Committee clearly recognizes the need for professional development, training, and proactive avoidance of unacceptable professional behavior.
6. The role of mediation may be fulfilled most effectively by the Faculty Ombudsperson, who is acts as an independent person. A committee of five or more faculty members may not be able to manage confidential matters effectively and in confidence.
7. This resolution reimagines the Committee on Professional Responsibility to focus on professional development and creating a more positive campus climate.
8. If passed and approved by the President, these procedures are expected to be implemented at the start of the 2025-2026 academic year.

9. When the budget allows, the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends 3 units of reassigned time for each member of the Committee for Professional Responsibility given the expectations for proactive efforts and programming.
10. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate is requested to review the activities of this committee after five years to determine whether it should be maintained, restructured, or eliminated.

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
AVP for Faculty Affairs
AVP for Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
College Deans
Associate Deans
Dean of Libraries
Dean of Antelope Valley
Department Chairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Evaluation of Academic Administrators - Part II

RES 242525

FAC

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate requests the President, in collaboration with the Division of People and Culture, explores mechanisms for obtaining feedback from faculty regarding the performance of administrators on campus, including those outside of the Division of Academic Affairs.
- RESOLVED:** The President, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, will determine review processes for new administrative positions within the Division of Academic Affairs, or when there is a change to existing administrative positions (e.g., revised roles, titles, etc.).
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate recommend revisions to the University Handbook language regarding the evaluation of academic and university-wide administrators. (Deletions in ~~strike through~~, additions in **bold underline**.)
- RATIONALE:** This resolution clarifies the membership of review committees for Associate Deans, including College Associate Deans and the Associate Dean of EEGO. Recent changes to campus, including the elimination and/or capturing of some administrative positions, also requires flexibility and adaptability of review procedures.

311.1 General Guidelines

Each academic administrator shall be evaluated according to these procedures at three-year intervals. The President will initiate the review process for the Provost in writing, and the Provost's office, in writing, will initiate the review process for all academic administrators. In August of each academic year, the Provost's office will send to the Executive Committee of the Senate a schedule of which administrators will undergo review in the current academic year and the next academic year. The President or Provost may, if they believe it is appropriate, call for an evaluation of an individual before a scheduled evaluation. Academic administrators who are retiring or who have left the administrative role shall be reviewed upon exiting the respective role; this review shall also apply to academic administrators who are promoted or temporarily move into interim roles.

311.2 Academic Administrators

The following positions shall be subject to this policy:

- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA)
- AVP Academic Affairs/Dean of Academic Programs
- AVP Enrollment Management
- AVP Faculty Affairs
- AVP Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs (GRaSP)
- AVP Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA)
- Dean, College of Arts and Humanities
- Dean, College of Business and Public Administration
- Dean, College of Natural Sciences, Mathematics & Engineering
- Dean, College of Social Sciences and Education
- Dean, University Library
- Dean, Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO)
- **Associate Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO)**
- Dean, California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley Campus
- ~~And all respective College All Associate Deans~~
- **And other administrator positions as determined by the President, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate**

The Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) is formed in the Spring of the administrator's second year, and the review process begins in the Fall of the third year. The supervisor for each administrator undergoing review is responsible for providing the criteria for evaluation to the administrator and to the AARC.

311.3 Review Committee Membership

For review of the P&VPAA, **AVP** Academic Affairs/Dean of Academic Programs, AVP Enrollment Management, AVP Faculty Affairs, AVP GRaSP, AVP IRPA, ~~and Dean of EEGO~~, **Associate Dean of EEGO**, **and academic administrators not mentioned elsewhere who are subject to this policy**, the review committee shall be as follows:

A. The faculty of each college shall elect one tenured faculty;

B. The General Faculty (including teaching faculty, librarians, and counselors) shall elect one at-large tenured faculty;

~~BC. **The Provost (or President, in the case of the review of the P&VPAA)**~~ The President or Provost shall select a member of the Provost's Council; and

~~CD. **The Provost (or President, in the case of the review of the P&VPAA)**~~ The President or Provost shall choose a sixth member of the committee.

For review of the Dean of Arts and Humanities, Dean of Business and Public Administration, Dean of Natural Sciences, Mathematics & Engineering, Dean of Social Sciences and Education, Dean of University Library, Dean of the CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley Campus, **and College or Library Associate Deans,** the review committee shall consist of five members.

A. The faculty of the college dean being reviewed, or the librarians in the case of the Dean of University Library, shall elect three (3) tenured faculty members or librarians. In the case of the Antelope Valley Campus Dean, an election shall be held to select three (3) representatives from the faculty, staff, and librarians who are at the Antelope Valley Campus.

B. The P&VPAA shall select a college dean **for the review of Deans, or an associate dean for the review of College or Library Associate Deans;** and

C. The P&VPAA shall choose the fifth member of the committee.

Any prospective committee member with an active grievance (or other legal proceeding) against the specific Administrator under review at the time of review is not eligible for election or selection and cannot serve on the review committee.

The administrator under review may request that the supervisor of the review recuse any member who is ineligible due to an active grievance (or other legal proceeding) against the administrator under review, and the Senate will initiate a new election to replace that individual.

311.4 Review Procedures and Constituencies

The procedures for review committees of academic officers are as follows:

A. The President and P&VPAA shall maintain a schedule showing the year in which the regular review of each administrative officer is due, and shall complete the committee selection and initiate the review process prior to the end of the academic year preceding the actual academic year in which the review takes place. A schedule for an evaluation should then be constructed with April 1 as the target date for completion of the process. A list of academic officers to be reviewed with review timelines shall be made available on the Provost's website. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs is charged with maintaining and updating this list.

B. At the time of initial appointment and immediately following each review, the supervisor will review with the administrator being evaluated the areas (i.e., academic leadership, program development, management, diversity initiatives, etc.) in which their performance will be assessed. In all cases, the areas to be evaluated will include aspects of the position outlined in the job description and the following, as relevant:

1. Leadership and Strategic Vision (e.g., ability to set clear goals, make informed decisions, and inspire faculty, staff, and students toward achieving institutional objectives)
2. Resource and Financial Management (e.g., effective oversight of budgets, personnel, and operational resources, ensuring sustainability and efficiency in daily operations)
3. Academic Program Development and Quality Assurance (e.g., support for curriculum innovation, academic standards, and research initiatives while ensuring compliance with accreditation and quality benchmarks)
4. Student Success and Support Services (e.g., implementation of policies that enhance student retention, graduation rates, and equitable access to academic and support services)
5. Faculty and Staff Development and Support (e.g., promoting professional development, fostering an environment of excellence, and ensuring that faculty and staff are well-supported in fulfilling their roles and achieving success)
6. External Relations and Fundraising (e.g., building partnerships with external stakeholders, enhancing the institution's reputation, and securing external funding for institutional growth)
7. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (e.g., contributing to the creation of an inclusive campus environment that values diversity, promotes equity, and ensures all members of the community feel respected and supported)

In setting up the review process, the supervisor will solicit advice from the administrator under review as to any additional areas that should be included in the evaluation. In all cases, the appropriate faculty, librarians and staff shall be given the opportunity to participate in the evaluation.

The supervisor will complete the process of academic administrator review committee formation by October 1st of the academic year in which the review takes place. The supervisor will provide the review committee information regarding the additional areas where the administrator's performance is to be assessed. The academic administrator review committee shall elect its own chair.

In the case of University-level administrators, including the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Associate Vice Presidents, Dean of the University Library, Dean of the Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach, and Dean of the California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley Campus, the constituents shall include faculty, staff, and students from the entire University community. Constituents participating in the review process shall be connected to the work of the administrator who is actively under review as determined by the review committee. These constituents shall be given an opportunity to participate in the evaluation. The administrator's supervisor may recommend additional constituencies to be sampled.

In the case of College-level administrators, including the College Deans, School Deans, and Associate Deans, constituents shall include faculty, staff, and students from the respective College, or School (if applicable). Constituents participating in the review process shall be connected to the work of the administrator who is actively under review as determined by the review committee. These constituents shall be given an opportunity to participate in the evaluation. The administrator's supervisor may recommend additional constituencies to be sampled.

The areas of assessment should not be changed once the supervisor has reviewed them with the administrator being evaluated unless the administrator and supervisor agree and provide written justification for the changes in assessment to the academic administrator review committee. Throughout the review process, all parties shall bear in mind that the purpose of the administrator review is developmental as well as evaluative, in keeping with the essential mission of the University.

C. The review committee shall request from the administrator under review a ~~concise~~ thorough and detailed self-study. The self-study will focus on areas to be evaluated, major accomplishments, problems and issues related to the responsibilities of the position (e.g. job description), future goals and plans, and personal professional development and accomplishments. The self-study shall include evidence and documentation to support evidence of major accomplishments, and evidence of the administrator's roles, contributions, and support of faculty and staff under their supervision. The review committee shall review evidence of accomplishments provided by the administrator. The administrator under review should provide evidence of their own contributions. Administrators with oversight of faculty and staff projects or activities should acknowledge the contributions of other administrators, faculty or staff responsible for the project/activities. A clear distinction should be identified between administrator accomplishments and those of the faculty/staff under their supervision. This self-study shall be completed and submitted to the review committee and the supervisor.

D. The review committee shall survey various performance appraisal systems to determine the appropriate guidelines and instruments for the evaluation process. The evaluation shall cover a three-year period; therefore, the guidelines and process should be constructed to reflect this time frame. The committee, in consultation with the supervisor and the person being reviewed, shall develop the specific format for the appraisal.

E. In the case of evaluation of College Associate Deans, during the third year, all College Deans, including those in their final year of service as College Associate Dean and those who are retiring, shall be reviewed by the College faculty. The Dean shall meet with the faculty to discuss how they wish to proceed with the review. In preparation for the review, College Associate Deans, may, at their own initiative, submit to the College faculty and the Dean a brief self-evaluation of their performance for the period under review. In addition, the appropriate Dean shall offer the opportunity to all faculty of the College to give individual, confidential advice, orally, or in writing. This review shall assess the College Associate Dean's effectiveness based on the criteria established at the time of appointment. The review must occur during the fall semester of the third year. The written review of the College Associate Dean should be submitted to the

College Dean by April first (1st) of that year. The Dean and the ~~School~~ College Associate Dean shall then meet to discuss the report by April 15th.

F. The review committee shall issue calls for feedback and comments at multiple times in the review process and shall remind constituents that the process is confidential. Individuals participating in the evaluation of administrators shall submit their written comments ~~on~~ in a confidential survey that does not collect identifiable information (e.g., names, email addresses). This survey shall include quantitative and qualitative (i.e., open-ended) assessments, including questions about constituency type so that data can be disaggregated and reviewed by the committee. The review committee may work with Information Technology Services to develop the survey and build processes for ensuring confidentiality, fairness, and validity. The comments will then be coded, deidentified, and aggregated by the review committee to ensure the person's confidentiality in the review process. Examination of the deidentified and aggregated documents by the administrator under review may occur in the event of a protested personnel action. Comments will be collected, and the confidential coding maintained in the office of the ~~P&VPAA~~ administrator's supervisor.

G. While conducting their review, the review committee may request a meeting with the administrator under review to request additional evidence, context, and documentation related to the self-study and the areas under review to be used in finalizing their final report. The review committee shall consolidate all evaluations and forward the final report, which will include the administrator's self-study, to the appropriate supervisor. The administrator's supervisor will review the evaluation, self-study, and any written response, discuss these with the administrator under review, and forward the package with appropriate comments/recommendations to the President with a copy to the administrator under review by April 15th of that year. In cases where there is a supervisory level between the administrator under review and the P&VPAA, the evaluation shall pass through that level for comments and go forward to the P&VPAA. The supervisor's written comments and recommendations should include components related to future goals and plans in addition to the expected review and comments on the evaluation.

In the case of the P&VPAA, the same process as outlined above will be followed except that the review committee's report shall be forwarded directly to the President.

H. In all cases the final review level will be the President.

I. In the case of the review of the P&VPAA, the President and P&VPAA shall meet to discuss the report before acknowledging to the campus that the review process has been completed by May 1st of that year. In the case of the review of the AVPs and Deans, the P&VPAA and administrator under review shall meet to discuss the report before acknowledging to the campus that the review process has been completed by May 1st of that year.

J. In the event the administrator under review does not agree with any aspect of the evaluation, a written commentary may be submitted, and it shall accompany the report. The administrator under review shall have ten working days after receiving a copy of the final evaluation to prepare ~~his/her~~ their reaction and commentary. The Academic Administrator Review Committee and all respondents are protected from any

form of reprisal, not only by the expectation of high ethical behavior from all University personnel, but by Executive Order No. 929 and California Government Code Section 8547.12.

HK. Provisions governing campus personnel files such as confidentiality, disclosure, and rebuttal shall apply to the evaluation process. The consolidated report and all data collected for this report will become a part of the personnel file and will reside in the office of the administrator's supervisor.

Distribution List:

- President
- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA)
- AVP Academic Affairs/Dean of Academic Programs
- AVP Enrollment Management
- AVP Faculty Affairs
- AVP Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs (GRaSP)
- AVP Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA)
- Dean, College of Arts and Humanities
- Dean, College of Business and Public Administration
- Dean, College of Natural Sciences, Mathematics & Engineering
- Dean, College of Social Sciences and Education
- Dean, University Library
- Dean, Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO)
- Associate Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach (EEGO)
- Dean, California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley Campus
- Associate Deans
- Department Chairs
- General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Standardizing the Unit RTP Committee Composition Process

RES 242527

FAC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend revisions to the University Handbook language regarding the Unit RTP Committee. (Deletions in ~~striketrough~~, additions in **bold underline**.)

RATIONALE: This resolution clarifies and standardizes the composition of unit RTP committees and procedures for constituting the unit RTP committees. It clarifies that all tenured faculty are eligible to serve on a Unit RTP Committee unless a determination of ineligibility has been made b the AVP for Faculty Affairs.

This resolution describes a three-step process for determining the number of Unit RTP Committees to be established, the Unit RTP Committee(s) that tenured faculty wish to serve on, and approval of Unit RTP Committee(s) membership by tenured and probationary faculty. As written, this ensures that all faculty who have earned tenure have the right to serve on a committee, subject to the approval of the majority of tenured and probationary faculty in a unit, and assuming that there is no determination of ineligibility (e.g., due to active or past grievance).

305.6 The Unit RTP Committee

305.6.1 Election and Composition of the Unit RTP Committee ~~(revised 2023-2024).~~

The academic deans will be responsible for ensuring that departments are in compliance with this section. To ensure that the unit committee is appropriately constituted, the department will submit to the dean, at least ~~three~~ **two** weeks before the beginning of a review cycle, a list of members of the Unit RTP Committee. **“Candidate” in this section refers to faculty members submitting their working personnel action files and whom are under review for retention, the award of tenure, and/or promotion. Candidates may refer to tenure-track (probationary) faculty and faculty with temporary appointments (i.e., lecturers).**

If a unit committee is inappropriately constituted, the review(s) performed by that committee is (are) null and void. The review level that discovers the violation will notify the department that it must reconstitute the Unit RTP Committee so that it can reevaluate the file(s).

- a. The probationary and tenured faculty of each unit shall elect a committee **or committees** from among its **eligible** tenured members for the purposes of evaluating and recommending faculty for retention, the award of tenure, and/or promotion.

i. Eligibility

- i. Tenured faculty enrolled in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) are eligible to serve, in accordance with their FERP contracts but may decline such service.
- ii. If elected, eligible tenured members not in the FERP are obligated to serve.

iii. All tenured faculty in a Unit are eligible to serve on a Unit RTP Committee unless Faculty serving as President of the CFA, Director of the Teaching and Learning Center, or Director of Assessment are not eligible to serve on a Unit RTP Committee. a determination of ineligibility has been made by the AVP for Faculty Affairs.

1. **Any prospective Unit RTP Committee member involved in a current or past grievance involving one or more candidates under review may be determined to be ineligible. This determination shall be made by the AVP for Faculty Affairs and may be applied only to the case(s) of a specific candidate or specific candidates.**

ii. The following election procedures shall take place for the formation of Unit RTP Committees.

- i. **First, the probationary and tenured faculty in a unit shall determine how many Unit RTP Committees will be constituted for their unit. Although only one Unit RTP**

Committee will normally be formed per unit, units may consider additional factors and needs for multiple Unit RTP Committees (e.g., having one Unit RTP Committee per program or per subdiscipline). This decision shall be made by the tenured and probationary faculty within a unit.

1. If a unit establishes more than one Unit RTP Committee, then each candidate being reviewed shall recommend which Unit RTP Committee will perform their review. This decision shall be approved by the majority of probationary and tenured faculty within the unit.

ii. Second, the tenured faculty in the unit shall indicate which committee(s) they are interested in serving on. Tenured and eligible faculty shall serve on at least one Unit RTP Committee (unless they are a FERP faculty), subject to approval by the probationary and tenured faculty of the unit.

iii. Third, for each Unit RTP Committee, the probationary and tenured faculty of each unit shall complete a secret ballot for each eligible member of the Unit RTP Committee.

1. If a majority of probationary and tenured faculty vote in favor of a member, then they shall serve on the Unit RTP Committee.

2. If a majority of probationary and tenured faculty are not in favor of a member, then that eligible member shall not serve on the Unit RTP Committee.

b. At the candidate's discretion, for unstated reasons, the candidate may request a specific eligible member from within or outside the unit to serve as an additional member of the committee. This member serves in addition to the three or more-faculty elected by the unit. The requested member shall serve as a voting member of the unit RTP committee for the requesting faculty case only. Such members shall not participate in the review of any faculty except those who have requested their service.

c. A faculty with a formal joint appointment shall have, at the time of appointment, designated the unit to conduct their review.

- i. A faculty with a formal joint appointment shall have the right to participate in the elections of both the unit RTP committee of the designated unit and that of the other unit.
 - ii. When reviewing a faculty holding a formal joint appointment, one or two members selected by and from the secondary unit RTP committee shall augment the designated unit RTP committee.
- d. The unit RTP committee shall consist of no fewer than three (3) full-time tenured faculty. If a unit has fewer than three members qualified to serve on the committee, all eligible members from the unit are expected to serve on the committee. The probationary and tenured faculty shall elect one or more eligible committee members from other units to fill the remaining positions on the unit committee up to a total number of 3 members. The outside member(s) shall have the same responsibilities as all such committee members.
 - i. Probationary and tenured faculty within a unit shall nominate eligible committee members from other units. If the nominee accepts, nominees must be approved by the majority of probationary and tenured faculty in a unit with a vote.**
- e. With respect to librarians and counselors, the word “unit” as used in this section of the Handbook refers to the library and the counseling center, respectively, as the administrative unit for the election of a unit RTP committee.
- f. Except in cases of probationary faculty already at the top rank (professor or equivalent), in promotion and tenure considerations, members of the unit RTP committee must have a higher rank than those being considered for promotion or tenure.
- g. Faculty may serve on the review committee of more than one unit during a given RTP cycle.
- h. Faculty members undergoing post-tenure review may serve on RTP committees unless they are requesting promotion during that academic year.
- i. A unit chair submitting a separate evaluation and recommendation shall not serve on the unit RTP committee. The unit chair review shall be conducted independently and in parallel with the unit committee review.
- j. A faculty serving as a dean (including assistant or associate dean) or as a member of the University Review Committee (URC) shall not serve on any unit RTP committee.

k. The unit RTP committee shall elect its own chair, who participates in the evaluation and votes on the recommendation.

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
AVP for Faculty Affairs
College Deans
Dean of Libraries
Department Chairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Updating the Bylaws to Create an Interruption Statement and Add Clarity to Procedures

RES 242528

FAC

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate adopts the revisions to Section 1: Governance of Academic Senate Meetings, as a revision to the Academic Senate Bylaws.

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate adds the proposed Interruption Statement to each Academic Senate agenda.

RATIONALE: The ASCSU, California Faculty Association, Faculty Senate of California State University, Sacramento, and others include interruption statements. Interruption statements are used to bring an issue of bias to the Senate's attention.

The revisions to Section 1 of the Bylaws include recognized priorities for motions, including privileged motions (first priority) and other motions (second priority), with some guidance and clarity for the use of different types of motions. This is meant to enhance consistency and understanding of the Academic Senate's procedures. Although several motions are considered standard as part of Robert's Rules of Order (e.g., move to amend, call the question, etc.), others may not be considered as universal (e.g., Point of Interruption).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: AS-3551-21/FA/AEDI (Rev) from the Academic Senate of the California State University (Establishing an Interruption Practice for the ASCSU) and the Senator Information Guide (2023-2024 Academic Year) from the Faculty Senate of California State University, Sacramento, were used as the basis for the proposed updates Bylaws. We are grateful to our colleagues on this and other Academic Senates, as well as our colleagues on prior senate bodies (e.g., graduate and professional student senates).

Attachments:

- A. Updated Bylaws (Section 1)
- B. Interruption Statement
- C. AS-3551-21/FA/AEDI - Establishing an Interruption Practice for the ASCSU
- D. [Senator Information Guide \(California State University, Sacramento\)](#)

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
Academic Senate
College Deans
College Associate Deans
Department Chairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Attachment A – Updated Bylaws (Section 1)

SECTION I: GOVERNANCE OF ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

A. Robert's Rules of Order, Latest Edition, shall govern the conduct of the meetings of the Academic Senate except insofar as the Bylaws may make express provision to the contrary.

B. The Academic Senate recognizes the following priorities for motions. For top priority motions, a member can interrupt the current speaker to make the motion to ask the Chair to be recognized.

1. Top Priority: Privileged Motions

- a. Point of Order
- b. Point of Information, or Clarification
- c. Point of Privilege
- d. Point of Personal Privilege
- e. Point of Interruption

2. Second Priority

- a. Move to amend
- b. Move a substitute motion
- c. Move to divide (Division of the Question)
- d. Move to consider ad seratium (i.e., one after the other)
- e. Move to refer (e.g., back to a committee)
- f. Add an item to the agenda
- g. Move to adjourn – non-debatable (requires a simple majority)
- h. Move to table (or “lay on the table”) – non-debatable (requires a simple majority)
- i. Move to postpone (to a specific time, or indefinitely) – debatable
- j. Challenge ruling of the Chair (Debatable, but only as to whether to sustain the Chair’s ruling, not the issue ruled upon)
- k. Call the Question/Move the Previous Question
 - ii. To force a vote on an item (i. e., bring about a vote when there are still names on the speaker’s list), a member must first be recognized by the Chair (usually by rising to the top of the speaker’s list) and then move to close debate (or “move the previous question.”) This is non-debatable and requires a 2/3 vote

C. The Senate Chair may appoint an Academic Senate Parliamentarian.

D. Normally, all members shall attend all scheduled meetings of the Academic Senate. The presence of a majority of the voting members of the Academic Senate shall constitute a quorum.

E. By the second meeting of the academic year, each member shall designate an alternate who may substitute for that member when the member must be absent. A member may be represented by an alternate at no more than five meetings. Proxies are not permitted. A member who does not attend or have an alternate attend, without excuse or notification, three consecutive meetings of the Academic Senate will be replaced by an election conducted by the appropriate constituency.

F. All meetings of the Academic Senate shall be open with the provision that the Senate may, by a two-thirds vote, go into closed session to consider matters which are required to be held confidential (such as appointments, recommendations concerning the naming of campus facilities, or other similar items) or to maintain order.

Attachment B – Interruption Statement

All agendas of the Academic Senate shall include the following:

As part of our ongoing commitment to fostering an environment where equity, inclusion, and social justice can thrive, we affirm the importance of addressing harmful narratives or behaviors when they arise. If we encounter instances of bias (including, but not limited to, racism, ethnocentrism, ableism, ageism, sexism, cisheteronormativity), whether in our meetings or as we conduct our work, we will speak up. This may involve respectfully interrupting to bring attention to the issue. We will do so with kindness, care, and a spirit of mutual respect. We also commit to responding thoughtfully to such interruptions, recognizing that systems of inequity often intersect and impact people in complex ways.

**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.



Updating the CSUB Policy on Discontinuance of Academic Degree Programs

RES 242529

FA and AAC

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate adopts the April, 2025 version of the CSU Bakersfield Policy on Discontinuance of Academic Degree Programs (attached).

RATIONALE: The existing Policy on Discontinuance of Academic Degree Programs (“discontinuation policy”) includes many complexities that reduce efficiency and create unnecessary burden. Compared to the existing policy, the update is designed to have several strengths.

1. It removes the “Dean of Undergraduate Studies” as a position that can initiate program discontinuance. CSUB does not currently have a Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the five other positions or groups listed are more suited to initiate this process.
2. It specifies that the written request for the review of an academic program for the purpose of determining whether program discontinuance shall include all full-time temporary faculty who teach in the program, and that notification should be received at the same time as other positions or groups (i.e., Provost, Deans involved in the administration of the program, Academic Senate, tenured and probationary faculty who teach in the program).
3. It allows for any of the above positions (i.e., Provost, Deans involved in the administration of the program, Academic Senate (by majority vote), all tenured, probationary, and full-time temporary faculty who are affected by the program (by majority vote)) to object to the proposed discontinuance.
4. It updates the review process to be managed primarily by the Academic Senate, who is responsible for the curriculum.
 - a. The Executive Committee is tasked with issuing a call for vote on discontinuation, a call for comments from students, and a request for comments from the University committee at large.
 - b. This information is then passed on to the University Program Review Committee, a group currently managed by Academic Senate, to handle most of the tasks currently handled by the (ad-hoc) Special Review Committee.
5. It ensures that if a program discontinuance is official, the President shall notify all campus faculty, students, staff, and administrators, as well as all units,

advisors, and agencies involved in advising or providing information regarding academic programs. This is meant to enhance communication, and allow for appropriate planning and curricular adjustment.

6. It is meant to improve the efficiency of the process from ~150 days to up to 100 days.

Attachments:

1. Proposed CSUB Bakersfield Policy on Discontinuance of Academic Degree Programs (Revised: April, 2025)
2. [Current CSUB Bakersfield Policy on Discontinuance of Academic Degree Programs](#)

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
AVP for Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
University Program Review Committee
College Deans
College Associate Deans
EEGO Dean
Dean of Libraries
Department Chairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

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 discontinuation 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, college and/or university. Program discontinuation 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 ensure 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 College in which the program is housed;
3. the Dean of Academic Programs
4. a majority vote of the Academic Senate; or
5. a majority vote of the University Program Review Committee.

Such a request shall be simultaneously submitted in writing to:

1. the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs;
2. all Deans involved in the administration of the program;
3. the Academic Senate;
4. all tenured and probationary faculty who teach in the program; and
5. all full-time temporary faculty who teach in the program; and

All part-time faculty who teach in the program shall also be informed of this request.

The letter making this request must clearly indicate the specific reasons for the suggested program discontinuance and include the most recent report on the program from the University Program Review Committee and the most recent MOUAP from the University Program Review Committee as supplementary attachments. A copy of this CSU Bakersfield Policy on Discontinuance of Academic Programs shall also be included as an attachment.

If within 14 calendar days* of receipt of this notification letter, none of the following parties (the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, any Dean involved in the administration of the program, the Academic Senate (by majority vote), or the tenured, probationary and full-time temporary faculty in the affected program (by majority vote) submits an written objection to the proposed discontinuance to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chair of the Academic Senate, a recommendation for discontinuance will be sent to the Academic Senate, which will then create a resolution with their recommendations to the President.

If within 14 calendar days of receipt of the letter requesting program discontinuance at least 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 breaks between semesters wherever the term is used in this document.

Academic Senate Review

Within 7 calendar days of receipt of a letter objecting to a proposed program discontinuance from one of the parties listed above, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall complete the following procedures within 7 calendar days:

1. Issue a call for a vote on program discontinuation by every full-time faculty member who has taught in the program for the last two years
2. Voting results shall be made available to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (i.e., number of faculty voting in favor of discontinuation, number of faculty voting against discontinuation, and number of faculty abstaining from voting on discontinuation)
 - a. The voting period shall last at least between 7 and 14 calendar days
3. Issue a request for comments from students presently enrolled in the program to provide written statements regarding the proposed program discontinuance
 - a. Comments shall be submitted within 14 calendar days of the request for comment
4. Issue a request for comments from the University community at large, to allow for written statements and to ensure that the University community at large has an opportunity to express its views
 - a. Comments shall be submitted within 14 days of the request for comment

After completing the above procedures, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall forward all materials and documentation collected (i.e., results of the vote on program discontinuation by every full-time faculty members who has taught in the program for the last two years, comments from students presently enrolled in the program, and comments from the University community at large) to the University Program Review Committee within 7 calendar days.

The University Program Review Committee shall then begin a formal review process.

The review shall address the following points:

1. an evaluation of the academic quality of the program
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.

This final report must include the opportunity for minority reports from the University Program Review Committee.

Upon completion of its review procedures, above, the University Program Review Committee shall make a written report and final recommendation to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The University Program Review Committee shall complete its tasks within 44 calendar days of receiving the request.

The Senate Executive Committee shall forward the University Program Review Committee's final report for review and comment by the Faculty Affairs Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, and the Budget and Planning Committee. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall forward the report to the appropriate Dean(s) and the affected department for review. The Academic Senate will then create a resolution with their recommendations to the President.

A minimum of 14 and maximum of 28 calendar days will be allowed for review of and rebuttal to the University Program Review Committee's final recommendation 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 Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs for final review.

The President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, shall make the final decision on program discontinuance.

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.

In the event of the official discontinuance of an academic program, the President shall notify all campus faculty, students, staff, and administrators. This advanced notice is intended to allow for appropriate planning and curricular adjustment. 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 at CSU Bakersfield.

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 two full semesters following an official announcements of

Revised: April, 2025

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.

DRAFT

Timeline for Program Discontinuation

Step 1 (Day 0)

1. Written request for review of an academic program for the purpose of determining whether program discontinuance is warranted received by the (a) Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, (b) all Deans involved in the administration of a program, (c) the Academic Senate, (d) all tenured and probationary faculty who teach in the program, (e), all full-time temporary faculty who teach in the program, and (f) all part-time faculty who teach in the program.

Step 2 (Days 1 to 14)

2. After 14 calendar days of receipt of this letter:
 - a. If no objection to the proposed discontinuation is submitted by either the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, any Dean involved in the administration of the program, the Academic Senate (by majority vote), or a majority of tenured, probationary, or full-time temporary faculty members in the program is received, then a recommendation for discontinuation will be sent to the President by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.
 - b. If either the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, any Dean involved in the administration of the program, the Academic Senate (by majority vote), and a majority of tenured, probationary, or full-time temporary faculty members in the program submit a written objection to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Chair of the Academic Senate, then Academic Senate Review will be initiated.

Step 3 (Days 14 to 21)

3. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall complete the following within 7 calendar days
 - a. Issue a call for vote on program discontinuation by every full-time faculty member who has taught in the program for the last two years
 - b. Issue a request for comment from students presently enrolled in the program to provide written statements regarding the proposed program discontinuance
 - c. Issue a request for comment from the University community at large to allow for written statements and to ensure that the University community at large has an opportunity to express its views

Step 4 (Days 21 to 28)

4. Within 7 days of completing Step 3, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall forward all materials and documentation collected to the University Program Review Committee

Step 5 (Days 28 to 72)

5. The University Program Review Committee completes its tasks within 44 days

Step 6 (Day 100)

6. Rebuttals to the University Program Review Committee's report and recommendation must be received by the Executive Committee of the Academic Committee of the Academic Senate and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs must be submitted within 28 calendar days

Step 7

In the event that the above procedures are followed, Steps 1 through 6 shall normally be completed within 100 days of the initial request for review of an academic program for the purpose of determining whether program discontinuance is warranted.

The President shall then make their final decision on program discontinuance.