



Academic Senate: Executive Committee

AGENDA

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2025

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 AM

Location: BDC 134- BPA Conference Room

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

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

1. Call to Order
2. Announcements and Information
 - a. President Harper to attend EC:
 - i) October 7
 - ii) March 24
 - b. Senate Guests:
 - i) Upcoming:
 - (1) September 25 – K. Susa, FAR Report 2024-25 and M. Malhotra, AVP IRPA, Data Literacy Campaign
 - (2) October 9 – I. Sumaya, AVP GRaSP (*tentative*)
 - ii) Future:
 - (1) D. Cantrell – VP for SASEM
 - (2) E. Adams – Interim AVP Academic Programs
 - (3) E. Montoya – GE Director
 - (4) Others (?)
3. Approval of Agenda (Time Certain: 10:05 AM)
4. Approval of Minutes
 - a. June 9, 2025 ([handout](#))
 - b. August 26, 2025 (hold)
5. Continued Items (Time Certain: 10:30 AM)
 - a. AS Referral Log (see BOX folder)
 - i) AAC (T. Tsantsoulas)
 - (1) Pending Referrals:
 - i. Special Review Committee for Anthropology- AAC and BPC; Hold until September 15
 - ii. Catalog language inconsistency with Title V
 - ii) AS&SS (L. Kirstein)
 - iii) BPC (A. Grombly)

- (1) Pending Referrals:
 - i. Special Review Committee for Anthropology- AAC and BPC; Hold until September 15
 - iv) FAC (Z. Zenko)
 - (1) Pending Referrals:
 - i. Sabbatical Application Process (handout)
 - ii. Sixth-year Lecturer Review (carry-over from 2024-2025; Hold for taskforce report)
 - b. Provost Report (D. Thien)
 - i) Academic Administrator Searches:
 - (1) Arts and Humanities: Associate Dean Search (in progress)
 - (2) Social Sciences and Education:
 - i. Associate Dean Appointment (acting/ interim)
 - ii. Dean and Associate Dean Searches
 - (3) AVP of Academic Programs
 - ii) Academic Administrator Reviews (AARC)
 - (1) 2024-2025:
 - i. AVP for Enrollment Management (Review not conducted)
 - ii. Dean of Antelope Valley (Status?)
 - (2) 2025-2026:
 - i. Deborah Cours, Dean, College of Business and Public Administration
 - ii. Karlo Lopez, Associate Dean, College of Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering
 - iii. Rhonda Dawson, Associate Dean, Extended Education and Global Outreach
 - c. Reports and Recommendations
 - i) Scholarship and Creative Activities Taskforce (handout)
 - ii) Task Force for Periodic Evaluation (Hold; waiting for report)
 - iii) Criteria for Proposing New Schools Taskforce (Hold; waiting for report)
 - d. Pending Curriculum Proposals
 - i) Minor in Early Childhood Development
 - ii) Minor in Medical Spanish
 - iii) Renaming an MPA concentration
 - iv) E. Adams is checking with the College Curriculum Committees for other missing proposals
 - e. Faculty Visa
 - f. Calendar Committee
 - g. Add “Statements of the Senate” Process to governing documents – EC
 - h. Resolution to rename the Faculty Leadership and Service Award – EC (in progress)

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

 - a. Summer Disqualifications (handout)
 - b. WASC Steering Committee for next CSUB report and site visit (handout)
 - i) Report due: Spring 2027
 - ii) Site visit: Fall 2027
 - c. WASC Proposed Standard Changes (handout)
 - i) Link: <https://www.wscuc.org/post/wscuc-invites-comments-on-proposed-standards-updates/>
 - d. Post-enrollment Requirements Checking (PERC) Timing Concerns – AAC and AS&SS (handout)
 - e. Concerns about teaching modality language in the handbook (handout) – AAC and FAC?
 - f. Elections and Appointments (D. Solano)

- i) Urgent Calls- Fall 2025:
 - (1) SEI Board – Election to take place at Senate 9/11
 - (2) Faculty Ombudsperson
 - (3) SSE Dean Search Committee
 - (4) Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) for Associate Dean, EEEO
 - (5) Exceptional Service Awards Committee
 - (6) Others as identified – *in progress*
- g. Concerns about content and assignment of instructors for CSUB 1029 ([handout](#)) – AAC and FAC?
- h. Term limits for Department Chairs - FAC
- i. Inventory of AI and other automated software ([handout](#)) – AS&SS
- j. Process for appointing academic Acting MPPs
- k. Reconstitute High Impact Practices (HIP) Taskforce – AAC and AS&SS
- l. Handbook and Bylaws Project - EC
 - 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?
 - xiii) Review and update the Standing Committees ex-officio positions due to the re-organization of university
 - xiv) Changes to bylaws that were approved by previous resolution but never posted (clarifying the edition of Robert's Rules of Order).
 - xv) Q2S Lingered Issues:
 - (1) Deadline issue for stating one's intent to seek promotion to full professor
 - (2) Discussions about whether we should change the Handbook to require classroom observations for tenured faculty.

7. Agenda Items for Senate (Time Certain: 11:15 AM) ([handout](#))

Academic Senate Meeting – Fall 2025

Thursday, September 11, 2025

Agenda

10:00 AM – 11:30 AM

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

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

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

- I. Call to Order and Tejon Tribal Land Acknowledgement
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - a. August 28, 2025 (handout)
- III. Announcements and Information
 - a. President’s Report – V. Harper **(Time Certain: 10:10 AM)**
 - b. Elections and Appointments – D. Solano (handout)
- IV. Approval of Agenda **(Time Certain: 10:05 AM)**
- V. Reports
 - a. Provost’s Report – D. Thien
 - b. ASCSU Report – Senators Lam and Michieka (handout)
 - c. ASI Report – Senator Reyes
 - d. Staff Report – Senator Gonzalez
 - e. Committee Reports:
 - i. Executive Committee and Summer Senate– Vice-Chair Solano (handout)
 - ii. Standing Committees:
 1. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) – Senator Tsantsoulas (handout)
 2. Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS) – Senator Kirstein (handout)
 3. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) – Senator Grombly (handout)
 4. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – Senator Zenko (handout)
 - f. CFA Report – Senator Salisbury
- VI. Resolutions **(Time Certain: 10:45 AM)**
 - a. Consent Agenda: no items.
 - b. Old Business:
 - i. No items.
 - c. New Business:
 - i. RES 252601- Renaming of the Faculty Leadership and Service Award – EC (handout)

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

VIII. Adjournment

8. Adjournment

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2025 1:48 PM
To: Kathleen Szick
Cc: Danielle Solano; Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: Re: Senate referral request

Hi Kathy,

We'll add this to the pending requests for Fall Senate.

Thanks,
Melissa

From: Kathleen Szick <kszick@csu.edu>
Date: Thursday, May 15, 2025 at 11:37 AM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csu.edu>, Danielle Solano <dsolano@csu.edu>
Subject: Senate referral request

Good Morning!

In your upcoming discussions of referral items for the 2025-26 academic year, I request that the senate review the process, procedure and transparency of the Faculty Honors and Awards Committee, with respect to awarding sabbaticals. While I fully understand that not everyone who applies for sabbatical is awarded that request (especially given the current CA budget situation), however the guidelines are not clearly outlined in the handbook. They are vague at best and allow for subjectivity on the part of the committee. Furthermore, if someone is not awarded a sabbatical, it would be beneficial to have feedback from the committee on what needs to be improved in a subsequent application. For example, is a proposal that is "pure" research ranked higher than a proposal that focused on course/curriculum development? My interpretation of the handbook language suggests that both are acceptable.

On a personal note, I am one of the individuals that did not receive sabbatical for the upcoming year, and I did reach out to both the chair of FHAC and VP Boschini, but I do not feel that they were able to adequately address my concerns. In fact, I felt that I was just being given the run around. I am happy to share those correspondences with you if you would like.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kathy

Topic: Resolution to rename the Faculty Leadership and Service Award

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2025 2:20 PM
To: Senate Executive Committee Group
Subject: Leadership Award

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi all,

After our conversations about renaming the Faculty Leadership and Service Award, I checked the Handbook to see which office oversees the awards (the Provost's Office). I found that there's a section in the Handbook specifically on this award, as well as the other faculty awards. The awards are collectively listed under Section 308.3, and the Leadership award is in Section 308.3.2 (after the Millie Ablin award in 308.3.1).

Since the award is listed in the Handbook (and the Millie Ablin award is specifically listed, rather than being generically listed as the Excellence in Teaching award), one option to proceed is to prepare a resolution from EC for the first Senate meeting in Fall with all the Handbook changes needed to rename the award. This would slow the process down a bit, but would allow the change to go through the normal Handbook modification channels.

If we have time on Wednesday at the retreat, we can discuss this further.

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/>

From: [Melissa Danforth](#)
To: [Elizabeth Adams](#); [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Cc: [Deborah Thien](#)
Subject: Re: Summer DQs and WASC Steering Committee consult with Exec
Date: Friday, August 29, 2025 2:25:19 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hi Elizabeth,

We'll add this to the EC agenda. EC next meets on Sep 9th, although I can't guarantee we'll get to this part of the agenda then. The agenda is already packed.

Thanks,
Melissa

From: Elizabeth Adams <eadams6@csub.edu>
Date: Thursday, August 28, 2025 at 5:50 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>, Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Cc: Deborah Thien <dthien@csub.edu>
Subject: Summer DQs and WASC Steering Committee consult with Exec

Hi Melissa,

As I mentioned to you last week, I asked EM to not disqualify students as a result of their summer term performance (which matches what we do with winter term). I'd like to continue this practice, but want to make sure that EC has a chance to give input before we make it an ongoing practice. There's nothing specific in the CSUB or CSU policies about which terms and/or semesters DQs need to be applied.

We also need to get started on getting started on WASC. I'm going to discuss the formation of a Steering Committee with the Provost and would like EC's input on the make-up of it.

Thanks and let me know if/when you want to put these on your agenda.

Elizabeth

--

Elizabeth T. Adams, PhD
Dean, Antelope Valley
Interim AVP for Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
Professor of English
California State University, Bakersfield

Existing 2023 Standard/CFR	Updated 2023 Standard/CFR
STANDARD 1: Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity The institution defines its mission and establishes educational and student success objectives aligned with that mission. The institution has a clear sense of its essential values, culture, and distinctive elements, and its contributions to society and the public good. It promotes the success of all students and makes explicit its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The institution functions with integrity and transparency.	STANDARD 1: Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity The institution defines its mission and establishes educational and student success objectives aligned with that mission. The institution pursues excellence and clearly defines its essential values, culture, and distinctive elements, and its contributions to society and the public good. It articulates student-centered pathways to success and promotes success for all students. The institution functions with integrity and transparency.
CFR 1.2 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution defines and acts with intention to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in all its activities, including its goal setting, policies, practices, and use of resources across academic, student support, and co-curricular programs and services.	CFR 1.2 Consistent with its purpose and character, the institution defines and sets goals, policies, and practices; evaluates student outcomes; removes barriers to student success; and allocates resources across academic, student support, and co-curricular programs and services to advance institutional excellence.
STANDARD 2: Achieving Educational Objectives and Student Success The institution achieves its educational and student success objectives through the core functions of teaching and learning, and through support for student learning, scholarship, and creative activity. It promotes the success of all students and makes explicit its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The institution demonstrates that core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning.	STANDARD 2: Achieving Educational Objectives and Student Success The institution achieves its objectives for educational excellence, student-centered pathways to success, and success for all students through the core functions of teaching and learning, removal of barriers to student success, and support for student learning, scholarship, and creative activity. The institution demonstrates that core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning and other outcomes.
STANDARD 3: Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures The institution achieves its educational and student success objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technology, and information resources within appropriate organizational and decision-making structures, and consistent with its explicit commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.	STANDARD 3: Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures The institution achieves its objectives for educational excellence, student-centered pathways to success, and success for all students through allocation of human, physical, fiscal, technology, and information resources within appropriate organizational and decision-making structures and consistent with its stated mission and objectives.
STANDARD 4: Creating an Institution Committed to Quality Assurance and Improvement The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its mission, achieving its educational and student success objectives, and realizing its commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. The institution envisions its future in light of the changing environment of higher education. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness.	STANDARD 4: Creating an Institution Committed to Quality Assurance and Improvement The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its mission and achieving its objectives for educational excellence, student-centered pathways to success, and success for all students. The institution envisions its future in light of the changing environment of higher education. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness.

Topic: Post-enrollment Requirements Checking (PERC) Timing Concerns

From: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>

Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 3:38 PM

To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>

Cc: ORG-AcademicSenateChair <academicsenatechair@csub.edu>; ORG-AcademicSenateOffice <academicsenateoffice@csub.edu>

Subject: Fw: Re: PERC

Hi Melissa

FYI...I'm not sure if this is something that you think senate can/should do anything about, but apparently PERC was just run TODAY. This doesn't give ASCs much time to notify students as the last day to add classes is September 3rd. Per the instructor initiated drop policy (which I believe this would fall under), students should be notified by Tuesday at the latest. And of course this doesn't give students much time to find an alternative class if they are kicked out due to not meeting prereqs.

Thought I would pass it along.

--Dani

Danielle Solano, Ph.D.

Professor, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry

California State University, Bakersfield

Office: SCI II 268

Phone: (661) 654-2785

Email: dsolano@csub.edu

From: Tabitha Marsh <tmarsh3@csub.edu>

Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 3:26 PM

To: Chemistry & Biochemistry Faculty & Staff <chemistrydepartment@CSUB.onmicrosoft.com>

Subject: Re: PERC

Hi all,

Just a heads up, PERC just got updated today. I will be running the list today and notifying students that they need to provide me with proof of meeting requirements by tomorrow 12pm.

If I do not receive proof, I will drop them from the class tomorrow.

Thanks,

Tabitha Marsh, MBA

Administrative Support Coordinator

Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, #62

Bakersfield, CA 93311

(661)654-2030 | Email: TMarsh3@CSUB.edu

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Byoung Bae
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2025 2:04 PM
To: Melissa Danforth
Cc: Richard Gearhart; Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: Re: Some questions on teaching modalities

Many thanks.

From: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2025 1:43 PM
To: Byoung Bae <bbae@csb.edu>
Cc: Richard Gearhart <rgearhart1@csb.edu>; Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csb.edu>
Subject: Re: Some questions on teaching modalities

Hi Ben,

I have asked Katie to add this to the list of potential business for Executive Committee to discuss in Fall semester.

If you want to engage in discussions with your dean before that, the relevant Handbook sections are 203.1 and 303.1.1.

Thanks,
Melissa

From: Byoung Bae <bbae@csb.edu>
Date: Tuesday, May 13, 2025 at 9:46 AM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>
Cc: Richard Gearhart <rgearhart1@csb.edu>
Subject: Re: Some questions on teaching modalities

Hi Melissa,

This is Benjamin Bae. I have some questions about teaching modalities.

Recently, the College of Business and Public Administration Dean's office mandated that starting Fall 25 semester, all classes should be face-to-face. If I remember correctly, teaching modalities are determined by the department or faculty, not administrators.

In fact, the department of accounting and finance had a departmental meeting last week and discussed this issue. Some wanted to have academic freedom on teaching modalities while others wanted to have at least some options available among F2F, hybrid, and online. So far, BPA dean's office is not flexible.

I like to ask the Academic Senate to intervene this issue and make a resolution if necessary.

Thanks for your help.

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Wednesday, April 9, 2025 4:14 PM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven
Cc: Danielle Solano
Subject: Requested referral from DCLC

Hi Katie,

At DCLC today, there was a request to refer CSUB 1029 to Senate. I said it would have to wait until Fall as there is no time for Senate to address new issues right now, but it may be part of a bigger issue EC has discussed in the past about how much oversight Senate should have of GECCo.

The concerns were both curricular and who is hired as instructors. On the curricular side, GECCo is supposed to have a subcommittee that monitors this curriculum, but maybe there are issues there. On the instructor side, there was concern expressed that many staff members are hired to teach this course when many lecturers may not be reaching their teaching entitlements.

So, please start a pending referral folder for Fall and place this concern there.

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/>

From: [Melissa Danforth](#)
To: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#); [Danielle Solano](#)
Subject: FW: Notification: Annual Requirement – High-Risk ADS Inventory
Date: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 4:56:10 PM
Attachments: [High-Risk Autonomous Decision-Making Systems in Higher Education.pdf](#)

Hi Katie and Dani,

We'll need to add this email and attachment to the Senate Exec agenda. The agenda should have a printout of the two links at the bottom of Chris's email.

And it should contain a link to the CSU page on faculty use of AI in instruction (it's not structured well enough to make a printout since it only allows you to expand one section at a time):

<https://genai.calstate.edu/communities/faculty/guidelines-faculty-regarding-ai-instruction>

There's nothing in the Handbook about inventorying "automated grading or proctoring tools" outside of those provided by ITS directly, and I'm not sure we'd want to add anything beyond an informational note about this state law.

Perhaps we can discuss expanding the existing pending referral on faculty ethical use of AI tools to include a notification about this state law.

Melissa

From: Christopher Diniz <cdiniz@csub.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2025 4:30 PM
To: Dwayne Cantrell <dcantrell2@csub.edu>; Lori Blodorn <lblodorn@csub.edu>; Deborah Thien <dthien@csub.edu>; Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>; Jane Dong <jdong2@csub.edu>; Luis Vega <lvega@csub.edu>; Alicia Rodriquez <arodriquez@csub.edu>; Deborah Cours <dcours@csub.edu>; Jennifer Mabry <jmabry2@csub.edu>; Elizabeth Adams <eadams6@csub.edu>; Deborah Boschini <dboschini@csub.edu>; Sonya Gaitan <sgaitan@csub.edu>; Tommy Holowell <tholiwell@csub.edu>; Christine Lopez <clopez23@csub.edu>; Tina Williams <twilliams@csub.edu>; Michelle Ponci <mpearce@csub.edu>; Sandra Bozarth <sbozarth2@csub.edu>; Emily Poole Callahan <epoole1@csub.edu>; EJ Callahan <ecallahan@csub.edu>; Hilda Nieblas Valenzuela <hnieblas@csub.edu>; Brooke Davis <bdavis42@csub.edu>
Subject: Notification: Annual Requirement – High-Risk ADS Inventory

Dear Colleagues,

As part of our responsibilities under California AB 302, CSU Bakersfield is required to annually inventory any high-risk automated or autonomous decision-making systems (ADS) used across campus. These systems assist or replace human decision-making in areas that significantly impact individuals' rights, opportunities, or access to services.

Examples of high-risk ADS include, but are not limited to:

- Admissions or hiring algorithms
- Predictive analytics for financial aid or enrollment
- Automated grading or proctoring tools
- Tools used in student discipline, housing, or behavioral monitoring
- AI systems used in talent acquisition or classification reviews

This message is for awareness only at this stage. If any systems in your area meet this definition, or if automated tools are being explored for such functions, please ensure they are brought to our attention.

Our Information Security Officer, Doug Cornell, may be following up to verify whether your area currently uses or does not use these systems as part of the annual review.

You can find additional background here:

- [CA AB 302 – High-Risk ADS Bill Text](#) Refer to page 3 of PDF
- [CDT FAQs on High-Risk ADS Reporting](#) Refer to page 6 of PDF
- Overview and Examples in Higher Education (PDF) is attached. Refer to page 13 of PDF

This process does not prohibit the use of such systems. It ensures proper transparency, documentation, and human oversight as mandated by law.

Please feel free to reach out with any questions or to provide relevant information.

Thank you,

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

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 41LIB
Bakersfield, CA 93311

<https://its.csub.edu>

<https://twitter.com/itscsub>

Assembly Bill No. 302

CHAPTER 800

An act to add Section 11546.45.5 to the Government Code, relating to automated decision systems.

[Approved by Governor October 13, 2023. Filed with Secretary of State October 13, 2023.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 302, Ward. Department of Technology: high-risk automated decision systems: inventory.

Existing law establishes the Department of Technology within the Government Operations Agency and requires the Director of Technology to supervise the Department of Technology and report directly to the Governor on issues relating to information technology.

This bill would require the department, in coordination with other interagency bodies, to conduct, on or before September 1, 2024, a comprehensive inventory of all high-risk automated decision systems, as defined, that have been proposed for use, development, or procurement by, or are being used, developed, or procured by, state agencies, as defined. The bill would require the comprehensive inventory to include a description of, among other things, the categories of data and personal information the automated decision system uses to make its decisions. On or before January 1, 2025, and annually thereafter, the bill would require the department to submit a report of the above-described comprehensive inventory to specified committees of the Legislature.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 11546.45.5 is added to the Government Code, to read:

11546.45.5. (a) For purposes of this section:

(1) "Automated decision system" means a computational process derived from machine learning, statistical modeling, data analytics, or artificial intelligence that issues simplified output, including a score, classification, or recommendation, that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decisionmaking and materially impacts natural persons. "Automated decision system" does not include a spam email filter, firewall, antivirus software, identity and access management tools, calculator, database, dataset, or other compilation of data.

(2) "Board" means any administrative or regulatory board, commission, committee, council, association, or authority consisting of more than one

person whose members are appointed by the Governor, the Legislature, or both.

(3) “Department” means the Department of Technology.

(4) “High-risk automated decision system” means an automated decision system that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decisions that have a legal or similarly significant effect, including decisions that materially impact access to, or approval for, housing or accommodations, education, employment, credit, health care, and criminal justice.

(5) (A) “State agency” means any of the following:

(i) Any state office, department, division, or bureau.

(ii) The California State University.

(iii) The Board of Parole Hearings.

(iv) Any board or other professional licensing and regulatory body under the administration or oversight of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

(B) “State agency” does not include the University of California, the Legislature, the judicial branch, or any board, except as provided in subparagraph (A).

(b) On or before September 1, 2024, the Department of Technology shall conduct, in coordination with other interagency bodies as it deems appropriate, a comprehensive inventory of all high-risk automated decision systems that have been proposed for use, development, or procurement by, or are being used, developed, or procured by, any state agency.

(c) The comprehensive inventory described by subdivision (b) shall include a description of all of the following:

(1) (A) Any decision the automated decision system can make or support and the intended benefits of that use.

(B) The alternatives to any use described in subparagraph (A).

(2) The results of any research assessing the efficacy and relative benefits of the uses and alternatives of the automated decision system described by paragraph (1).

(3) The categories of data and personal information the automated decision system uses to make its decisions.

(4) (A) The measures in place, if any, to mitigate the risks, including cybersecurity risk and the risk of inaccurate, unfairly discriminatory, or biased decisions, of the automated decision system.

(B) Measures described by this paragraph may include, but are not limited to, any of the following:

(i) Performance metrics to gauge the accuracy of the system.

(ii) Cybersecurity controls.

(iii) Privacy controls.

(iv) Risk assessments or audits for potential risks.

(v) Measures or processes in place to contest an automated decision.

(d) (1) On or before January 1, 2025, and annually thereafter, the department shall submit a report of the comprehensive inventory described in subdivision (b) to the Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection and the Senate Committee on Governmental Organization.

- (2) The requirement for submitting a report imposed under paragraph (1) is inoperative on January 1, 2029, pursuant to Section 10231.5.
- (3) A report to be submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795.

Frequently Asked Questions

High-Risk Automated Decision Systems Data Collection

On this page

- [Background](#)
 - [Data Collection](#)
 - [High-Risk ADS Examples](#)
-

Background

Q: Why is the California Department of Technology (CDT) requiring departments to submit a list of their High-Risk Automated Decision Systems?

A: [GC § 11546.45.5](#) requires the California Department of Technology (CDT) on or before January 1, 2025, and annually thereafter, to submit a report of the comprehensive inventory of high-risk automated decision systems as described in subdivision **GC § 11546.45.5 (b)** to the Assembly Committee on Privacy and Consumer Protection and the Senate Committee on Governmental Organization.

This comprehensive inventory includes all high-risk automated decision systems that have been proposed for use, development, or procurement by, or are being used, developed, or procured by any “State agency”.

Q: What is a “State agency”?

A: For the purposes of the [GC § 11546.45.5](#) ADS reporting, a “State agency” means any of the following:

- i. Any state office, department, division, or bureau.
- ii. The California State University.
- iii. The Board of Parole Hearings.
- iv. Any board or other professional licensing and regulatory body under the administration or oversight of the Department of Consumer Affairs.

“State agency” does not include the University of California, the Legislature, the judicial branch, or any board, except as provided above.

“Board” means any administrative or regulatory board, commission, committee, council, association, or authority consisting of more than one person whose members are appointed by the Governor, the Legislature, or both.

Q: What is an Automated Decision System?

A: “Automated decision system” means a computational process derived from machine learning, statistical modeling, data analytics, or artificial intelligence that issues simplified output, including a score, classification, or recommendation, that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decisionmaking and materially impacts natural persons. “Automated decision system” does not include a spam email filter, firewall, antivirus software, identity and access management tools, calculator, database, dataset, or other compilation of data.

Q: What is a High-Risk Automated Decision System (ADS)?

A: A high-risk automated decision system (ADS) means an automated decision system that is used to assist or replace human discretionary decisions that have a legal or similarly significant effect, including decisions that materially impact access to, or approval for, housing or accommodations, education, employment, credit, health care, and criminal justice.

Q: Who should I contact if I need assistance in interpreting GC § 11546.45.5?

A: Please contact your legal counsel.

Data Collection

Q: What if my “State agency” does not use a High-Risk ADS, do I still need to submit a data collection?

A: Yes. This will ensure CDT complies with the comprehensive inventory requirement of [**GC § 11546.45.5**](#).

Q: What if my “State agency” has more than one High-Risk ADS, in use or planned to be in use?

A: CDT requires a separate data collection submission for each High-Risk ADS that has been proposed for use, development, or procurement, or is being used, developed, or procured.

Q: Why is it essential for me to supply my work email?

A: A copy of the submission of your High-Risk ADS will be emailed back to the email you supply. If it is not correct or valid, you will not receive the confirmation message along with your submitted response.

Q: How do I know my High-Risk ADS Data collection survey was received by CDT?

A: Upon submitting the data collection, you will receive an automated email response entitled, “Legislatively Mandated High-Risk ADS Data Collection GC § 11546.45.5” from noreply+automations@airtableemail.com acknowledging your response was submitted successfully.

If you are unable to locate your automated email response, please check your Microsoft Outlook Junk Email folder.

Q: Will my data be shared outside of CDT?

A: While data collection submissions of High-Risk ADS are generally considered as confidential, certain information is required to be submitted to the Legislature in the annual report. Additionally, to the extent that information in data collection submissions is not considered confidential or otherwise prohibited from disclosure under applicable law, such information must be shared in response to a lawful request for information (Public Records Request, Subpoena, Court Order, etc.).

Q: What if my High-Risk ADS uses Generative AI, do I need to submit a response?

A: Yes. Generative AI is a type of Artificial Intelligence.

Q: Since I already provided CDT with a SIMM 5305-F for my High-Risk Generative AI, do I need to submit a response?

A: Yes. The definition of a High-Risk ADS is different than a High-Risk GenAI.

Q: What if I submitted a form in error?

A: Please send an email to highriskadsreporting@state.ca.gov to correct your submission.

Q: What should I do if I have a question regarding the data collection submission process for my High-Risk ADS ?

A: Please contact CDT at highriskadsreporting@state.ca.gov for further clarification on the reporting requirements of [GC § 11546.45.5](#).

Q: How can I contact CDT if I have further questions?

A: Please send your question to highriskadsreporting@state.ca.gov.

High-Risk ADS Examples

Below are some possible examples of High-Risk ADS. The examples below do not imply that these High-Risk ADS are being used by State agencies subject to [GC § 11546.45.5](#)

Example 1: A system uses artificial intelligence to assist state employees in approving or denying benefits. The system provides a simplified output in the form of an

approval/denial recommendation which the state employees rely upon to make benefits decisions.

Because the system uses AI as a computational process to issue a simplified output in the form of recommendation, and materially impacts a natural person, and is used to assist human discretionary decision making, and has a legal or similarly significant effect for benefits, it is a High-Risk Automated Decision System. This should be reported as a High-Risk ADS.

Example 2: A system uses Generative Artificial Intelligence to evaluate and rank resumés and job applications for alignment to job requirements and issues a ranking score. A state employee relies upon the rank score to either move applicants forward to the next phase of recruitment or reject applicants.

Because the system uses Generative Artificial Intelligence, a type of AI, as a computational process to issue a simplified output in the form of a rank score, and materially impacts a natural person, and is used to assist human discretionary decision making, and has a legal or similarly significant effect on a natural person's employment eligibility, it is a High-Risk Automated Decision System. This should be reported as a High-Risk ADS.

Example 3: A law enforcement system uses a statistical model to assist law enforcement in identifying persons who have committed a crime. Law enforcement relies upon these positive identifications to obtain arrest warrants.

Because the system uses a statistical model as a computational process to issue a simplified output in the form of a natural person's identity match, and materially impacts a natural person, and is used to assist human discretionary decision making, and has a legal or similarly significant effect identifying a natural person as a suspect, it is a High-Risk Automated Decision System. This should be reported as a High-Risk ADS.

Website Accessibility Certification

High-Risk Autonomous Decision-Making Systems in Higher Education

Definition (California AB 302): *High-risk* automated or autonomous decision systems are those that assist or replace human decision-making in ways that have a **legal or similarly significant effect** on individuals' rights, opportunities, or access to services ¹. In a higher education context, this covers any AI or algorithmic system influencing decisions on **admissions, hiring, financial aid, discipline, academic status, housing/accommodations, or grading/proctoring**, since these directly impact students' educational opportunities and welfare.

Below, we identify specific examples of such systems currently or recently used in colleges/universities, organized by decision area. A summary table is also provided for quick reference.

Examples of High-Risk AI Systems in Higher Ed (Summary)

2 3

System (Vendor)	Decision Function	Institutions Using It	Risks & Concerns
<i>UT Austin Grad Admissions Algorithm</i> (in-house ML)	Scoring and recommending grad admissions ⁴ . Trained on past admits (e.g. "elite" undergrad, strong rec letters) ⁵ .	University of Texas, Austin (used 2013–2020) ⁴	Encoded past biases (legitimized subjective biases in prior decisions) ⁶ ⁷ . Dropped amid criticism of fairness.
<i>Student Select</i> (Vendor AI)	Predicts admission likelihood; tiers applicants; analyzes essays & video interviews for traits ⁸ ⁹ .	Rutgers University, Rocky Mountain University , ~10+ others ¹⁰ (contracts reported)	Opaque "black box" model – risk of bias from training data ⁷ . Uses affect/word cues with unproven link to student success ⁷ . Lacks transparency or external accountability.

System (Vendor)	Decision Function	Institutions Using It	Risks & Concerns
<i>Enrollment Management Algorithms</i> (EAB, RNL, Othot, etc.)	Predict each admitted student's yield probability , then optimize financial aid offers to maximize enrollment or revenue ¹¹ .	Hundreds of colleges (e.g. RNL serves ~300; EAB ~150; others) ²	Tends to reduce aid for needier students by pinpointing “willingness to pay” ¹² . May worsen equity, debt, and drop-out rates by prioritizing revenue over student success ¹² . Potential for discriminatory pricing.
<i>Social Sentinel</i> (now Navigate360 Detect)	Monitors public social media (keywords, AI) for threats or protests ¹³ ¹⁴ . Often deployed via campus police.	At least 37 universities (since 2015) ¹⁵ (e.g. UNC-Chapel Hill, Kennesaw State, NC A&T in documented cases)	Surveillance of student speech – used to flag protest organizers ¹⁶ ¹⁵ . Chilling effect on First Amendment rights ¹⁷ . Privacy intrusions (even scanning student emails in newer versions) ¹⁸ ¹⁹ .
<i>SpotterEDU</i> (attendance app) and <i>Degree Analytics</i>	Track students’ physical presence : SpotterEDU via Bluetooth beacons, Degree Analytics via Wi-Fi, to log class attendance and campus engagement ²⁰ ²¹ .	SpotterEDU : ~40 colleges piloted (e.g. U. of Missouri, Syracuse) ²² ²³ . Degree Analytics : ~19 colleges ²¹ .	Student location tracking raises privacy concerns ²⁴ . Often <i>mandatory</i> for athletes or certain groups ²⁵ . Normalizes constant monitoring of behavior, with unclear consent and data use policies.
<i>UA “Smart Campus” ID Tracking</i> (Univ. of Arizona)	Analyzes <i>ID card swipes</i> (dorm, library, gym, etc.) to predict students likely to drop out (73% accuracy claimed) ²⁶ ²⁷ . Flags at-risk freshmen for advisor intervention via a dashboard.	University of Arizona (ongoing study/program) ²⁶	Tracks hundreds of daily activities per student – highly sensitive behavior data ²⁸ . Potential profiling: e.g. less social or routine = “risk” ²⁹ . If misused (e.g. punitive probation), could unfairly target nontraditional or introverted students.

System (Vendor)	Decision Function	Institutions Using It	Risks & Concerns
<i>Remote Proctoring AI</i> (e.g. Respondus, Proctorio , ProctorU, Honorlock)	Exam monitoring: uses webcam/microphone to flag “suspicious” behavior via AI (face not in frame, eyes wandering, another person present, etc.) ³⁰ ³¹ . Some do room pan scans and ID checks ³² ³³ .	Widespread – used across many CSU and UC campuses (and worldwide), especially during COVID ³⁴ . E.g. CSU San Marcos (Respondus), Cal Poly SLO (ProctorU) in 2023 ³⁵ ³⁶ .	Labeled “ <i>glorified spyware</i> ”: Privacy intrusion (recording rooms, personal data) ³ . Bias: Face-detection has failed to recognize students of color, flagging them unfairly ³¹ . ADA issues for students with disabilities or anxiety. A judge ruled forced room-scans <i>unconstitutional</i> (violating 4th Amendment) ³⁷ .
<i>Turnitin AI Writing Detector</i>	Flags student essays likely written by AI (uses NLP to find “average” writing patterns) ³⁸ ³⁹ . An extension of Turnitin plagiarism software.	Thousands of institutions (Turnitin is used by 16,000+ schools globally ⁴⁰ ; AI-detection rolled out April 2023)	False positives can accuse innocent students of cheating ³⁸ . <i>Disproportionate impact:</i> non-native English writers and even some high-achieving students get flagged because their prose seems too “simple” or formulaic to the algorithm ³⁹ . Such errors put students at risk of unjust discipline or loss of credit.

Table: High-risk AI systems in use, with their function, where they're used, and key risk concerns.

Admissions & Hiring Algorithms

Automated Admissions: A growing number of colleges have experimented with AI in admissions decisions. For example, the University of Texas at Austin's computer science department built a **machine-learning model** to help rank **graduate applicants** ⁴ . The in-house algorithm was trained on historical admissions data and looked for factors that correlated with past admit decisions (e.g. whether the applicant attended an “elite” undergraduate school, or if recommendation letters contained superlatives like “best”) ⁵ . While it never outright made final decisions without human review, it heavily influenced which students were recommended for admission. **Criticism:** UT's system was abandoned after 7 years amid complaints that it **embedded biases** – essentially codifying subjective preferences and inequalities from previous admissions cycles ⁶ . Detractors noted that such models could “encode and legitimize” biases (for instance, favoring applicants from prestigious backgrounds) and lacked transparency or accountability in how they worked ⁷ .

Another example is **Student Select**, a vendor offering AI-driven admissions screening to colleges. Student Select ingests a university's past admissions data and rubric, then **sorts applicants into tiers** by predicted likelihood of admission ⁸ . Top-tier applicants can be fast-tracked for acceptance, while lower tiers get additional human scrutiny ⁴¹ . The platform also analyzes textual data – it can scan application **essays** and

even **recorded interview videos** to infer personality traits or skills (e.g. mentioning “flexibility” might be tagged as openness to experience) ⁹ . At least a dozen universities have contracted with Student Select (Rutgers University and Rocky Mountain University were reported clients) ¹⁰ . **Criticism:** AI vendors often claim to find signals of “fit” or merit, but experts warn there’s *no proven link* between an applicant’s tone of voice or eye contact and their college performance ⁴² . These systems operate as “**black boxes**”, so neither students nor admissions officers can fully know why one candidate is ranked above another. Moreover, if the algorithms are trained on past data, any existing racial or gender biases in admissions decisions get reproduced and even amplified under the veneer of objectivity ⁷ .

AI in Hiring (University Staff): Universities themselves are large employers, and many have adopted the same AI-based hiring tools used in industry. For instance, **AI video interview platforms** like **HireVue** are used in some college hiring processes (the University of Colorado Boulder confirms it uses HireVue for initial staff screening) ⁴³ ⁴⁴ . These tools have applicants record video answers which are then analyzed algorithmically for speech patterns, facial expressions, and language use to predict job performance or “fit” ⁴⁵ ⁴⁶ . **Criticism:** Automated hiring systems have come under fire for potential **disability and racial discrimination** – e.g. facial analysis may not read non-white faces or autistic/neurodivergent body language accurately, leading to lower scores through no fault of the candidate ⁴⁷ ⁴⁸ . The U.S. EEOC and DOJ have warned that AI hiring tools can unlawfully **screen out** disabled applicants or minority groups even when vendors claim to reduce bias ⁴⁵ ⁴⁶ . Some universities using HireVue have responded by disabling certain AI scoring features and insisting that human reviewers assess all videos (as CU Boulder does) to avoid over-reliance on the algorithm ⁴⁸ ⁴⁹ . Nonetheless, the **lack of transparency** in how proprietary hiring algorithms evaluate candidates poses legal and ethical questions, especially for public institutions bound by equal opportunity rules.

Financial Aid Allocation Algorithms

In higher education, deciding **who gets financial aid and how much** is a high-stakes decision – one that many colleges now outsource to predictive algorithms. Companies like EAB, Ruffalo Noel Levitz (RNL), Othot, and others provide *enrollment management* software that uses machine learning to optimize the distribution of **scholarships and grants** ² . These systems typically work in two steps: first, an algorithm **predicts each admitted student’s probability of enrolling** if admitted (often called a *yield prediction*); second, it simulates countless financial aid award scenarios to find an “optimal” aid package that will *just* convince the student to enroll without unduly cutting into the college’s net revenue ¹¹ . In practice, this often means **offering less aid** to students deemed likely to enroll anyway, and concentrating resources on those who need an extra nudge (or competing offers) ¹² . Such systems are widely used – by 2015, **75%+ of colleges** were using analytics in enrollment management, and vendors like RNL claim to serve hundreds of institutions with these aid-optimizing models ⁵⁰ ⁵¹ .

Risks and Criticisms: While predictive aid allocation can help colleges meet enrollment targets, researchers warn it may **hurt students** in the long run. A Brookings analysis found these algorithms “generally reduce the amount of scholarship funding offered” to students overall, effectively **charging students more** by identifying their maximum willingness-to-pay ¹² . By prioritizing the college’s yield and revenue, the models can undermine access and equity – students from lower-income backgrounds or under-represented groups might receive smaller awards if the algorithm deems them likely to enroll regardless, potentially jeopardizing their ability to persist and graduate ⁵² . This two-stage optimization also opens the door to subtle **algorithmic discrimination**. For example, if yield predictions incorporate data like a student’s ZIP code or high school (which correlate with race and income), the resulting aid offers could inadvertently

perpetuate socioeconomic and racial disparities ⁵³. There is concern that **opportunity decisions are being made by opaque formulas**, without applicants' knowledge. In fact, the practice has drawn enough scrutiny that experts recommend colleges *not* use predicted enrollment likelihood in admissions or need-based aid decisions, keeping those based on merit and demonstrated need alone ⁵⁴. Nevertheless, the use of these systems is expanding, which is why laws like AB 302 seek more transparency. California's bill specifically flags **education and credit** decisions (which include student loans and aid) as high-risk areas for automated systems ¹.

Disciplinary Actions & Academic Probation

Academic Early-Warning Systems: Many universities now use predictive analytics to identify students at risk of failing courses, dropping out, or ending up on academic probation. These systems (e.g. Civitas Learning's "Illume" platform, EAB's Navigate) aggregate data like GPA trends, class attendance, LMS logins, and even socioeconomic factors to produce a **"risk score"** for each student. Advisors and deans can then intervene with at-risk students – offering tutoring, counseling, or in some cases placing students on **academic probation or contracts** if they don't improve. For instance, the University of Arizona's **"Smart Campus"** initiative goes beyond grades and uses student behavioral data: they track **ID card swipes across campus** (dorm entries, library usage, dining hall visits, etc.) for freshmen ²⁶. By mining these "digital traces," UA's algorithm identified patterns (like a student's social circle size or daily routine consistency) that correlate with dropout risk, reportedly achieving 73% accuracy in predicting which freshmen might leave ²⁷. Advisors are given a dashboard highlighting the top-risk students each quarter, so they can reach out ²⁹.

Risks: The intent of early-warning systems is supportive, but they raise flags when used in a punitive or surveillance-like manner. **Privacy** is a major concern – systems like UA's essentially monitor a student's whereabouts and activities 24/7, which some argue goes beyond the appropriate scope of an educational institution. There's also the risk of **false positives or bias** in these models. If a student is less engaged on campus (maybe due to working off-campus or being a commuter), the algorithm might label them high-risk inaccurately, potentially leading to stigma or unnecessary academic discipline. Conversely, heavy reliance on an algorithm might cause staff to **overlook students** who need help but don't fit the risk profile. Transparency is limited – students often do not know they are being algorithmically assessed for "likelihood to succeed," nor can they contest a risk score. If such scores were naively used to make probation decisions (e.g. automatically placing students in remedial programs or limiting their course load), that could **impact their educational trajectory based on a machine's guess**. In short, while predictive analytics can help allocate support resources, using them to make formal disciplinary or academic status decisions is rightly considered *high-risk* and must be done with great care and human oversight.

AI in Student Conduct Monitoring: Some disciplinary actions in college stem not from grades but behavior (plagiarism, cheating, misconduct). Here too, automation is playing a role. Classic example: **plagiarism detection software** (like Turnitin) has long been used to automatically compare student papers against databases for copied text. Turnitin's originality reports can trigger academic misconduct proceedings – a clearly high-stakes outcome – and there have been cases of **false positives** (e.g. quoting common phrases or references getting mis-flagged as plagiarism). Now, with AI-written content on the rise, Turnitin in 2023 added an **AI Writing Detector** that labels what percent of an essay it thinks was generated by AI. This tool is already used in thousands of institutions ⁴⁰. However, AI text detection is notoriously error-prone. A *Washington Post* investigation found Turnitin's AI detector can **wrongly flag human-written text as AI** ³⁸. Even more troubling, AI detectors show bias: they often identify **non-native English**

speakers' writing as "too simple" and thus AI-generated – one study showed several detectors mislabeled 61% of ESL students' essays as AI-written ⁵⁵ ⁵⁶ . That means international or bilingual students could be **unfairly accused of cheating** just because of their writing style. The stakes are high: at many schools, being found guilty of academic dishonesty (plagiarism or AI cheating) can result in automatic failure or even expulsion, which, for international students, can jeopardize their visa status ⁵⁷ . This scenario played out in May 2023, when a Texas A&M-Commerce professor ran student essays through ChatGPT (in an attempt to see if ChatGPT would "admit" to writing them) and then **falsely accused the entire class of cheating** – threatening to withhold their diplomas ⁵⁸ ⁵⁹ . The students had to scramble to prove their innocence, illustrating how **misuse of AI** can lead to severe unintended consequences ⁶⁰ ⁶¹ . Institutions are now grappling with policies on these tools, but the incident underscored that automated "judgment" of student behavior is fallible and must not replace careful human evaluation ⁶² ³⁹ .

Student Surveillance & Behavioral Monitoring

Colleges have also adopted an array of monitoring technologies that, while couched in terms of safety or student success, function as **autonomous surveillance systems**. These tools collect data on students' movements, online activities, or communications – often in real time – and can trigger decisions affecting students' access to campus facilities or subject them to investigation. Under AB 302's framework, such **"student surveillance" systems are high-risk** because they may materially impact students' rights (e.g. privacy, free expression) or access to services (housing, campus resources) if misused.

Location Tracking Apps: One prominent example is **SpotterEDU**, an app that uses Bluetooth beacons installed in classrooms to automatically record attendance. When students walk into class with their phone, the app logs them as "present" and uploads this to a campus database ⁶³ ²⁰ . Some implementations allowed professors or coaches to **award or deduct points** based on these attendance logs. At the University of Missouri, for instance, freshmen (especially student-athletes) were reportedly **required** to install SpotterEDU so their class attendance could be tracked continuously ²² ⁶⁴ . The company's founder noted in 2019 that SpotterEDU was in use or pilot at nearly **40 colleges** ⁶⁵ (Syracuse University was an early adopter, boasting of improved attendance) ²³ . A similar system, **Degree Analytics**, uses Wi-Fi check-in data to monitor whether students are attending class and engaging in campus life, and was used by at least 19 universities as of 2020 ²¹ . These tools basically turn students' phones into **location trackers**.

Concerns: Even if improving attendance is a legitimate goal, mandating a tracking app raises **privacy and consent issues**. Students and privacy advocates have likened this to a digital "ankle monitor." Although universities claim the data stays internal and is not GPS-based ⁶⁶ ⁶⁷ , the **normalization of surveillance** is a worry. The Verge noted that such apps are making it routine for colleges to know where students are at all times, in a way that "smacks of surveillance" – potentially conditioning students to accept constant monitoring ²⁴ . There's also the question of **what else the data could be used for**: an attendance app could easily be repurposed to enforce curfews, monitor political gatherings, or analyze a student's friend network without consent. In fact, a few schools have tried incentivizing student behavior outside class with similar tech (e.g. an app that gave *loyalty points* for staying at football games) ⁶⁸ , blurring the line between benign uses and intrusive ones.

Social Media Monitoring: Another high-risk system is **Social Sentinel** (rebranded as Navigate360 Detect). Marketed as a campus safety tool, it uses AI to scan public social media posts (and optionally student email accounts) for keywords indicating threats of violence, self-harm, or other safety issues ¹³ ¹⁸ . In practice, however, several universities used Social Sentinel to **track student protests and activism**. An investigative

report found at least **37 colleges** between 2015–2021 (including UNC-Chapel Hill and Kennesaw State) secretly used this tool to monitor protest-related chatter and even specific student activists on platforms like Twitter ¹⁶ ¹⁵. For example, during protests over a Confederate statue at UNC, campus police asked Social Sentinel to flag any posts containing certain protest keywords, essentially enabling real-time surveillance of student demonstrators ¹⁶. **Risks:** This clearly implicates students' **free speech and privacy rights**. Monitoring social media for safety blurs into monitoring dissent – a **First Amendment red flag**, especially at public universities. One law expert noted that identifying students who associate with a protest or cause has a chilling effect: knowing that “the university is watching” can deter people from exercising their right to assemble or speak out ¹⁷. There are also data security concerns: Social Sentinel's emails showed the company urging universities to upload **student directory data and social media handles** to improve monitoring – effectively creating a database of students' online identities ¹⁹. If such data were breached or misused, it could expose students to external surveillance as well. The backlash has led some schools (like UCLA, once it became public ⁶⁹) to reconsider, and the company now insists it focuses on self-harm prevention, but the **potential for abuse** in these AI surveillance tools is high. Notably, California's legislature is aware of this trend – AB 302's definition of high-risk AI explicitly includes systems affecting “access to... criminal justice,” which covers policing practices on campuses ⁷⁰.

Campus Access & Security Decisions: Autonomous systems are also beginning to influence who gets access to physical spaces or accommodations. While less publicized, imagine an algorithm that decides which students get priority for *on-campus housing* (perhaps based on distance, GPA, or other factors), or a system that automatically schedules and assigns dorm rooms. If, say, a housing algorithm favored certain profiles of students (upperclassmen, or those who can pay more for premium dorms), that could materially affect other students' access to accommodations. Additionally, **facial recognition** technology has been piloted at some campuses for building entry or event security. For instance, some universities considered facial recognition for dorm access control – an automated system might unlock doors only for recognized students. This raises similar issues seen in broader society: face recognition AI has well-known **accuracy biases** (often misidentifying women and people of color) ⁷¹ ⁴⁷. In a campus context, a false negative could mean a student is wrongly denied entry to their residence hall, or flagged as an intruder, simply due to an algorithm's error. Although many universities (like those in the California State system) proactively **banned facial recognition on campus** after student protests ⁷² ⁷³, the pressure to enhance security with AI remains. Any such system – determining access to dorms, labs, or disability accommodations (e.g. an AI deciding if a student's documentation warrants special housing) – would fall under *high-risk automated decisions*, given the potential to unfairly exclude individuals from essential services.

In summary, **student surveillance and access-control systems** illustrate the tension between innovation and civil liberties in higher ed. These tools operate continuously and often invisibly, so strong oversight is needed to ensure they don't cross the line into unlawful monitoring or discrimination. As one student privacy advocate put it, universities are “normalizing the practice of handing over...sensitive biometric information,” without truly obtaining *meaningful consent* from students who often have no choice but to comply ⁷⁴ ⁷⁵. The risks are not just hypothetical – they manifest in chilling of speech, unequal treatment, or violations of privacy that can deeply affect the campus climate and student trust.

Algorithmic Grading & Proctoring Tools

Finally, the use of autonomous systems in **grading and exam proctoring** deserves special attention, as it directly impacts academic evaluations – which have “legal or similarly significant effects” on students

(grades affect graduation, scholarships, etc.). Two areas stand out: **AI-assisted grading** and **remote proctoring**.

Automated Grading: Some large courses and standardized testing platforms have experimented with AI or algorithmic grading of student work. For example, MOOCs and standardized tests have used **automated essay scoring** systems that assign grades by comparing against trained models of writing. While efficient, these systems can be **deeply flawed**. There have been reports of students learning to game essay algorithms by using verbose, nonsense sentences that the algorithm perceives as sophisticated writing – yielding high scores for content a human would judge as poor (one famous case involved students writing gibberish essays to trick an SAT essay scorer algorithm). Automated grading can also penalize creative or non-standard responses that don't fit the algorithm's expectations ⁷⁶ ⁷⁷. Because of these concerns, many faculty are hesitant to rely on algorithmic graders for high-stakes evaluations. In some instances, professors have attempted to use AI tools like ChatGPT to **grade or check student work**, with disastrous results – as seen in the Texas A&M case above, using AI naively to detect cheating led to nearly failing an entire class wrongly ⁵⁹ ⁶⁰. The consensus in recent studies is that **AI grading is not ready to replace human teachers**: it may work as a second reader or for low-stakes feedback, but issues of bias (against non-native writers, etc.) and lack of contextual understanding make fully automated grading *high-risk*. Even the makers of these tools often acknowledge they should only *assist* humans, not make final judgments. For now, any college using algorithmic grading in a significant way must be extremely cautious to ensure fairness and allow human appeal/review of any machine-made scoring decisions.

Remote Proctoring AI: A more widespread trend is the use of AI-driven **remote proctoring** tools to monitor exams taken online. Systems like **Respondus Monitor, Proctorio, ProctorU, ExamSoft**, and others became ubiquitous during the COVID-19 remote learning phase. They leverage a mix of video, audio, and desktop monitoring to flag possible cheating. For instance, Proctorio runs as a browser plugin that can record a student via webcam, track keystrokes and browsing activity, and use **machine vision** algorithms to detect if the student's face is looking away too often, if an unknown person comes into view, or if the student speaks/read aloud (which might indicate help from someone off-camera) ³⁰ ⁷⁸. Unusual movements or sounds are logged as "suspicious" and the software creates an alert report for instructors, sometimes even assigning an automatic "risk score" to each exam session. Some proctoring services also require a 360° **room pan** with the webcam before the test, to ensure no notes or other people are in the room ³² ⁷⁹. These recordings and analyses happen with minimal human oversight (Proctorio prides itself on being fully automated – no live proctors) ⁸⁰ ³⁰.

Criticism and Legal Issues: Remote proctoring has drawn intense criticism from students, faculty, and digital rights groups. **Privacy** is the biggest concern: effectively, these tools turn your personal laptop and camera into an **in-home surveillance device** for the university. Students have reported anxiety and humiliation at having to show their bedrooms on camera and be watched for hours. In one notable case (Ogletree v. Cleveland State University, 2022), a student sued after being forced to do a room scan before an online test; a federal judge ruled that the warrantless room scan by the public university **violated the Fourth Amendment** (unreasonable search) ³⁷. This was a landmark decision that has begun to influence how colleges handle e-proctoring. Several California State University campuses, for example, stopped requiring room pans after this ruling, though some still allow them with student consent or faculty request ³⁵ ³⁶.

Another major issue is **bias and accessibility**. Facial recognition or detection algorithms used by proctoring software have struggled with accurately recognizing **darker-skinned and female faces**. There have been

reports of Black students being flagged for “missing” from their seat simply because the software couldn’t detect their face under poor lighting, or students in turbans/veils being mistakenly flagged for “different person present.” One student told Recode that Proctorio’s algorithm had trouble recognizing them at all due to skin tone, which is “a sign that the software could be racially biased” ³¹ . Likewise, students with certain disabilities or medical conditions (e.g. tics, anxiety that causes looking around, the need to stand up or move frequently) have been unfairly flagged by rigid AI rules. These programs were even called **“innately racist, flawed, and an invasion of privacy”** in a 2021 open letter by Fight for the Future (a digital rights nonprofit) ³ . That advocacy led some universities (e.g. CUNY and University of Illinois) to ban or strongly discourage e-proctoring, but many others continue its use in the absence of a centralized policy ^{72 81} .

Data security is another risk – proctoring companies collect video recordings, face data, ID cards, and sometimes biometric keystroke or faceprint profiles. There have been **data breaches** at proctoring companies (for instance, ProctorU had a breach exposing 440,000 student records in 2020) ⁸² . If such sensitive data are leaked, students could be vulnerable to identity theft or worse. Even without breaches, students are uneasy about how long these companies store their footage and whether it could be repurposed.

Furthermore, the **stress and mental health impact** of algorithmic invigilation should not be underestimated. Knowing that any eye movement or fidget will be judged by an unforgiving AI causes extreme test anxiety in some students, to the point that it may affect performance or deter students from taking classes. It also **changes the student-institution relationship**: there’s an implicit message of distrust (assuming all students might cheat unless watched by AI), which students and some faculty find corrosive to academic culture ^{83 84} .

In response to these concerns, some universities and even states have begun implementing safeguards. The California legislature passed the **Student Test Taker Privacy Protection Act** (in effect Jan 2023) restricting proctoring companies from using or selling student data for any purpose besides the proctoring itself ⁸⁵ . Faculty senates (e.g. in the Cal State system) have issued resolutions urging alternatives to e-proctoring and prohibiting any use of facial recognition tech in the classroom ^{72 73} . These steps indicate a growing acknowledgement that, while remote proctoring AI can help maintain academic integrity in online exams, its **high risks to student rights require strict limits and transparency**.

Conclusion: The examples above underscore that **autonomous decision-making systems in higher education are already here** – from admissions and financial aid algorithms quietly shaping who gets in and how much they pay, to AI “eyes” watching students in dorms, online, and during tests. Each promises efficiency or enhanced decision-making, but also carries significant risks of error, bias, or rights infringements. California’s AB 302 recognizes these as *high-risk systems*, calling for inventories and oversight. As colleges continue to adopt AI solutions, the key challenge will be ensuring **algorithmic accountability**: requiring rigorous bias testing, human review of important decisions, informed consent from students, and avenues to contest or appeal algorithm-driven decisions ^{54 86} . High-risk or not, the ultimate goal should be to harness these technologies to *enhance* educational access and fairness – not undermine it. Each university example above has sparked valuable debates and policy responses that will shape how AI is ethically integrated into higher ed in the years to come.

Sources: High-risk ADS definition from California AB 302 ¹; examples and usage details from news investigations, academic reports, and vendor documentation ^{4 8 12 15 23 26 37 31 39} (full citations above).

1 70 Bill Text: CA AB302 | 2023-2024 | Regular Session | Amended | LegiScan

<https://legiscan.com/CA/text/AB302/id/2814759>

2 11 12 50 52 53 54 86 Enrollment algorithms are contributing to the crises of higher education | Brookings

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/enrollment-algorithms-are-contributing-to-the-crises-of-higher-education/>

3 32 33 34 35 36 37 72 73 74 75 79 81 85 E-proctoring still used at California colleges despite ruling - CalMatters

<https://calmatters.org/education/higher-education/college-beat/2023/02/remote-proctoring-california-colleges/>

4 5 6 7 8 9 10 41 42 Should colleges use AI in admissions? | Higher Ed Dive

<https://www.highereddive.com/news/ai-admissions-ethics-college-university-higher-ed/686588/>

13 14 15 16 17 18 19 Tracked: How Colleges Use AI To Monitor Student Protests | Pulitzer Center

<https://pulitzercenter.org/stories/tracked-how-colleges-use-ai-monitor-student-protests>

20 21 22 23 24 25 64 65 66 67 68 US colleges are trying to install location tracking apps on students' phones | The Verge

<https://www.theverge.com/2020/1/28/21112456/spotteredu-degree-analytics-student-location-tracking-app-attendance>

26 27 28 29 University of Arizona tracks student ID cards to detect who might drop out | The Verge

<https://www.theverge.com/2018/3/12/17109224/university-of-arizona-tracking-smartchips-student-ids-privacy-drop-out>

30 31 78 80 82 83 84 Online proctoring services pose privacy concerns for remote learning | Vox

<https://www.vox.com/recode/22175021/school-cheating-student-privacy-remote-learning>

38 39 58 59 60 61 62 Texas A&M professor threatened to fail class for AI most didn't use - The Washington Post

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2023/05/18/texas-professor-threatened-fail-class-chatgpt-cheating/>

40 55 56 57 AI Detection Tools Falsely Accuse International Students of Cheating - The Markup

<https://themarkup.org/machine-learning/2023/08/14/ai-detection-tools-falsely-accuse-international-students-of-cheating>

43 44 48 49 What is HireVue and How Does it Help us to Hire You? | CU Boulder Jobs | University of Colorado Boulder

<https://www.colorado.edu/jobs/2024/02/27/what-hirevue-and-how-does-it-help-us-hire-you>

45 46 47 71 Facial Recognition in Hiring: Occupational Segregation on Speed | Posts | Ethics Matter | Point of View Blog | News and Events | Albers School of Business & Economics | Seattle University

<https://www.seattleu.edu/business/news-events/pov/ethics-matter/posts/facial-recognition-in-hiring-occupational-segregation-on-speed.php>

51 Financial Aid Management | Financial Aid Leveraging | RNL

<https://www.ruffalonl.com/enrollment-management-solutions/optimizing-yield/advanced-financial-aid-management-leveraging-solutions/>

63 Colleges are turning students' phones into surveillance machines

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2019/12/24/colleges-are-turning-students-phones-into-surveillance-machines-tracking-locations-hundreds-thousands/>

69 UCLA administrators monitor students' social media activity

<https://dailybruin.com/2022/10/09/ucla-administrators-monitor-students-social-media-activity>

76 77 Flawed Algorithms Are Grading Millions of Students' Essays | Hacker News

<https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=20834379>

Executive Summary and Recommendations from the Scholarship and Creative Activities Task Force

Approved by the Task Force on May 12th, 2025

Submitted to the Academic Senate Executive Committee on May 13th, 2025

Task Force Members

Dr. Zachary Zenko, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair and Associate Professor from Social Sciences and Education

Dr. Maryann Parada, Associate Professor from Arts and Humanities

Dr. Jing Wang, Associate Professor from Business and Public Administration

Dr. Kathleen Szick, Associate Professor from Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering

Dr. Brittney Beck, Associate Professor from Social Sciences and Education

Ms. Kristine Holloway, Librarian

Dr. Tracey Salisbury, CFA President

Dr. Deborah Boschini, AVP for Faculty Affairs

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Executive Summary and Recommendations

The Scholarship and Creative Activities Task Force was established in Fall 2024 by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to examine faculty workload distribution, support for research, scholarship, and creative activities (RSCA), and potential disparities across colleges and disciplines. The Task Force included tenured faculty representatives from all four colleges and the library, as well as the CFA President and the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs. Task Force members brought a range of scholarly and leadership experiences, including high levels of grant activity, publication records, and student mentorship.

The charge of the Task Force was to investigate how Weighted Teaching Units (WTUs) are allocated, particularly in relation to RSCA expectations for retention, tenure, and promotion, and to make recommendations to improve equity and feasibility. The Task Force met regularly to examine faculty workload and support for research, scholarship, and creative activities (RSCA). The Task Force reviewed CSU policies and prior campus reports and developed a faculty survey to assess workload, RSCA support, and potential disparities across colleges. The survey included both closed- and open-ended items and was administered in Fall 2024, with responses from a broad cross-section of faculty, including 96 full-time faculty. Additionally, Deans were consulted to gather information on existing RSCA support practices and suggestions for improvement. A mixed-methods analysis was conducted, including statistical evaluation of workload patterns and thematic analysis of qualitative responses and Dean feedback.

Faculty Workload and Presidential Authority

EPR 76-36 (“Faculty Workload: Policies and Procedures”) defines faculty workload as consisting of 12 weighted teaching units (WTUs) for direct instructional assignments, including classroom and laboratory teaching and supervision, and 3 WTUs for indirect instructional activities such as advising, curriculum development, and committee service. Research, scholarship, and creative activities (RSCA) are only specifically referenced in connection with student thesis supervision, and the standard workload distribution is intended to reflect 40 to 45 total hours of faculty effort per week.

Importantly, EPR 76-36 grants the President of each campus authority over the assignment of individual faculty workloads and the overall conduct of the educational program. This authority provides the flexibility needed to revisit and reframe workload structures in collaboration and consultation with the Academic Senate. The Task Force emphasizes that the recommendations outlined in this report are consistent with this authority, and that CSUB has the opportunity to intentionally align faculty workload distributions with the university’s academic mission by supporting RSCA, teaching, and service in a balanced and sustainable way.

Collective Bargaining Agreement, University Handbook, and RSCA

Research, scholarship, and creative activities are referenced throughout the handbook as an area that faculty are evaluated (especially tenure-track and tenured-faculty). Documentation of scholarly and creative activities is a required component of the Working Personnel Action File (“RTP File”) that is used to evaluate faculty. The Collective Bargaining Agreement¹ indicates that the “primary professional responsibilities of instructional faculty members are: Teaching,

¹ <https://www.calfac.org/contract-2022-2025/>

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

scholarship, creative activity, and service to the University, profession, and to the community” (Article 20.1). Recently, CSUB was designated as a Research University². Engagement in RSCA is a priority for the University and for the faculty and students.

While the practice of the institution is to allocate WTUs for teaching (i.e., classroom instruction and contact with students) and service (e.g., advising, committee work), there are typically no WTUs designated for scholarship and creative activities, although some exceptions do exist (e.g., for new tenure-track faculty or for faculty with funding for reassigned time). The Collective Bargaining Agreement, however, also notes that “research, scholarly, and creative activities” shall be considered for adjustments in workload (Article 20.3.B).

Taken together, a re-evaluation and re-imagining of how CSUB prioritizes RSCA as a normal part of the workload—with dedicated time and resources—seems appropriate given the (a) President’s authority over assignment of faculty workloads, in consultation with the Academic Senate, (b) the requirements for RSCA outlined in the University Handbook, and (c) the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Major Findings of this Task Force

Faculty Workload

Faculty consistently reported workloads well above the CSU benchmark of 40-45 hours per week. Full-time faculty worked an average of 51.6 hours per week, with significant time dedicated to teaching, advising, service, and RSCA. Workload distribution varied widely even among faculty without reassigned time. Further, 33% of faculty believe their overall workload is much higher than when they started at CSUB. In contrast, about 6% of faculty respondents believe their overall workload is slightly lower or much lower than when they started at CSUB.

RSCA and Workload Misalignment

Many faculty reported that RSCA expectations are reasonable in principle but unmanageable in practice without greater structural support. Almost two-thirds of underrepresented-minority faculty (URM faculty³) and almost one-fourth of non-URM faculty indicated that WTU distribution does not align with RSCA expectations. While some faculty felt RSCA expectations should be much higher (1.7%), moderately higher (6.1%), or slightly higher (3.5%) than current expectations for tenure and promotion, about one-third of faculty respondents felt that the RSCA expectations should be much lower (10.4%), moderately lower (12.2%), or slightly lower (11.3%) than current expectations. Few faculty indicate the desire for fewer RSCA and instead the consensus is that there should be a reduced teaching and service workload, but not fewer RSCA expectations.

Service and Advising Loads

Service and advising duties varied across colleges and units, with unclear or inconsistent expectations leading to disparities in workload. Many faculty described service demands as encroaching on time for teaching and RSCA.

² <https://news.csub.edu/carnegie-foundation-classifies-csub-as-research-university>

³ For the purposes of this Task Force report, the term *Underrepresented Minority* (“URM”) was used for any faculty member of Hispanic or Latino origin and/or non-White/Caucasian or Asian racial identity, in line with our understanding of the categorizations used during the *Graduation Initiative 2025* program.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Increased Teaching Demands

More than 25% of respondents reported that their teaching-related workload is “much higher” than when they began at CSUB. Increased student support needs, constant digital communication, curriculum changes, and larger class sizes were cited as contributing factors. On the other hand, about 30% of faculty respondents perceived their teaching workload to be about the same (17.4%), slightly lower (8.7%) or much lower (2.6%) than when they started at CSUB.

Faculty Well-Being and RSCA

Faculty often work off-contract to meet RSCA expectations, citing heavy teaching and service loads during the semester. Many described working through breaks and summer to produce scholarship, raising concerns about burnout, mental health, and long-term sustainability. Some of the challenges cited for balancing RSCA with other faculty responsibilities included the heavy teaching and service loads, institutional and administrative challenges, lack of research support, service and advising responsibilities negatively impacting time for RSCA, and challenges in finding uninterrupted time (e.g., “deep work”).

Areas for Support

Many faculty indicated that reduced teaching load, increased funding for research and creative activities, and additional release time would be beneficial. In addition, nearly one-third of respondents indicated that increased opportunities for professional development (e.g., grant writing, time management) would be helpful, and that improved access to research facilities and resources would help advance their efforts related to scholarly and creative activities. These findings align with several key recommendations in this report and highlight tangible, institutionally actionable pathways for advancing a more supportive and productive RSCA environment at CSUB.

Key Disparities Identified

URM Faculty

URM faculty reported significantly greater challenges related to workload and support for RSCA compared to non-URM peers. They were more likely to describe RSCA expectations as misaligned with their assigned WTUs and more often found the requirements unmanageable within contracted hours. URM faculty also reported higher levels of service and advising responsibilities, suggesting that cultural taxation and structural inequities may be contributing to disparities in time and opportunity to engage in scholarly work. URM faculty were more likely to view the current level of support for RSCA through CSUB as inadequate.

College and Disciplinary Differences

Despite disciplinary differences and some differences in support for RSCA, a notable proportion of faculty find the requirements for RSCA to be somewhat unmanageable or very unmanageable within contracted hours (more than 37% overall). At least 40% of faculty in each college indicated that both their teaching workload and overall workload have increased since they began at CSUB, highlighting growing pressures on faculty time across disciplines. Some disciplinary differences did emerge, with some faculty citing the need for laboratory space and time with human participants for in-person data collection, while others may more readily rely

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

on different forms of data (e.g., secondary analysis of publicly available data).

Gender Differences

Faculty identifying as women or nonmen (i.e., women, non-binary faculty, and faculty who preferred to self-describe or not to say) reported greater challenges balancing RSCA with other workload demands compared to men. These faculty were more likely to describe RSCA expectations as unmanageable within contracted hours and reported spending more time on advising activities. This suggests potential gendered disparities in workload distribution that warrant targeted structural and cultural interventions.

Advising Differences

Differences in advising duties were apparent, with nearly half of faculty indicating that they are required to advise students (e.g., with registration for classes, releasing advising holds, discussion program planners and roadmaps, etc.), and the rest indicating that they either had no advising duties (about 23%) or not responding.

Overall Conclusion

CSUB faculty are highly dedicated to their roles as educators, scholars, and campus citizens. Many find deep meaning and fulfillment in their work, yet face significant challenges related to workload, institutional support, and the alignment of expectations with the realities of academic life. The data reflect a widespread desire not for reduced scholarly expectations, but for more realistic and equitable systems that allow faculty to meet those expectations without sacrificing personal well-being or professional integrity. If CSUB can address these issues, then we anticipate improvements in faculty morale, retention, wellbeing, and productivity.

The strengths of our methods included mixed-methods approach, combining broad faculty participation with detailed qualitative responses that provide meaningful context to the quantitative data on faculty workload and RSCA. The Task Force included members from a range of disciplines and roles, and the recommendations are grounded in faculty feedback and lived experiences. Limitations include the lack of formal pilot testing, a notable amount of missing survey data, and limited representation from some colleges and demographic groups. These limitations highlight the need for clearer instruments and more robust methods in future assessments. Looking ahead, the CSUB would benefit from continued faculty engagement through listening sessions and periodic surveys to reassess workload and RSCA support, ensuring that future policies are both inclusive and sustainable.

Recommendations

The Task Force recommends that CSUB commit to ongoing dialogue, periodic reassessments, and the implementation of evidence-based, equitable practices that foster a thriving scholarly culture for all faculty. This Task Force makes several [recommendations \(Table R1\)](#), which are expanded upon in [subsequent pages](#) and based on the overall report.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Table R1. Recommendations

Recommendations from the Scholarship and Creative Activities Task Force	Suggested Level(s) of Implementation
1 Ensure that support for RSCA is a standard agenda item, receives continuous attention, and becomes a priority for California State University, Bakersfield.	University
2 Rearrange and recalibrate teaching workloads to facilitate deep work and research, scholarship, and creative activities.	University, Unit
3 Establish a mentorship program focused on RSCA-support and development of less research-active faculty.	University, College
4 Ensure that expectations for RSCA for retention, tenure, and promotion are reasonable, manageable, and associated with release time.	University, College, Unit
5 Make the annual reporting processes meaningful and award merit pay for RSCA engagement.	University, College
6 Establish and ensure equitable and accountable service distributions.	University, College, Unit
7 Establish flexible criteria for tenure and promotion that value both traditional outputs and broader impact measures; there is no “one-size fits all” approach.	Unit
8 Align workload, compensation, and RSCA expectations with faculty realities.	University
9 Establish RSCA dashboards to track RSCA outputs, reassigned time use, and funding distributions (with both internal and external supports) across units.	University, College
10 Develop department-level RSCA profiles and impact portfolios.	Unit
11 Celebrate diverse forms of RSCA and amplify campus culture and achievement.	University, College

Note: RSCA – Research, scholarship, and creative activities

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations

1. Ensure that support for RSCA is a standard agenda item, receives continuous attention, and becomes a priority for California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB).

- 1.1. It is clear that the issues surrounding research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA) are complex, persistent, and constantly evolving in the landscape of higher education and CSUB. Although this Task Force was assigned duties for one year, the Task Force recommends that this issue receives continuous attention from the Academic Senate, the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs (GRaSP).
- 1.2. We recommend that the Academic Senate initially establishes an ongoing Task Force, with overlapping terms, to address this issue. The Academic Senate may consider including Faculty for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (FAC-4-RSCA) as an eventual Standing Committee with an elected membership.
 - 1.2.1. This Task Force (or FAC-4-RSCA, if appropriate), in collaboration with the Faculty Affairs Committee and other appropriate Standing Committees, should be charged with ensuring recommendations are effectively implemented and providing regular updates to the Academic Senate and the Faculty.
 - 1.2.2. This issue is too important to be tabled, and regular progress updates are necessary. The Academic Senate, in collaboration with the Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, should issue a yearly report on efforts to improve the issues and recommendations noted in this report.
- 1.3. We recommend that this Executive Summary and Recommendations and report be shared with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the AVP for Grants, Research, and Sponsored Programs.
 - 1.3.1. The report has internal data and is not meant to contribute to generalizable knowledge; it should not be shared externally. This is intended for evaluation and program improvement and is not expected to be shared with an audience outside of CSUB.
- 1.4. We recommend that the Executive Summary and Recommendations be shared with the General Faculty.
- 1.5. Similar efforts (e.g., faculty surveys, listening sessions, town halls focused on RSCA) should be ongoing. We recommend that a survey on workload, teaching, service, supports, and their interactions with RSCA be completed at least once every ten years to ensure current data that are relevant to the changing landscape of higher education and CSUB.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2. Rearrange and recalibrate teaching workloads to facilitate deep work and research, scholarship, and creative activities.

2.1. We recommend departments and academic affairs leadership adopt flexible, budget-neutral strategies to rearrange teaching workloads in ways that prioritize and protect time for RSCA. Strategies may include:

2.1.1. Strategic Scheduling: Allow faculty to work with Department Chairs to schedule classes and meetings in ways that protect uninterrupted time (e.g., reserving Fridays for RSCA work with no teaching or standing meetings).

2.1.2. Asymmetrical Semester Loads: Permit faculty, with department approval and faculty agreement, to teach a heavier load in one semester (e.g., 18 WTUs in Fall, with 15 WTUs for direct instructional activity and 3 WTUs for indirect instructional activity) and a lighter load in another (e.g., 12 WTUs in Spring, with 9 WTUs for direct instructional activity and 3 WTUs for indirect instructional activity) to create focused RSCA time.

2.1.3. Prioritize course scheduling for RSCA-active faculty: In consultation with the faculty and pedagogical best practices, provide more predictable, consolidated, or asynchronous teaching schedules to create blocks of uninterrupted time for research.

2.2. Faculty-Driven Flexibility: Ensure these options are implemented collaboratively and voluntarily, recognizing the diverse needs across disciplines and career stages.

3. Establish a mentorship program focused on RSCA-support and development of less research-active faculty.

3.1. Create a formal mentorship program to make RSCA expectations feel more manageable, especially for early-career faculty and faculty who intend to become more RSCA-active. Appropriate mentorship may also help address some of the problematic gaps identified in this report (e.g., URM-faculty perceiving the requirements for RSCA to be more unmanageable compared to non-URM faculty) by offering additional, and perhaps essential support.

3.1.1. Pairing and Selection: Appoint experienced, highly research-active faculty as mentors, recommended by Deans, and pair them with early-career or less research-active faculty. Mentors should receive reassigned time (e.g., 3 WTUs) to support meaningful engagement and successful outcomes.

3.1.2. Structure and Expectations: Mentors and mentees should meet regularly to discuss goal setting, time management, collaboration within and between units, funding strategies, publishing, and balancing RSCA with teaching and service. Mentorship should offer both practical advice and emotional support.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.1.3. Voluntary Participation and Evaluation: Participation should be voluntary, with pairings based on alignment in research interests and goals. The program should include an annual feedback process to assess impact and guide future improvements.

4. Ensure that expectations for RSCA for retention, tenure, and promotion are reasonable, manageable, and associated with release time.

- 4.1. Retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) criteria consistently emphasize the importance of RSCA. While new tenure-track faculty receive reassigned time to support early-career development, long-term scholarly productivity also requires ongoing time, space, and institutional support. Without these supports, RSCA expectations can become unmanageable.

- 4.1.1. Continue offering reassigned time to tenure-track Assistant Professors (or equivalent) to establish a foundation for RSCA success. Ensure that departments provide clear guidance on expected RSCA outputs in relation to reassigned time.

- 4.1.2. Recognize that RSCA expectations do not (and should not) end at tenure. Associate Professors should also have access to reassigned time for scholarly work, particularly in preparation for promotion to Professor. Offer mid-career faculty the option to pursue RSCA-enhancement release time as an alternative or supplement to sabbatical leave. Reserve some internal funding for the purposes of enhancing RSCA for mid-career faculty as a first priority, but make this internal funding available to others if it is not used by mid-career faculty.

- 4.1.3. Allocate a number of WTUs per college annually that departments can award competitively to support active scholars outside of sabbaticals or new-faculty release.

- 4.1.4. Allow faculty to apply for multiyear RSCA workload plans (e.g., averaging 3 WTUs/year over 3 years), supporting sustained scholarly efforts with flexibility across semesters.

5. Make the annual reporting processes meaningful and award merit pay for RSCA engagement.

- 5.1. Faculty invest significant time documenting RSCA contributions in annual reports. We often list publications, presentations, student collaborations, and grant activity. However, these reports rarely translate into tangible recognition or support. When reporting processes lack clear outcomes, they become performative and demotivating. To promote a culture of meaningful scholarship and creative activity, RSCA activity should be recognized through merit-based incentives that validate faculty efforts and encourage continued engagement.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1.1. Ensure that RSCA-related achievements reported annually are reviewed systematically and considered for merit-pay increases, one-time stipends, and professional development awards.
- 5.1.2. Use annual report data to allocate increased travel funding, research mini-grants, and reassigned time to high-performing RSCA faculty.
- 5.1.3. Communicate how annual report data are used in decision-making and ensure faculty receive feedback or acknowledgment tied to their reported RSCA efforts.
- 5.1.4. Recognize and reward faculty who involve students in research and creative projects, especially in ways that lead to conference presentations, co-authored publications, or graduate school placements.

6. Establish and ensure equitable and accountable service distributions.

- 6.1. We recommend that departments and administrators develop mechanisms to ensure equitable distribution, celebration, and transparency related to service activities among tenured and tenure-track faculty. While faculty are allotted 3 WTUs for indirect instructional activities (e.g., advising, service), not all contributions are equal in scope or impact. For example, one faculty member may engage solely in student advising, while another advises students, serves on professional committees, conducts peer and grant reviews, and holds elected roles such as Academic Senator. In such cases, administrators and departments should:
 - 6.1.1. Establish intentional systems for evaluating the time allotted to service activities.
 - 6.1.2. Recognize and reward high levels of service through formal mechanisms (e.g., merit-based reassigned time, stipends, and favorable evaluation).
 - 6.1.3. Ensure accountability by assigning appropriate service responsibilities to under-engaged faculty during reviews or workload planning. If faculty have 3 WTUs for indirect instructional activities, then they should be held accountable for those activities by Deans.
 - 6.1.4. Avoid overburdening the most active faculty and faculty who might be engaged with less visible activities, including women and URM faculty who are disproportionately called on for service (e.g., “cultural taxation”).
- 6.2. Equity in service should be approached with care: it must not discourage meaningful engagement, but it should foster shared responsibility and transparency across the faculty.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7. Establish flexible criteria for tenure and promotion that value both traditional outputs and broader impact measures; there is no “one-size fits all” approach.

- 7.1. We recommend that unit- and university-level criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion include both quantitative and qualitative impact measures for demonstrating scholarly achievement. Faculty should be able to meet expectations by:
 - 7.1.1. Quantitative Threshold: e.g., a pre-determined number of peer-reviewed publications and professional conference presentations over six years, or
 - 7.1.2. Qualitative Impact: e.g., one highly impactful work (such as a monograph, major creative work, or community-engaged research project), supported by evidence such as external reviews, citation metrics, policy influence, or student mentorship.
- 7.2. This dual-pathway model recognizes that meaningful RSCA takes many forms and allows faculty to pursue excellence in ways that align with their discipline, methodology, and professional identity. For example, a faculty member might publish a single book cited in national scholarship and used in graduate curricula or lead a community-based research project resulting in one publication and demonstrable societal impact.
- 7.3. Clear expectations and flexible evaluation criteria will promote equity across departments and disciplines while upholding rigorous standards for scholarly contributions. This is meant to allow faculty to achieve a minimum standard for assurance of achieving criteria for acceptable RSCA (for tenure and/or promotion), while also allowing flexibility for faculty to achieve tenure and/or promotion based on a smaller number of more impactful works.
- 7.4. Current University policy indicates that “Unit RTP criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five (5) years” (Section 305.4.2.4 of the University Handbook). We recommend that this policy is followed and that the Deans, in collaboration with the Office of the Provost, ensure that this policy is followed.
- 7.5. Departments and units without clear post-tenure review criteria should establish clear post-tenure review criteria to ensure continued growth, professional development, and continuous contributions and engagement with the University.

8. Align workload, compensation, and RSCA expectations with faculty realities.

- 8.1. We recommend that CSUB engage in a university-wide effort to realign faculty workload expectations, compensation, and support structures with the actual demands of academic labor. The data reveal that faculty are deeply committed to their roles as educators, scholars, and campus citizens but they are often stretched beyond reasonable limits.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.2. To strengthen faculty well-being, productivity, and retention, and to reinforce the university's scholarly mission, administrators and faculty leadership should:

8.2.1. Regularly assess workload realities (teaching, service, and RSCA) through surveys and listening sessions.

8.2.2. Implement systemic workload planning that reflects the diversity of faculty roles, disciplines, and labor demands.

8.2.3. Invest in infrastructure and culture that fosters deep work, collaboration, and scholarly engagement across all ranks and appointment types.

9. Establish RSCA dashboards to track RSCA outputs, reassigned time use, and funding distributions (with both internal and external supports) across units.

9.1. To promote transparency, accountability, and data-informed decision-making, the university should develop RSCA dashboards that track research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA) outputs, reassigned time utilization, and internal and external funding distributions across departments and colleges.

9.2. These dashboards would serve as important tools for faculty, department chairs, deans, and campus leadership to better understand patterns of scholarly engagement and support allocation. This information should be used to recognize and reward highly RSCA-active faculty, and support faculty who wish to become more engaged with RSCA.

9.3. Specifically, the dashboards should include metrics such as the number of publications, presentations, performances, exhibitions, or equivalent scholarly outputs per unit; the amount and source of reassigned time granted for RSCA activities; and internal and external funding awarded to support faculty research and creative endeavors. Where appropriate, data should be disaggregated by college and department, while recognizing and accounting for disciplinary differences in publication norms, creative output timelines, and funding opportunities.

9.4. By making these data visible and accessible, the university can foster a culture of transparency and continuous improvement, allowing units to celebrate successes, identify gaps in support, and advocate for necessary resources. Importantly, the dashboards should be used as a tool for self-assessment and equity, rather than as punitive or overly simplistic comparisons across disciplines.

9.5. Care must be taken to contextualize RSCA metrics within the realities of different academic fields and to ensure that the dashboards inform constructive, rather than competitive, dialogue about faculty workload and scholarly productivity.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

10. Develop department-level RSCA profiles and impact portfolios.

- 10.1. Each department should create RSCA profiles to highlight faculty achievements in research, scholarship, and creative activities. These profiles should recognize highly research-active faculty and provide opportunities for appropriate reward and professional recognition.
- 10.2. RSCA profiles should include faculty research interests, areas of expertise, recent outputs (such as publications, grants, performances, exhibitions), and ongoing or emerging projects.
- 10.3. Departments should also maintain impact portfolios that document broader scholarly contributions, such as student mentorship, community-engaged scholarship, leadership roles in professional organizations, and creative achievements. The primary purpose of these profiles and portfolios is to celebrate faculty accomplishments, facilitate collaboration across disciplines, and inform strategic planning, not to foster comparison or competition among departments.
- 10.4. Profiles and portfolios should be updated regularly to reflect current activities and should be easily accessible to faculty, administrators, and potential collaborators. These tools should be used to support and advocate for faculty success and resource needs, ensuring that a wide range of scholarly excellence is acknowledged and valued.

11. Celebrate diverse forms of RSCA and amplify campus culture and achievement.

- 11.1. Led by the Provost and Deans, the University and each college should actively celebrate a wide range of research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA) contributions. Faculty engagement in RSCA should be meaningfully recognized through both symbolic and tangible rewards.
- 11.2. Recognition efforts should highlight not only traditional scholarly outputs (such as publications and grants) but also creative achievements, community-engaged scholarship, interdisciplinary collaborations, and student mentorship.
- 11.3. Celebrations could include campus-wide events, faculty-led seminars and symposia, recognition ceremonies, showcases of faculty work, and public communications that amplify the impact of RSCA efforts at CSUB.
- 11.4. Tangible rewards for faculty with high RSCA achievement should be explored, such as providing additional reassigned time, merit pay, travel support, or internal funding opportunities.
- 11.5. Colleges and departments should collaborate with the Academic Senate and University leadership to ensure that RSCA accomplishments are consistently valued, visible, and integrated into the broader campus culture.