



Academic Senate Meeting – Spring 2026

Thursday, April 16, 2026

Agenda

10:00 AM – 11:30 AM

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

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

Senate Members: Chair M. Danforth, Vice-Chair D. Solano, CSU Senator C. Lam (excused), CSU Senator N. Michieka, AH Senator T. Tsantsoulas, AH Senator M. Naser, BPA Senator D. Wu, BPA Senator S. Sarma (excused; alt. M. Choi), NSME Senator L. Kirstein, NSME Senator A. Stokes, SSE Senator Z. Zenko, SSE Senator S. Roberts (alt. for Spring 2026 K. Henderson), AV Senator K. Holloway (excused; alt. A. Ried), At-Large Senator H. He (excused; alt. D. Wilson), 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 E. Reed – ASI Executive Vice-President, VP AA & Provost D. Thien, Senator J. Dong – Dean Representative, and Senate Analyst K. Van Grinsven.

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Tejon Tribal Land Acknowledgement
 - b. [Robert's Rules of Order](#)
 - c. [Interruption Statement](#)

- II. Approval of Minutes
 - a. March 26, 2026 (handout)

- III. Announcements and Information
 - a. President's Report – V. Harper (deferred)
 - b. Elections and Appointments – D. Solano (handout)
 - c. Upcoming Events:
 - i. April 23 – Emeriti Ceremony
 1. 3 pm; Dezember Reading Room, WSL
 - ii. April 24 – Town Hall: Instructional Budget Model
 1. 9-10:30 am; HUM 1109 and virtual.
 2. [Zoom Link for Instructional Budget Model Town Hall](#)

- IV. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:05 AM**)

- V. Reports
 - a. ASI Report – Senator Reed
 - b. Provost’s Report – D. Thien **(Time Certain: 10:15 AM)** (handout)
 - c. ASCSU Report – Senators Lam and Michieka (deferred)
 - d. Staff Report – Senator Gonzalez
 - e. Committee Reports:
 - i. Executive Committee – Vice-Chair Solano (handout)
 - ii. Standing Committees:
 - 1. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) – Senator Tsantsoulas (handout)
 - 2. Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS) – Senator Kirstein (handout)
 - 3. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) – Senator Grombly (handout)
 - 4. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – Senator Zenko (handout)
 - a. Memorandum: Recommendation on Transition from Box to Interfolio for RTP and Periodic Evaluation Processes (handout)
 - f. CFA Report – T. Salisbury, CFA Bakersfield

- VI. Resolutions **(Time Certain: 10:25 AM)**
 - a. Consent Agenda:
 - i. RES 252646 – Research Misconduct Policy – EC (handout)
 - b. Old Business:
 - i. RES 252632-REVISED – Required Unit RTP Criteria Elements and Guidance on Unit RTP Criteria Revision – Handbook Changes – FAC (handout)
 - ii. RES 252645 – Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty – Handbook Change – FAC (handout)
 - iii. RES 252627 – Policy on Use of Informational Banner Space in Canvas – AS&SS (handout)
 - iv. RES 252628 – Inventory of Automated Decision-Making Software for the Classroom – AS&SS (HOLD)
 - v. RES 252622 – Academic Advising Structure Is an Academic Endeavor – AAC, AS&SS (TABLED)
 - c. New Business:
 - i. RES 252644 – Guidance on WPAF Contents and Timelines for Review – Handbook Change- FAC (handout)
 - ii. RES 252647 – Acting Appointments – Handbook Change – FAC (handout)
 - iii. RES 252648 – Teaching Modality – Handbook Changes – AAC, FAC (handout)
 - iv. RES 252624 – Expressions of the Senate- Bylaws Changes – EC (handout)
 - v. RES 252629 – Academic, Curricular, and Student Support Software Governance – AS&SS (handout)
 - vi. RES 252641 – Readmission Requirements Following Academic Disqualification - AAC, AS&SS (handout)

- vii. RES 252638 – New Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering – AAC, BPC (handout)
- viii. RES 252639 – Program Name Change from a Bachelor of Arts in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to a Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) – AAC, BPC (handout)
- ix. RES 252640 – Department Name Change from Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS) to Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) – AAC, BPC (handout)
- x. RES 252643 – Policies & Procedures for Establishing New Schools – EC (handout)

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

VIII. Adjournment

DRAFT



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD

Academic Senate: Elections & Appointments

April 16, 2026

1

Important Information & Reminders

- ❖ View the [Senate Website](#) for up-to-date information
- ❖ Let the [Senate Office](#) know if there are:
 - Vacancies that need to be filled
 - Errors with committee rosters
- ❖ If you do not receive emails regarding calls:
 - College Calls → Contact your College Election Chair & Admin Support
 - University-wide Calls → Contact the Senate Office (academicsenateoffice@csub.edu)



2

Results of College Elected Positions (1 of 3)

Artificial Intelligence Committee (AIC)

- BPA: *Zhenning Xu – Management & Marketing*
- SSE: *Allison Evans – Psychology*

College Election Committees

- A&H: *Joel Haney – Music & Theatre*
- BPA: *Richard Gearhart – Economics*
- BPA: *Jinping Sun – Public Policy & Administration*
- NSME: *Danielle Solano – Chemistry & Biochemistry*
- SSE: *Dirk Horn – Political Science*
- SSE: *Anthony Flores – Criminal Justice*

Accessible Technology Initiative Instructional Materials Subcommittee (ATI-IM)

- Library: *Rebecca Penrose*

Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR)

- A&H: *Nate Olson – Philosophy & Religious Studies*
- SSE: *Zachary Zenko – Kinesiology*

Distributed Learning Committee (DLC)

- A&H: *David Melendez – Music & Theatre*
- BPA: *Dan Zhou – Accounting & Finance*
- NSME: *Danielle Solano – Chemistry & Biochemistry*
- SSE: *Allison Evans – Psychology*



3

California State University, Bakersfield

3

Results of College Elected Positions (2 of 3)

Faculty Honors & Awards Committee (FHAC)

- NSME (Reverted to At-Large): *Aaron Hegde – Economics*
- NSME Alternate: *Kanwalinderjit Kaur – CEE/CS*
- SSE: *Elaine Correa – HD-CAFS*
- SSE Alternate (Reverted to At-Large): *Gloria Dikeogu – Library*

Faculty Teaching & Learning Center Advisory Board (FTLC)

- A&H: *Joseph Florez – Philosophy & Religious Studies*
- BPA: *Kim Mishkind – Management & Marketing*
- NSME: *Bilin Zeng – Mathematics*

General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo)

- A&H: *Fran Fairbairn – Philosophy & Religious Studies*
- BPA (Reverted to At-Large): *Kirstin Lattimore – Library*
- NSME: *Anjana Yatawara – Mathematics*
- NSME: *Alberto Cruz – CEE/CS*
- SSE: *Nora Cisneros – Ethnic Studies*

Information Technology Committee (ITC)

- BPA: *Rich Ryan – Economics*
- SSE (Reverted to At-Large): *Annie Boehning – Nursing*



4

California State University, Bakersfield

4

Results of College Elected Positions (3 of 3)

Research Council of the University (RCU)

- *A&H: Joseph Florez – Philosophy & Religious Studies*
- *BPA: Election In Progress Sunjin Pak – Management & Marketing*
- *Library: Kristi Chavez*

University Program Review Committee (UPRC)

- *BPA: Mansik Hur – Management & Marketing*

University Review Committee (URC)

- *BPA: Mahdy Elhusseiny – Accounting & Finance*
- *SSE: Anne Duran – Psychology*



Status of At-Large Positions

Accessible Technology Initiative Instructional Materials Subcommittee (ATI-IM)

*Department Chair or College Curriculum
Committee Chair*

- *Reverted to At-Large Appointment*

Faculty Honors & Awards Committee (FHAC)

At-Large Alternate

- *Kyung Jung Han – Communications*

Foundation Board

- *Allison Evans – Psychology*

Student-Centered Enterprises, Inc. (SEI) Board

- *Kristen Gallant – Library*

University Council

- *Maryann Parada – Modern Languages & Literature*
- *Craig Harnetiaux – Kinesiology*

University Program Review Committee (UPRC)

- *Ji Li – Finance/Accounting*

University Review Committee (URC)

- *Charles Lam – Mathematics*



Special Election

Search & Screening Committee – Director of Athletics

President Harper has requested faculty representation on the search committee for the Director of Athletics to serve for the duration of the search.

- One (1) Full-time Coach
 - **Elected: Luke Smith - Head Coach, Wrestling**
- One (1) Full-time Faculty Member At-Large
 - **Elected: Craig Harnetiaux – Kinesiology**



7

California State University, Bakersfield

7

Spring 2026 Call Cycle

1. Senate Chair – **Complete**
2. Senate Vice Chair – **Complete**
3. ASCSU Senator – **Complete**
4. Senators for Colleges – **Complete**
5. Senators At-Large – **Complete**
6. College Elected Positions on Committees – **Complete**
7. At-Large Elected Positions on Committees – **Complete**
8. Standing Committees – **Call to go out next week**
9. College appointed positions on committees – *In Progress*
10. At-Large and unfilled college appointed positions (*including unfilled college positions and elected positions with no nominations after second calls*)



8

California State University, Bakersfield

8

2025-26 College Election Committees

Arts and Humanities

- **Joel Haney (Chair)**
- Lena Taub
- Sean Wempe
- *Admin Support: Adrianna Hook*

Business and Public Administration

- **Richard Gearhart (Chair)**
- Mansik Hur
- Jinping Sun
- Dan Zhou
- *Admin Support: Maria Diaz*

Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering

- **Prosper Torsu (Chair)**
- Alberto Cruz
- Bilin Zeng
- *Admin Support: Maria Chavez*

Social Science and Education

- **Dirk Horn (Chair)**
- Yeunjoo Lee
- Dahna Stowe
- *Admin Support: Vanessa Mayorga*



9

California State University, Bakersfield

9

2026-27 College Election Committees

Arts and Humanities

- Joel Haney
- Lena Taub
- Sean Wempe
- *Admin Support: Adrianna Hook*

Business and Public Administration

- Richard Gearhart
- Mansik Hur
- Jinping Sun
- Dan Zhou
- *Admin Support: Maria Diaz*

Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering

- Prosper Torsu
- Danielle Solano
- Bilin Zeng
- *Admin Support: Maria Chavez*

Social Science and Education

- Dirk Horn
- Yeunjoo Lee
- Anthony Flores
- *Admin Support: Vanessa Mayorga*



10

California State University, Bakersfield

10



MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 16, 2026

TO: Dr. Melissa Danforth, Chair
Academic Senate

FROM: Deborah Thien, Ph.D.
Provost

SUBJECT: Provost's Report – April 16, 2026

Provost's Report – April 16, 2026

Provost Thien intends to discuss the following with the Academic Senate on Thursday, April 16, 2026.

- Memos (time blocks, Interfolio)
- Schedule Building (ASI Survey, town hall)
- Searches (faculty, dean, AVP)

c: Katherine Van Grinsven

Vice-Chair Report to the Academic Senate

Senate Executive Committee (EC) Meeting – April 7, 2026

In addition to routine business, including approval of the agenda, EC discussed the following items:

- **RES 252632 - Required Unit RTP Criteria Elements and Guidance on Unit RTP Criteria Revision – Handbook Changes:** Intent to Seek Review was filed by FAC after passage so the wording could be clarified to match the original intent, specifically that all faculty would receive seven years under their unit RTP criteria.
- **Elections and Appointments:** Vice Chair Solano gave a brief update on elections; calls for appointed positions and standing committee chairs will be issued soon.
- **Research Misconduct Policy:** AVP for GRaSP Dr. Sumaya provided tracked changes reflecting federally mandated updates to the research misconduct policy. As these are federally mandated changes, EC decided to put this on the consent agenda for the next Senate meeting.
- **New Program Proposal - Master of Science in Applied Analytics:** EC received a late program proposal for an Extended Education M.S. in Applied Analytics and discussed whether there was time to review it this year. AAC may be able to begin discussion, but BPC does not have sufficient time to complete review this spring. Chair Danforth further indicated that the referral would not be ready for this week's standing committee meetings. Given the timeline and committee workload, it is unlikely to move through Senate this year; any initial discussion this spring would mainly serve to leave notes for next year's committees.
- **Faculty Legislative Liaison:** The statewide chairs mailing list had a recent thread about faculty legislative liaisons in response to an ASCSU resolution encouraging campuses to create such positions. The Handbook has one line mentioning the Public Affairs Committee of the Senate, which has long been dormant. EC discussed whether to create a faculty legislative liaison or small committee to monitor state, federal, and local policy developments, coordinate with statewide bodies, and improve campus communication on issues affecting shared governance, academic freedom, accessibility, and budget matters. It was suggested that members would function primarily as information gatherers and communicators, rather than as a traditional standing committee that meets regularly. Members expressed concern about creating a new committee, especially since it seems like faculty are burned out. Senator Lam suggested a representative structure tied to standing committees, while others raised the possibility of appointed members or a small three-person group. Members also expressed concern about the lack of faculty representation in campus advocacy. After extensive discussion, EC decided to develop the idea further over the summer and revisit a possible liaison or small committee structure in the fall, rather than trying to implement it this spring.
- **State Legislation:** EC discussed several state bills and Chair Danforth noted that members should review updated bill language before the next meeting.
 - AB-2693 California State University: Doctoral Programs would expand the CSU's authority to offer doctoral programs. San Diego State University supports the bill, but

the ASCSU does not. The bill was viewed as concerning because it aligns with broader efforts to revisit the state's higher education master plan. EC noted (based on prior discussions) that this bill could have broader implications, including possible expansion of community college baccalaureate offerings.

- AB-2606 Oil and Gas would create a state-supported research and demonstration program centered at CSUB using existing oil and gas infrastructure, including abandoned wells, for research and education, and was viewed as potentially beneficial to CSUB's energy research role.
- AB-1852 Kern Medical Education Authority would establish the Kern Medical Education Authority, enabling it to operate a medical education program (including granting MD degrees upon accreditation). The general view was that it did not require Senate action at this time.
- AB-2301 Community colleges: Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program would create a pilot program allowing up to 10 California community college districts to offer a Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN). EC previously opposed a similar bill.
- AB-2236 Postsecondary education: articulation agreements would require CCC, CSU, and UC to adopt a unified, systemwide articulation agreement based on common course numbering, replacing course-by-course articulation.
- **Proposed Title 5 Changes:** The proposed Title 5 changes would remove campus residency requirements and establish three new 90-unit bachelor's degree pathways within the CSU. The proposal would limit degree structures to GE, major, and electives, effectively disallowing additional campus-specific requirements. Members expressed concern that students would not be adequately prepared under a 90-unit degree structure. EC agreed to prepare a memo to the Board of Trustees, with Senator Grombly volunteering to start a draft.
- **Chair/Director of the Year:** EC agreed to refer the idea of a Chair/Director of the Year recognition process to FAC, with the understanding that it may not reach full Senate this year but could be developed further for next year.
- **Summer Handbook Project:** EC discussed the proposal for summer handbook update work and Chair Danforth will forward the proposal to the Provost for review.
- **RES 252624 – Senate Bylaws Revisions- Sections III and V. Expressions of the Senate:** EC approved the current draft to move forward for first reading at Senate.

Vice-Chair Report to the Academic Senate

Senate Executive Committee (EC) Meeting – April 14, 2026

In addition to routine business, including approval of the agenda, approval of the minutes, subcommittee reports, and setting the agenda for Thursday's Senate meeting, EC discussed the following items:

- **New Program Proposal - Master of Science in Applied Analytics:** Chair Danforth communicated with A. Hegde regarding the program proposal for the Extended Education

M.S. in Applied Analytics. He understands that the program cannot be approved by the Senate until fall, but is hoping that the subcommittees (AAC and BPC) can review it to provide feedback so he can address any issues this summer. The proposal is supported by a PACE Accelerator Grant, which provides funding for proposal development (e.g., market research), but does not require the program to be approved this spring.

- **First Year Seminar (FYS):** As part of the AAC report, EC discussed ongoing concerns regarding FYS. Key issues include the lack of a clearly defined purpose (e.g., student belonging vs. academic skills development), inconsistent implementation across campus, and the absence of centralized oversight. Historically, a more structured and coordinated model existed but dissolved during the transition to semesters. AAC is currently compiling prior reports and survey data to identify common themes; however, no resolution is expected this semester.
- **Post Enrollment Requirement Checking (PERC):** As part of the AS&SS report, EC discussed concerns about the timing of PERC. SASEM currently prefers to delay running PERC until all grades are submitted due to issues with late grade entry. However, there was strong sentiment from EC members that institutional processes should proceed on schedule, and that delays caused by late grades should be addressed at the department level rather than holding up PERC. This issue is particularly critical for departments that rely on prerequisite enforcement for accreditation.
- **Time Blocks:** As part of the BPC report, EC discussed ongoing issues with time block compliance. Approximately 25% of course sections are currently non-compliant with established time blocks, due either to structural limitations or departments scheduling outside the approved patterns. BPC intends to recommend a task force to address these issues, including policy clarification and enforcement. This task force will likely require appointments beginning in the fall.
- **Interfolio:** The Provost intends to move forward with Interfolio for managing RTP/Periodic Evaluation processes, based on a recommendation from FAC. Discussion focused on process concerns, particularly whether a memo (rather than a formal resolution) provides sufficient shared governance input. Implementation is expected on a longer timeline (likely 2027–28), with potential opportunities for early adopters once Interfolio is in place.
- **CFA Email Regarding Potential Layoffs:** A CFA email reported potential layoffs affecting several departments (including Sociology, Accounting/Finance, Economics, and Anthropology). Administration clarified that these notices are precautionary and tied to uncertainties in course scheduling, and that some situations may resolve as schedules are finalized. The Economics department chair raised concerns about possible miscommunication or disinformation, as he had no knowledge of potential layoffs in the department.
- **Access to Senate Archive Material:** AVP Boschini requested access to historical Senate resolutions. The current archive (maintained in Box) is not well-organized and includes multiple draft versions. EC discussed providing read-only access as an interim solution, while pursuing a more formal and accessible archive system (potentially in coordination with ITS or the library).

Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) Report to the Academic Senate

Thursday, April 16, 2026

The Academic Affairs Committee met on March 19th, chaired by Dr. Alice Hays. We received no feedback from Senate on RES 252635 – New Sociology Minor in Migration, Population and Globalization and so put it forward for second reading without changes. There was robust feedback on RES 252636 – New Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science, particularly regarding the cognate curriculum in Chemistry and Biology. The committee agreed with Senator Dong’s reminder that these curricular issues were raised and resolved in the NSME curriculum committee. AAC had no further concerns about the proposal and decided to put the resolution forward for second reading without changes. Regarding the first reading of RES 252637 – Academic Standing Policy Update: Summer Disqualification Removal, AAC agreed with Senator Dugan’s suggestion to update some language. Dr. Hays consulted with BPC and AS&SS, as appropriate, on the outcome of these discussions. AAC also prepared two resolutions affirming the name changes proposed by HD-CAFS to both their department and program (REF #38, REF #40). They were sent to Senate for first reading. Moving on to new business, AAC discussed RES 252642: Post-Enrollment Requirement Checking (PERC) Timing Alignment for Prerequisite Verification and Enrollment Stability. We reviewed a draft resolution provided by AS&SS and were not in agreement with the suggested timelines. AAC’s major concern was with the departments and students receiving the PERC report with adequate time for advising prior to the start of the next semester. We suggested edits to the timeline and sent it back to AS&SS for review.

On April 9th, AAC met and was chaired by Dr. Tiffany Tsantsoulas. With BPC’s permission, the committee made small stylistic edits to RES 252639 and RES 252640 before sending them back to Senate for first reading. We also revisited RES 252642 and reviewed a second round of edits from AS&SS. The committee was still unable to approve the draft resolution without more information from Academic Programs and SASEM regarding the feasibility of providing departments and programs with the PERC reports earlier. Chair Tsantsoulas has requested input from Dean Adams, Tommy Holiwell, and Chair Kirstein via email. AAC also reopened discussion of REF 2025-2026 #19: Teaching Modality Handbook Changes following input from the Distributed Learning Committee and FAC. Committee members were in agreement that teaching modality decisions are primarily the responsibility of the department or program, but consultation with the College Dean ought to occur where needed. Members were concerned that the proposed new policy removes all requirements for CSUB faculty to be certified or trained to teach online, while acknowledging that this has not been the practice for some time. We concluded that departments and programs should be responsible for deciding the qualifications of online instructors and should bear in mind accreditation and other program requirements. Following the meeting, Chair Tsantsoulas and Chair Zenko worked with their respective committees over email to approve a resolution regarding these handbook changes. It has been sent to Senate for first reading.

Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS)
Report to the Academic Senate
Thursday, April 9, 2026

AS&SS Committee members continued work on:

Resolution 252628: Inventory of Automated Decision-Making Software for the Classroom

Following first reading, the committee refined wording to improve clarity, alignment with state definitions, and responsiveness to Senate feedback. Revisions included strengthening the definition of high-risk automated decision systems using language consistent with the California Department of Technology. The committee also simplified and clarified the list of examples to better distinguish high-risk systems, such as automated grading, proctoring, predictive analytics, and algorithmic decision-making tools, while reaffirming exclusions for low-risk technologies and faculty-selected instructional tools.

Additional revisions incorporated a new RESOLVED clause aligning the use of these systems with CSUB data classification standards, recognizing that such technologies may process Level I (confidential) or Level II (internal use) data, including student records and personally identifiable information. The rationale was also strengthened to emphasize institutional risk, including compliance, legal, and reputational concerns, particularly when AI-enabled tools are self-procured or embedded in platforms without formal reporting. The resolution continues to focus on transparency and compliance through a faculty disclosure process and ITS coordination, while explicitly preserving academic freedom and faculty authority over instructional design.

Resolution 252627: Policy on Use of Informational Banner Space in Canvas

Following first reading, the committee clarified wording to more clearly define the Canvas banner as instructional space under faculty academic autonomy and to limit its use to content that directly supports teaching, learning, and student academic success. The revised language explicitly restricts the use of banner space for institution-wide announcements, surveys, and general campus messaging unrelated to course content, in order to reduce message fatigue and maintain the integrity of instructional communication.

Revisions also established a clearer process for required institutional notices, specifying that such communications must be coordinated through the Office of Academic Programs using a vetted approval process with advance faculty notification and consistent messaging, while allowing exceptions for emergency notifications. The resolution emphasizes maintaining a balance between institutional compliance requirements and preserving the instructional purpose of Canvas course spaces.

Resolution 252642: Post-Enrollment Requirement Checking (PERC) Timing Alignment

The committee engaged in an in-depth discussion of this resolution related to aligning the timing of Post-Enrollment Requirement Checking (PERC) for prerequisite verification and enrollment stability. Input was provided by Tommy Holiwell for technical and operational expertise, and the committee coordinated with Tiffany Tsantsoulas, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), who further consulted with Dr. Elizabeth Adams to ensure cross-committee alignment and consideration of academic and administrative perspectives.

Based on this discussion, the committee identified several areas requiring additional clarification, including timeline feasibility, coordination between Enrollment Management and Academic Affairs, and the operational impact on departments and advising processes. As a result, the resolution is not yet ready for second reading and will require further refinement before returning to the Senate for consideration.

Respectfully submitted,
Leslie Kirstein, Chair
Academic Support & Student Services Committee

Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate

April 9th, 2026

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) met on April 9th, 2026, and approved the minutes from March 5th and March 19th.

- In old business, the FAC advanced a revised version of RES 252632 (Required Unit RTP Criteria Elements and Guidance on Unit RTP Criteria) to third reading, with clarifications regarding the seven-year currency window, use of the Unit RTP Criteria that were approved and in effect at the time of the faculty member's most recent review, and prospective implementation beginning in AY 2026–2027.
 - This revision was completed after indicating intent to seek review. The FAC caught an issue in the previously approved version that could adversely affect faculty in some situations, due to the timing of Unit RTP Criteria revision. The new, updated version corrects these oversights.
- The Periodic Evaluation resolution (RES 252645) was moved to second reading with a minor typographical correction. There was no other feedback received from first reading.
- The WPAF Guidelines (RES 252644) remained in first reading.
- Discussion of the Teaching Modality policy highlighted the need to balance departmental authority with administrative oversight; no action was taken during the meeting pending further revisions from the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC).

- In new business, the FAC approved a memorandum supporting the transition to Interfolio for RTP and periodic evaluation processes, emphasizing improved organization, security, and the importance of training and phased implementation.
- The FAC also approved handbook revisions related to acting and interim MPP appointments for first reading. This is RES 252647.
- The First-Year Seminar item was not taken up and will not move forward this academic year.
- Following the meeting, a final revision of RES 252632 and a revised Teaching Modality resolution (as updated by AAC) were both approved via email vote.



MEMORANDUM

To: Executive Committee, Academic Senate
CC: Dr. Deborah Thien, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Deborah Boschini, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs
Academic Senate
From: Faculty Affairs Committee
Date: April 9th, 2026

Recommendation on Transition from Box to Interfolio for RTP and Periodic Evaluation Processes

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), informed by the recommendations of a prior task force that included broad faculty representation (see RES 232407, attached), writes to express its support for the transition from the current Box-based system to Interfolio for the management of periodic evaluation and retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) processes.

The Committee recognizes several anticipated strengths of adopting Interfolio. These include enhanced confidentiality and security of personnel materials, improved consistency in review workflows across colleges and units, and more structured and transparent processes for submission and evaluation of Working Personnel Action Files (WPAFs), and possibly Personnel Action Files (PAFs), which are sometimes outdated in their current paper-based form. Additionally, Interfolio's platform is designed specifically for academic personnel processes, which is expected to reduce ambiguity in file organization, improve accessibility for reviewers at all levels, and support more standardized documentation practices.

While the FAC acknowledges potential challenges associated with this transition (e.g., particularly financial costs and the time investment required for implementation and onboarding), we believe that these concerns are outweighed by the long-term benefits. Importantly, the FAC notes that existing staff effort currently dedicated to managing RTP processes within Box may be reallocated more effectively under Interfolio. This reallocation has the potential to provide more targeted support for faculty and reviewers navigating the periodic evaluation and RTP processes.

To ensure a successful transition, the FAC strongly emphasizes the need for robust and sustained institutional support. This includes the development and dissemination of clear, accessible documentation for WPAF preparation within Interfolio, as well as comprehensive training opportunities for all stakeholders. Specifically, training should be provided for faculty candidates, Unit RTP Committees, Department Chairs, College Deans, and members of the University Review Committee. Training should not

ACADEMIC SENATE

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy. • Mail Stop: BDC 20 • Bakersfield, CA 93311

be limited to initial rollout but should include ongoing support, updated guidance materials, and opportunities for feedback and continuous improvement.

Based on current understanding, implementation is not anticipated until the 2027–2028 academic year. The FAC views this timeline as appropriate and necessary to allow for thoughtful planning, system configuration, stakeholder engagement, and adequate training.

Finally, the Faculty Affairs Committee underscores the importance of shared governance throughout this transition. Continued consultation with the Academic Senate, including opportunities for feedback from faculty across all colleges, will be essential to ensuring that the system is implemented in a manner that is equitable, transparent, and effective for review of WPAFs.

Attachments:

RES 232407 - Pilot of Interfolio for Faculty Performance Review (Tabled)



Pilot of Interfolio for Faculty Performance Review

RES 232407

EC and FAC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate conduct a one-year pilot of Interfolio for faculty performance review (RTP, PTR, and PEF¹).

RESOLVED: That faculty have the option of using Box without penalty during the pilot period.

RATIONALE: The selection of an electronic repository and review system for faculty performance review is a critical issue for faculty and requires a careful and fully executed process of consultation and shared governance. Per RES 202219 (Submission of Electronic Faculty Performance Review Files), the Academic Senate established an exploratory committee to evaluate software options for a new electronic repository and review system for faculty performance review (RTP, PTR, and PEF*) files, and recommend the best available option that meets our campus requirements. After evaluating several options, the committee concluded that a pilot period of the top-rated option, Interfolio, is best to give interested faculty the opportunity to fully experience the system and provide feedback before committing to a three-year contract.

Attachments:

Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee Report
Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee Recommended Questions
Interfolio Quote
OnBase/Hyland Quote
Watermark/Faculty Success Quote

¹ RTP: Retention, Tenure and Promotion; PTR: Post-Tenure Review; PEF: Periodic Evaluation File

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
VP Student Affairs
AVP Faculty Affairs
AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
School Deans
Dean of Libraries
Dean of Antelope Valley
Dean of Extended University and Global Outreach
Department Chairs
General Faculty
AVP Information Technology Services & Chief Information Officer

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee Report

DESCRIPTION	1
MEMBERSHIP	1
CURRENT PLATFORM ISSUES	2
PLATFORM REQUIREMENTS	2
<i>Required Capabilities</i>	2
<i>Preferred Capabilities</i>	3
PLATFORM EXPLORATION	3
<i>Faculty Success (Digital Measures) by Watermark</i>	4
<i>OnBase/Hyland</i>	4
<i>Interfolio</i>	5
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	6
APPENDIX A: SURVEY OF OTHER CSUS	7
APPENDIX B: AVERAGE COMMITTEE RANKINGS	10
<i>Summary of Rankings</i>	10
<i>Required Capabilities</i>	10
<i>Preferred Capabilities</i>	11

Description

The Academic Senate convened the Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee to evaluate software options for a new electronic repository and review system for faculty performance review (RTP, PTR, and PEF¹) files, and recommend the best available option that meets our campus requirements, per RES 212219 (Submission of Electronic Performance Review Files).

Membership

Per RES 212219 (Submission of Electronic Performance Review Files), the exploratory committee is to be composed of faculty members from all schools, and with additional representation from other faculty units including the library. Faculty on this committee should represent differing ranks, and it is recommended that tenured, tenure-track, and lecturers all be represented. The AVP Faculty Affairs should be included on this committee as well as representatives of the CFA. ITS staff should be consulted as required. The following is the list of the initial committee membership:

Membership Position	Name	Rank
FT Tenured Faculty A&H	Leo Sakomoto	Associate Professor
FT Probationary Faculty A&H	Gladys Gillam	Lecturer
FT Tenured Faculty BPA	Chandra Commuri	Professor
FT Probationary Faculty BPA	Atieh Poushneh	Assistant Professor
FT Tenured Faculty NSME	Danielle Solano	Professor
FT Probationary Faculty NSME	Jonathan Troup	Assistant Professor
FT Tenured Faculty SSE	Gitika Commuri	Associate Professor

¹ RTP: Retention, Tenure and Promotion; PTR: Post-Tenure Review; PEF: Periodic Evaluation File

FT Probationary Faculty SSE	Tzu-Fen Chang	Assistant Professor
FT Librarian	Andrea Anderson	Associate Librarian
CFA Representative	Zachary Zenko	Assistant Professor
AVP of Faculty Affairs	Deborah Boschini	Administrator

The first meeting was convened by the AVP of Faculty Affairs, Dr. Deborah Boschini. During the first meeting, Dr. Danielle Solano was elected chair of the committee. After discussions at the initial meetings, the committee decided it needed feedback from the URC, ITS, and FTLC. The following members were added to the committee:

Membership Position	Name
University Review Committee (URC)	Emerson Case
Information Technology Services (ITS)	Jaimi Paschal
Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC)	Alex Slabey

The committee also consulted other ITS staff during the process including Brian Chen and Jason Ferguson. Additionally, Andrea Anderson left CSUB at the end of spring 2023 and was replaced by Chris Livingston in fall 2023.

Current Platform Issues

Per RES 212219 and committee discussions, the following issues of concern were identified:

1. The quick change to Box from physical files during pandemic-related shifts to virtual campus activities was not a careful and fully executed process.
2. A survey conducted in Spring 2021 by the Faculty Affairs Committee and additional consultation revealed potential concerns about the accessibility, security, ease of use, tracking of access and records, and the ownership of files within Box.
3. Some faculty are exceeding the physical “3-inch” requirement and including an extensive number of files in Box.
4. PAFs will eventually be digitized and thus a platform compatible with electronic PAFs would be ideal.
5. Committee members who had experience submitting RTP files in Box found the process to very time consuming and had issues organizing files in Box.
6. Committee members who had experience reviewing RTP files in Box stressed that organization (i.e., finding things) was a very large issues as different departments often organize files differently; there were also concerns with the lack of completion of access sheets and log sheets.

Platform Requirements

Per RES 212219, the committee developed a list of required and preferred capabilities of the selected electronic faculty review platform.

Required Capabilities

1. Secure
2. Tracks access & file changes
3. Aids in the ease of faculty organization

4. Be easily reviewed by all levels of the review process

Preferred Capabilities

1. Compatible with PAF
2. Limits the number of documents
3. Not clunky/ugly
4. Easy to post/upload CV
5. Easy to re-organize folders & files
6. Easy to export items (i.e., in the event we convert to a new system)
7. Workflow is easy to use
8. Minimal cost

Platform Exploration

The committee started by consulting other CSUs to see what platforms are utilized across the system and their experiences with those platforms (Appendix A). Committee members also consulted with their constituents to develop an initial list of software solutions for consideration. The following is a list of all platforms evaluated to some degree. In evaluating these platforms, the committee considered both the process of preparing an RTP file and the process of reviewing it. Three of these systems will be discussed in extensive detail in the following section.

Platform	Comments
Adobe Binder/Portfolio	While this platform is free with Adobe CS license, it is primarily meant for creating a personal website portfolio and there would likely be a significant learning curve to use it. After discussion, we decided not to request a demo.
Faculty Success (Digital Measures)	One of our top three choices. See detailed discussion later in this section.
OnBase/Hyland	One of our top three choices. See detailed discussion later in this section.
Interfolio	One of our top three choices. See detailed discussion later in this section.
Live Binders	This platform is used by some universities for RTP; we requested a demo, but learned this system is incompatible with SSO and it also did not seem to be able to track views; additionally, it seems more like a way to organize Box documents rather than a full RTP review. We do not recommend further consideration.
Mahara	This platform is an eportfolio design; after discussion, there was not a lot of excitement about this option, so we decided not to request a demo.
Scholarly Software	Scholarly is a higher ed startup building software for faculty affairs to compete with Interfolio and Watermark (Digital Measures). Their Tenure & Promotion module does not appear to be available yet.

Faculty Success (Digital Measures) by Watermark

A summary of committee evaluations ranked this platform 3rd, and similar in comparison to Box. Monetary costs include a one-time implementation fee of \$6,300 and an annual fee of \$31,132 (includes optional \$5,400 Silver Service Package). The annual fee is based on FTE and thus subject to change. Additionally, in the quote we received, the annual fee increases by approximately \$800 each year. (While the university is already planning to adopt some aspects of this system for use in annual reports, these costs would be additional.)

Pros

1. The university is already planning to adopt some aspects of this system for use in annual reports, so faculty will need to learn to use the platform anyway (BPA uses it already for accreditation reporting, so those faculty would already be familiar with it).
2. Uses information already existing in the system (CVs, publications) for RTP.
3. Pulls data from LMS and other systems.

Cons

1. Most faculty will need to be trained how to use the system; also, faculty members who are already familiar with it may need to learn how to use the additional modules.
2. Some committee members did not find the system visually appealing and referred to it as “ugly”.
3. Some committee members did not find the system easy to use and referred to it as “clunky”.

Technical support

Watermark has email, phone, and chat support. The Silver Service Package is optional but allows for group training or post-implementation meetings with WM's implementation experts.

OnBase/Hyland

A summary of committee evaluations ranked this system 2nd, and higher in comparison to Box. Since we already use OnBase and own the required modules, the only cost would be a one-time setup fee of \$140,500 to assist with configuration. Additionally, we currently pay for a certain number of concurrent user licenses; it is likely that we will need to add more concurrent user licenses if more people will be using the system (Hyland recommends 10 additional concurrent licenses which would cost \$5,416.61 annually). The committee inquired about the option to explore the system or do a trial run but was informed that this is not an option; OnBase/Hyland does not provide a “sandbox” option and the cost of \$140,500 is required to configure out system even for a small trial.

Pros

1. This system is already used on campus, so ITS is familiar with it and already supports it.
2. Currently, few faculty use OnBase for advising. Using the platform for RTP may increase faculty familiarity with it and increase its utilization for advising.
3. The platform is compatible with storing PAF files electronically.

Cons

1. Most faculty will need to be trained how to use it.
2. For off campus users, this system is accessible by VPN only.
3. Some committee members did not find the system easy to use and referred to it as “clunky”.

4. Many committee members felt the platform was not intuitive (i.e., would be harder for those unfamiliar with it to start using it).
5. Some committee members noted that the process for uploading files seemed complicated.
6. It was noted that OnBase sometimes freezes during advising.

Technical support

Hyland provides 24/7, 365 Technical Support for all emergency process down scenarios through a toll-free hotline; for all other non-emergency issues or even functionality questions, Technical Support Analysts are available to assist through the Hyland Community Customer Portal with typical response time to each ticket submitted within 24 hours. There is also a team of Customer Care Advocates that are engaged in the Customer Portal for any other request or support needed. Beyond these formal Technical Support resources – CSU Bakersfield’s current OnBase System Administrators are also trained by Hyland to be a good on-campus resource.

Interfolio

A summary of committee evaluations ranked this system 1st, and higher in comparison to Box. Annual cost is \$27,907 for year one (includes mandatory \$4,651 Client Advisory Service fee). The annual fee is based on FTE and thus subject to change. Additionally, in the quote we received, the annual fee increases by approximately \$1700 each year (6% inflationary rate increase).² The committee inquired about the option to explore the system or do a trial run, but was informed that this is not an option; Interfolio does not provide a “sandbox” option and the cost of \$27,907 for one year is the same regardless of the number of faculty who use it.

Pros

1. There was general agreement that this system was the most user friendly and intuitive.
2. Many committee members thought the system was the most aesthetically pleasing.
3. The platform seems be designed specifically for RTP.

Cons

1. Some campuses have reported issues with the slowness of the system and documents taking a while to load.
2. All faculty would have to be trained how to use this system.
3. Some campuses have expressed frustrations with the External Review functionality.³

Technical support

The "Client Advisory Service" is a mandatory fee that includes: Dedicated Client Success Manager to help provide best practices for usage across the campus; Technical and Product Roadmap consultation services around usage with API's, SSO and other configuration questions; access to Interfolio University LMS system to provide on-demand training; bi-annual executive briefing reports delivered to Provost; end user training either live or virtually; and access to best practices webinars to help inform decisions and support. They also provide a support desk called, Scholar Services, that not only supports the administrators who will manage the software from but also support faculty if they experience any technical issues.

² Other CSUs have reported higher annual escalations for their three-year renewal (as high as a 15% escalation each year).

³ Communicated via personal email to Jaimi Paschal.

Recommendations

1. Faculty Success (Digital Measures) by Watermark is **not recommended** as it was ranked similarly to Box and thus the committee feels that the additional cost is not justified.
2. The committee had mixed feelings about OnBase/Hyland as there were several cons to this platform, but overall, it was ranked higher than Box. The committee considered a pilot of OnBase/Hyland, but ultimately decided against it due to the high cost associated with the setup (\$140,500).
3. Interfolio was easily the highest ranked platform, but the committee had reservations due to the high annual cost. **Ultimately, the committee decided to recommend a one-year pilot of Interfolio to determine if the benefits of Interfolio outweigh the cost.**
4. The committee further recommends a Qualtrics survey for faculty to evaluate Interfolio during the pilot period (one for reviewers and one for faculty undergoing review) and reviewing the results of this survey during/after the pilot period to determine if Interfolio is worth the additional cost to using Box. The committee developed a list of recommended questions to use in the Qualtrics survey which are included in an attached file.

Appendix A: Survey of Other CSUs⁴

Platform	Response
Box	It's better than the paper system we used before, so I think most faculty are happy about that, but there are areas for improvement.
Interfolio	[Our campus] was one of the earlier adopters of Interfolio for our tenure-track RTP process and we have been very pleased; we are now using it for faculty awards and sabbaticals/DIPs as well. Unlike some campuses, though, we have not moved lecturer evaluations to Interfolio because of workload and staffing issues in our office and in the colleges.
Interfolio	...we use Interfolio RPT for all tenure-track evaluations, post-tenure review, promotions of tenured faculty, all lecturer evaluations, and range elevation evaluations. We are satisfied and able to run everything fairly smoothly—no plans to change. But, users do complain about the slowness of the system sometimes. And I wish the reporting features were better. Also, we manually archive the cases into our PAF storage, although our office does this for only the full-time employees. It's up to the colleges to deal with the part-time lecturers' PAFs.
Interfolio	...we are using Interfolio for our faculty evaluations – tenured/tenure-track and faculty lecturers. We also have complaints from reviewers about slowness and the character limit on evaluation forms...the campus views it as a great improvement over paper. We will be re-signing for our next contract soon. We have heard from faculty that the functionality is better at [another campus], so I will explore that some more and try to determine if it is something with our configuration or what the difference is.
Interfolio	...we are also using Interfolio for faculty evaluations and don't have any plans to change. Overall, it is a significant improvement from the hard copy files that were used pre-pandemic and the workflow system is really good. There are some complaints from reviewers (e.g., slowness) and we don't yet have integration with our PAF storage system (OnBase). But we have invested in the system and view it as our long-term solution.
Interfolio	We use Interfolio for our evaluation processes for both RTP and lecturers and like it very much. But we are having serious technical challenges getting the material from Interfolio to OnBase which we are just starting to use to digitize our PAFs.
OneDrive	...we implemented on the fly a homebuilt system in OneDrive (we were still using physical binders when COVID hit, fortunately in S20 all files were already to the deans/provost so it was manageable to move binders). The OneDrive system wasn't elegant, and I suspect it may be similar to what you've got in Box. The biggest concern that [we] had with that interim solution is the manual processing required for granting and removing access. But when we looked at other solutions, it was determined in discussion with other campuses that Interfolio was just as time consuming in that aspect. Ultimately, [we] decided to keep the "interim" homebuilt system for the time being because a) it didn't cost \$75k a year, b) wouldn't trigger folks to need to learn something new, c) was leveraging a tool that was otherwise commonly already in use, and d) the few extra features of Interfolio seems insignificant when taking a-c into consideration. "The grass is always

⁴ Responses are from the AVP of Faculty Affairs or equivalent position at the campus as sent via email to our AVP of Faculty Affairs, Dr. Deborah Boschini (not all campuses responded); they have been edited for clarity and to remove identifying information.

	<p>greener...." When I taught electronics I reminded folks that for every benefit found there is a cost: that could be a cost in more money, longer to develop, or at the expense of other performance characteristics. Finding the right balance is the key. As I was the one that spend a long weekend developing and doing the primary testing of the OneDrive system, I'll say that I'm personally extremely proud of finding this solution in the middle of a crisis and it has stood the test of time. The biggest issue we've had with it, to be honest, is the challenges with building an access log that everyone was satisfied with.</p>
Interfolio	<p><u>Systems and Issues.</u> [Here] we use Interfolio for all collectively bargained for faculty evaluations. Faculty put career information into their F180, reviewers use their RPT interface. Most faculty are settled in with and appreciate the Interfolio products.</p> <p>The F180 interface isn't intuitive, which leaves us having to provide lots of training on using it. RPT is integrated with F180 in that it can retrieve all information within specified semesters/terms. RPT is often slow for reviewers--it takes quite some time for pdfs to load. Also, there are restrictions on the size and types of files that can be warehoused within the Interfolio product.</p> <p><u>We use OnBase to host the faculty PAFs.</u> OnBase is okay, but there is a certain level of clunkiness in how items are stored and viewed. I highly recommend the packet reader for OnBase to deliver PAFs to any party, relieving them of having to enter OnBase itself to review the PAF other than to log the view (as we configured that [here]). The packet reader creates a single pdf with a table of contents that can be exported.</p> <p><u>Getting items into OnBase presents problems for us.</u> There are a lot of steps/obstacles to getting stray documents into PAFs. We have begun using OnBase for more processes (appointments, additional employment) from start to finish because the documents must end up in OnBase eventually. OnBase wasn't really built for workflow, but there are some simple routing configurations that allow approval within OnBase.</p> <p>Our biggest issues with OnBase have to do with our campus's IT having extreme restrictions on users making modifications. My team must meet with IT staff to redraft forms or add features. We can use an IT ticket to change simple things like toggles (required or not) or change a few words or correct grammar. There are systems integrations marketed by OnBase (e.g., DocuSign from/to OnBase) that our IT group has been very slow to help us implement. So my frustrations are more with our local systems administration than with OnBase itself.</p> <p><u>Getting information from Interfolio to PAFs.</u> Faculty Services partnered with IT about 2 years ago to develop a system to retrieve review materials from Interfolio to deposit them into OnBase PAFs. The IT team worked with us and Interfolio to leverage Interfolio's APIs (which had some errors) to create a solution. Unfortunately, the OnBase side still requires "manual" steps which should be automated.</p> <p>The solution includes:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A web-based dashboard to order the retrieval of evaluation materials from RPT. (We also have a "legal" option to retrieve all submitted materials rather than the PAF version). • The files are downloaded to a drive with proper naming convention for OnBase. • The team member requesting the download notifies the OnBase team at IT and requests a sweep the files into OnBase. After they developed the solutions for Faculty Services, I told the IT team leader that other campuses will wish to get his team's assistance with Interfolio and its APIs. He volunteered to help out, so if you could use IT help with moving files from Interfolio to OnBase, just send me a message and I will connect you with that IT group.
Interfolio	Overall we are pleased with the platform, but there are things we would like to change. For instance, our current configuration does not integrate with our Canvas, our LMS. Additionally, the platform is often slow to load/view pdfs, which slows down the review process.
Interfolio	The items [noted directly above] are similar to what we've seen, but I don't see any traction for us to move to something else due to the "cost of change."
Canvas	We never had funding for Interfolio, or other programs, so we developed an in-house approach to create e-Working Personnel Action File/review folders. Originally it was in Moodle and recently migrated to Canvas. Downside is it is a little clunky and somewhat time intensive. Upside is we owned the programs so we incurred no additional cost...We are mostly satisfied - occasional person who is not well versed in using it and have issues with creating their file.
OnBase/ Google Drive	I think campus satisfaction ranges from neutral to dissatisfied. It is hard to navigate and find what you are looking for. It is also difficult to manage and change or add workflows to it. We are not in a position to change this year, but I suspect we will in the near future. We also use OnBase to store our PAFs. I am still learning about that.
Interfolio	I can't say that we are satisfied, but we are not dissatisfied.

Appendix B: Average Committee Rankings

Summary of Rankings⁵

Platform	TOTAL Required	TOTAL Preferred	GRAND TOTAL
Box.com	14.9	17.6	32.4
Faculty Success (Digital Measures)	15.5	16.5	32.0
OnBase/Hyland	15.8	21.6	37.5
Interfolio	19.1	25.4	44.5
Live Binders	13.8	19.3	33.1

Required Capabilities⁶

Platform	Secure	Tracks Access & File Changes	Ease of Faculty Organization	Easily Reviewed	TOTAL Required
Box.com	4.9	3.6	2.9	3.5	14.9
Faculty Success (Digital Measures)	4.7	4.2	3.6	3.0	15.5
OnBase/Hyland	4.4	4.4	3.3	3.8	15.8
Interfolio	4.9	4.8	4.7	4.8	19.1
Live Binders	4.1	3.0	3.3	3.4	13.8

⁵ Ranked 1-5 with 5 being the best

⁶ Ranked 1-5 with 5 being the best

Preferred Capabilities⁷

Platform	Compatible with PAF	Limits # of documents	Not Clunky/Ugly	Easy to post CV	Easy to re-organize files/folders	Workflow Easy to Use	TOTAL Preferred
Box.com	1.0	3.4	2.8	4.7	3.2	2.5	17.6
Faculty Success (Digital Measures)	1.0	2.5	3.0	3.6	3.2	3.2	16.5
OnBase/Hyland	4.5	4.0	2.4	4.0	3.1	3.6	21.6
Interfolio	2.3	4.3	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.8	25.4
Live Binders	2.5	3.2	3.4	3.8	3.5	2.9	19.3

⁷ Ranked 1-5 with 5 being the best

Faculty Performance Review Software Exploratory Committee Recommended Questions

For those undergoing RTP review:

1. What platforms have you used for submitting your RTP files? (Box only/Interfolio only/Both)
2. **Display Logic: Q1 answer (Both)** → Which tool would you prefer for RTP files? (Prefer Box/Prefer Interfolio /no preference) Why? (comment box)
3. How did you learn how to prepare your RTP file in Interfolio? (check all that apply: guide/videos/CSUB ITS or FTLC/other)
4. Which training method helped you prepare to use Interfolio the most? (guides/videos/CSUB ITS or FTLC/other)
5. How easy was it to upload your documents? (1-5 scale - easy to hard)
6. How easy was it to organize your documents into your RTP portfolio? (1-5 scale - easy to hard)
7. Did you feel that Interfolio kept your files secure? (yes/no)
8. Did you feel that CSUB configured your Interfolio access privileges to your RTP file correctly? (yes/no)
9. What aspect(s) of Interfolio did you like? (comment box)
10. What aspect(s) need improvement? (comment box)
11. Would you recommend Interfolio as CSUB's official RTP review software? (yes/no)

For those reviewing RTP files:

1. What platforms have you used for reviewing RTP files? (Box only/Interfolio only/both)
2. **Display Logic: Q1 answer (Both)** → Which tool would you prefer for reviewing RTP files? (Prefer Box/Prefer Interfolio /no preference) Why? (comment box)
3. How did you learn how to review RTP files in Interfolio? (guides/videos/CSUB ITS or FTLC/other)
4. Which training method helped you prepare to review RTPs in Interfolio the most? (guides/videos/CSUB ITS or FTLC/other)
5. Was it easy to navigate through RTP files? (1-5 scale - easy to hard)
6. Was it easy to update access logs and upload committee letters? (1-5 scale - easy to hard)
7. Did you feel that Interfolio kept your files secure? (yes/no)
8. Did you feel that CSUB configure your Interfolio access privileges to the RTP files you reviewed correctly? (yes/no)
9. What aspect(s) of Interfolio did you like? (comment box)
10. What aspect(s) need improvement? (comment box)
11. Would you recommend Interfolio as CSUB's official RTP review software? (yes/no)

Date	Referral	Status	Committee/s Charged	Action	Resolution	Handbook/Bylaws Change	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
9/2/2025	2025-2026 01 Clarify ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Procedures	Complete	FAC	Clarify ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Procedures. During your discussion, please consider the following: whether non-tenure track, non-teaching faculty can be eligible; what term the elected representative serves on CSUB Academic Senate; encoding the nomination and election procedures in CSUB Senate Bylaws or University Handbook.	RES 252609 Clarifying ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Procedures	-	12/4/2025	1/5/2026	1/14/2026
9/2/2025	2025-2026 02 Academic Degree Policies	Complete	AAC	<i>Carry-over referral: 2024-2025 #36 Clarify ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Procedures</i> Review the academic policies about double majors and double counting courses. Consider: Timeline for declaring a double major, double counting courses between the major and the minor, and double counting courses between both majors for a double major. <i>Carry-over referral: 2024-2025 #37 Academic Degree Policies</i>	RES 252603 Double Major Policy Changes RES 252604 Minor Policy Changes	-	RES 252603 approved 10/23/2025 RES 252604 approved 12/11/2025	10/31/2025 12/11/2025	11/5/2025; RES 252604 011/04/2026
9/2/2025	2025-2026 03 Academic Policies and Academic Advising in SASEM	RES 252622 Tabled	AAC and AS&SS	To discuss shared governance with respect to the academic policies and advising housed in the Division of Strategic Enrollment Management Expanded Carry-over of: 2024-2025 #31 Academic Policies House in the Registrar's Office and 2024-2025 #25 Academic Advising Structure and Report; RES 242518 Academic Advising Structure as an Academic Endeavor	RES 252622 Academic Advising Structure Is an Academic Endeavor (Tabled)	-	-	-	-
9/2/2025	2025-2026 04 Time Blocks	In committee/s	BPC	The need to reconsider Time Blocks for classes. During discussion, consider how to address meeting patterns that are not visualized in RES 1314059, whether the 50 minutes M/W/F time blocks are sufficient for pedagogical reasons, overlap between current time blocks of different types, effects of time blocks on space utilization.	-	-	-	-	-
9/2/2025	2025-2026 05 Unit RTP Committees	Complete	FAC	<i>Carry-over referral: 2023-2024 #04 and 2024-2025 #10 Time Blocks</i> For FAC to review the University Handbook sections related to Unit RTP Committees. Handbook 305.6.1, 301.6.4 Revised Referral 2024-2025 #34 Unit RTP Committees and PAF Content; drafted RES 242557 (not approved by Senate)	RES 252610 Unit RTP and PTR Composition	Handbook 305.4.1, 305.6.1, 305.6.2, 305.6.3, 305.6.4, 306.3	2/12/2026	2/27/2026	3/12/2026
9/4/2025	2025-2026 06 Proposal to Elevate the Concentration of Computer Information Systems (CIS) to a Degree Program.	In committee/s	AAC and BPC	Review the proposal to elevate the Computer Science Computer Information Systems (CIS) Concentration to a new Degree Program. Note: Per M. Danforth CIS is on hold; waiting for GE modification approvals from GECCo. 2026-02-24	-	-	-	-	-
9/4/2025	2025-2026 07 Proposal to Rename the Computer Science Information Security Concentration	Complete	AAC and BPC	Review the proposal to rename the Computer Science Information Security Concentration to Computer Science Cybersecurity Concentration.	RES 252615 Renaming of Computer Science Cybersecurity Concentration	-	1/29/2026	2/9/2026	1/3/1900
9/4/2025	2025-2026 08 Proposal to Change the MS in Computer Science from Self-support to Stateside Support	Canceled	AAC and BPC	Review the proposal to Change the MS in Computer Science from Self-support to Stateside Support. Note: Per M. Danforth, MS CS is going back to department committee; mark as cancelled. 2026-02-24	-	-	-	-	-
9/4/2025	2025-2026 09 Proposal for New Minor in Applied Mathematics	Complete	AAC and BPC	Review the proposal for New Minor in Applied Mathematics.	RES 252611 New Minor in Applied Mathematics	-	12/4/2025	1/5/2026	1/14/2026
9/15/2025	2025-2026 10 Proposal for New Minor in Medical Spanish	Complete	AAC and BPC	Review and approve the proposal for a New Minor in Medical Spanish; Department of Modern Languages and Literatures.	RES 252630 New Minor in Medical Spanish	-	3/12/2026	3/23/2026	4/1/2026
9/15/2025	2025-2026 11 Proposal for New Minor in Creative Writing	Complete	AAC and BPC	Review and approve the proposal for a New Minor in Creative Writing; Department of English.	RES 252614 Minor in Creative Writing	-	1/29/2026	2/9/2026	2/17/2026
9/15/2025	2025-2026 12 Proposal for New Concentration HCM_Healthcare Administration	Complete	AAC and BPC	Review and approve the proposal for a New Concentration in Healthcare Administration (HCM) in the Master of Public Administration (MPA) degree.	RES 252612 New Concentration in Nonprofit Management in MPA Degree	-	12/4/2025	1/5/2026	1/14/2026
9/15/2025	2025-2026 13 Proposal for New Concentration NPM_Nonprofit Management	Complete	AAC and BPC	Review and approve the proposal for a New Concentration in Nonprofit Management (NPM) in the Master of Public Administration (MPA) degree.	RES 252613 New Concentration in Healthcare Administration in MPA Degree	-	12/4/2025	1/5/2026	1/14/2026
9/15/2025	2025-2026 14 Proposal for Public Personnel Services Credential	Canceled	AAC and BPC	Review and approve the proposal for a Pupil Personnel Services Credential in Advanced Educational Studies. Note: Mark as cancelled per AAC Chair T. Tsantsoulas 2026-02-24; sent back to curriculum or	-	-	-	-	-
9/15/2025	2025-2026 15 Proposal for New Minor_HD-CAFS_Early Childhood Development (ECD)	Complete	AAC and BPC	Review and approve the proposal for 2025-2026 15, Proposal for New Minor in Early Childhood Development; Department of Human Development and Child, Adolescent and Family Studies (HD-CAFS)	RES 252631 New Minor in Early Childhood Development	-	3/12/2026	3/23/2026	4/1/2026
9/16/2025	2025-2026 16 Catalog Language Inconsistency with Title 5	Complete	AAC	Review the inconsistencies between CSUB Academic Catalog language and Title 5 requirements with respect to upper-division units required for BS degree completion. Items included in Senate Agenda 02/17/2026. No further action. Complete	-	-	-	-	-
9/16/2025	2025-2026 17 Sabbatical Application Process	Complete	FAC	Review the handbook guidelines on sabbatical applications. During your discussion, please consider: potential revisions to Sections 307.2 and 307.3 of the University Handbook; consistency with the Collective Bargaining Agreement for Unit 3; whether an application rubric should be developed.	RES 252608 Sabbatical Rubric and Feedback	Handbook 307.2, 307.3	12/4/2025	1/5/2026	1/14/2026
9/17/2025	2025-2026 18 Special Review Committee for Anthropology	Complete	AAC and BPC	Review and address the recommendations provided by the Special Review Committee for Anthropology with respect to the proposed discontinuation of the Anthropology MA and BA programs.	RES 252618; RES 252618-REVISED Special Review Committee for Anthropology	-	1/29/2026; 03/06/2026	2/9/2026; 03/23/2026	4/1/2026
9/29/2025	2025-2026 19 Teaching Modality	RES 252648 IP: (1st reading scheduled for 04/16/2026)	AAC and FAC	Review and discuss section 303 "Instructional Policy" of the University Handbook, particularly the sub-sections related to course modality and online and hybrid courses. Section 303.1 also has references to online teaching.	RES 252648 Teaching Modality-Handbook Changes (1st reading scheduled for 04/16/2026)	Handbook 203 and 303.1	-	-	-
9/29/2025	2025-2026 20 Disqualification and Readmission Policies	RES 252637 Complete; RES 252641 Complete	AAC and AS&SS	Review and discuss the policies related to academic disqualification and readmission to the university.	RES 252637 Academic Standing Policy Update: Summer Disqualification Removal; RES 252641 Readmission Requirements Following Academic Disqualification	-	RES 252637 3/26/2026	4/10/2026	

Date	Referral	Status	Committee/s Charged	Action	Resolution	Handbook/Bylaws Change	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
9/29/2025	2025-2026 21 Policy on Use of Informational Banner Space in Canvas	RES 252627 IP; <i>(2nd reading scheduled 4/16/2026)</i>	AS&SS	Discuss developing a policy on what information can be posted to the banner space on Canvas.	RES 252627 Policy on Use of Informational Banner Space in Canvas <i>(2nd reading scheduled for 04/16/2026)</i>	-			
10/7/2025	2025-2026 22 President's Cabinet Structure and Officers of the University	In committee/s	FAC	Update section 103.2.3 and 104 of the University Handbook to be consistent with the current structure of the President's Cabinet, President's direct reports, and other officers of the University.		Handbook 103.2.3 and 104			
10/14/2025	2025-2026 23 PERC Timing Concerns	RES 252642 IP; <i>NOT READY for 1st Reading</i>	AAC and AS&SS	Investigate the timing of the Post-Enrollment Requirements Checking (PERC) report generation.	RES 252642 Post-Enrollment Requirement Checking (PERC) Timing Alignment for Prerequisite Verification and Enrollment Stability <i>(NOT READY for 1st reading)</i>	-			
10/14/2025	2025-2026 24 First-Year Seminar (CSUB 1029) Concerns	In committee/s	AAC and FAC	Investigate concerns related to the curricular content and oversight of First-Year Seminar (CSUB 1029) and the assignment of instructors for CSUB 1029.		-			
10/29/2025	2025-2026 25 Inconsistency with Previous Handbook Changes to Unit Committee Evaluations	Complete	FAC	FAC to review the two resolutions from 2022-2023 related to section 305.6.3 Evaluation and Recommendation by the Unit Committee of the University Handbook. During your discussion, please consider the following: Any language from RES 222309 that may have been accidentally excluded from RES 222335 and will need to be incorporated in the handbook; Incorporating recommendations from this referral with recommendations for referral 2025-2026 05 Unit RTP Committees.	RES 252610 Unit RTP and PTR Composition	Handbook 305.4.1, 305.6.1, 305.6.2, 305.6.3, 305.6.4, 306.3	2/12/2026	2/27/2026	3/12/2026
10/29/2025	2025-2026 26 Inventory of Automated Decision-making Software for the Classroom	RES 252628 IP <i>(2nd Reading scheduled 04/16/2026)</i>	AS&SS	Inventory of AI and other automated software; A new state law requires CSU campuses to inventory automated decision-making systems. It was suggested that ATI-IM also participate	RES 252628 Inventory of Automated Decision-Making Software for the Classroom <i>(2nd Reading scheduled 04/16/2026)</i>	-			
10/29/2025	2025-2026 27 Handbook Policies on Acting and Interim MPPs	RES 252647 IP <i>(1st reading scheduled 04/16/2026)</i>	FAC	FAC to review the University Handbook sections, 309.7 through 309.11, regarding appointments of interim administrators. During your discussion, please consider the following: Whether language should be added to define the title "Acting" and provide guidelines for appointing and length of term; Whether the consultation process for interim appointments should be clarified with respect to entities that are consulted prior to appointment and renewal.	RES 252647 Acting Appointments - Handbook Changes <i>(1st reading scheduled 04/16/2026)</i>	Handbook 309.7 through 309.11			
10/29/2025	2025-2026 28 Term Limits for Department Chairs and Program Directors	Complete	FAC	FAC to review the term limit language in section 312.3 Selection and Appointment Procedures of the University Handbook, specifically relating to department chairs, program chairs, and program directors.	RES 252621 Department Chair Terms	Handbook 312.3	2/12/2026	2/27/2026	3/12/2026
11/3/2025	2025-2026 29 Academic Calendar, Fall 2026 - Summer 2027	Complete	BPC	Approval of Academic Calendar, Fall 2026, Winter session, Spring 2027 and Summer 2027; correction identified 1/28/2026- RES 252623 on consent agenda for Senate 1/29/2026	RES 252616 Academic Calendar Fall 2026 - Summer 2027 RES 252623 Changes to Fall 2026 Academic Calendar	-	RES 252616 12/4/2025; RES 252623 1/29/26	RES 252616 1/5/2026; RES 252623 2/9/2026	RES 252616 1/14/2026; RES 252623 02/17/2026
11/3/2025	2025-2026 30 Academic Master Plan 2026-27 through 2035-36	Complete	AAC and BPC	Academic Master Plan; 2026-27 through 2035-36	RES 252617 Academic Master Plan 2026-27 through 2035-36	-	12/4/2025	1/5/2026	1/14/2026
11/3/2025	2025-2026 31 Clarify Handbook Language Related to Faculty Reviews	RES 252644 IP <i>(1st reading deferred 04/16/2026)</i>	FAC	FAC to review the Handbook language pertaining to timelines for Post-Tenure Review (PTR) and WPAF length for all faculty reviews. During your discussion, please consider the following: The language in Handbook section 305.4.2.10 "RTP File" related to expected contents and maximum length for the following types of reviews... Multiple timeline issues with Handbook section 305.3.3 "Promotion of Tenured Faculty."	RES 252644 Guidance on WPAF Contents and Timelines for Review <i>(1st reading deferred 04/16/2026)</i>	Handbook 305.3.3., 305.5.2., 305.5.3., 305.4.2.10, and Appendix G			
11/3/2025	2025-2026 32 Clarification of Unit Criteria for Faculty Review	Complete	FAC	FAC to review the Handbook language related to Unit RTP, PTR and PEF Criteria. During your discussion, please consider the following: The following Handbook sections related to Unit Criteria, including any changes made in RES 252610 "Unit RTP and PTR Composition"; 305.4.2.4 "Unit RTP Criteria," 306.2.2 "Criteria for Periodic Evaluation of Faculty," 306.3 "Post-Tenure Review, " Definition of "exceptional" for Early Promotion at different ranks (i.e. Assistant to Associate and Associate to Full), Developing a checklist of required criteria elements to assist units in revising their Unit Criteria. Referral revised and sent to FAC 3/13/2026.	RES 252632 Required Unit RTP Criteria Elements and Guidance on Unit RTP Criteria Revision	Handbook 305.3.1, 305.3.4, 305.4.2.4, 305.4.2.8., and 305.4.2.9.	3/26/2026		HOLD; returning to Senate 04/16/2026
11/7/2025	2025-2026 33 Academic, Curricular, and Student Support Software Concerns	RES 252629 IP <i>(1st Reading deferred to 04/16/26)</i>	AS&SS	AS&SS discuss academic, curricular, and student support software needs with ITS. Consider: Consulting with ITS about rising software costs for academic, curricular, and student support software, and assisting ITS with determining acceptable replacements and/or non-renewals; Whether AS&SS (via bylaws change), another existing committee (such as ITC), or a new committee	RES 252629 Academic, Curricular, and Student Support Software Governance <i>(1st Reading deferred to 04/16/2026)</i>	-			
11/7/2025	2025-2026 34 Review of the Report and Recommendations from the Task Force for Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty	RES 252645 IP; <i>(2nd reading scheduled 04/16/2026)</i>	FAC	FAC review the submitted report and recommendations from the Task Force for Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty. Consider: Which recommendations for changes to the Handbook, if any, should be formally adopted; The impact of the report and recommendations on other referrals and resolutions.	RES 252645 Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty <i>(2nd reading scheduled 04/16/2026)</i>	Handbook 306			
11/25/2025	2025-2026 35 SOCI Modality	Complete	FAC	<i>Carryover referral 2021-2022 #41, 2023-2024 #03 and 2024-2025 #06</i> Review the request from Provost Council to eliminate paper SOCLs and move entirely to online SOCLs. During discussion, consider: Costs of administering paper SOCLs, Low response rates for online SOCLs and how to address. ITS support for online SOCLs.	RES 252620 Transitioning to Online SOCLs	Handbook 305.4.4, 305.4.5	2/26/2026	3/6/2026	3/12/2026
1/20/2026	2025-2026 36 New Degree Proposal for Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science	Complete	AAC and BPC	Review and address the new proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Environmental Studies.	RES 252636 New Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science	-	3/26/2026	4/10/2026	
1/20/2026	2025-2026 37 New Degree Proposal for Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering	RES 252638 IP <i>(1st reading scheduled 04/16/2026)</i>	AAC and BPC	Review and address the new proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering.	RES 252638 New Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering <i>(1st reading scheduled 04/16/2026)</i>	-			
1/22/2026	2025-2026 38 New Degree Proposal for Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies	RES 252639 IP <i>(1st reading deferred 04/16/2026)</i>	AAC and BPC	Review and address the new proposal for a Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies.	RES 252639 Program Name Change from a Bachelor of Arts in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to a Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) <i>(1st reading deferred 04/16/2026)</i>	-			

Date	Referral	Status	Committee/s Charged	Action	Resolution	Handbook/Bylaws Change	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
1/20/2026	2025-2026 39 Proposal for New Minor in Migration, Population, and Globalization	Complete	AAC and BPC	Review and address the proposal for a new minor in Migration, Population, and Globalization (MPG).	RES 252635 New Sociology Minor in Migration, Population and Globalization	-	3/26/2026	4/10/2026	
1/20/2026	2025-2026 40 Department Name Change Request for HD-CAFS	RES 252640 IP (1st reading deferred 04/16/2026)	AAC and BPC	Review and address the new proposal Department name change from Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS) to Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS).	RES 252640 Department Name Change from Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS) to Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) (1st reading deferred 04/16/2026)	-			
1/20/2026	2025-2026 41 AS&SS Membership – Bylaws Change	Complete	AS&SS	Review and address the request from Information Technology Services (ITS) to add the Chief Information Officer as an ex-office non-voting member to AS&SS	RES 252626 AS&SS Membership-Bylaws Change	Bylaws- Section IV	2/26/2026	3/6/2026	3/12/2026
2/18/2026	2025-2026 42 DLC membership and Description	In committee/s	AAC	Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) Membership & Description; review and address the request and proposed resolution submitted by the Distributed Learning Committee regarding DLC's membership and description.		Handbook 203.11			
2/18/2026	2025-2026 43 Review of the Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity Reports	Complete	FAC	Review the submitted reports and recommendations from the Scholarship and Creative Activities Task Force and the Faculty Advisory Committee for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (FAC-4-RSCA). During your discussion, please consider: Which recommendations for changes to the Handbook, if any, should be formally adopted through the Senate resolution process; The impact of the report and recommendations on other referrals and resolutions currently before FAC. Note: per FAC Chair, Z. Zenko, this referral will likely require multiple resolutions and continued work over future academic years.	RES 252633 Clarifying Faculty Workload, RSCA Expectations, and Service Responsibilities	-	3/26/2026	4/10/2026	
2/18/2026	2025-2026 44 Consideration of Senior Lecturer Honorific	Complete	FAC	Consider the request for the honorific "Senior Lecturer" for entitled lecturers under a 3-year contract (CBA Article 12.12 Appointments). During your discussion, please consider: Whether to adopt such an honorific for 3-year lecturers; What process would be used for determining if a lecturer qualifies for the honorific; Other existing honorific processes, such as the Emeriti status, Handbook section 308.2, that could be used to inform this process.	RES 252634 Establishing a Preferred Non-Contractual Academic Honorific Title "Senior Lecturer"	Handbook 304.7.3.	3/26/2026	4/10/2026	
3/2/2026	2025-2026 45 Request Help with Remediation of Course Materials for Accessibility	In committee/s	AS&SS	To review and address the request from ATI about how faculty would request help for course remediation and how students would report concerns about accessibility in a course					
4/7/2026	2025-2026 46 Request for Chair/Director of the Year Award	In committee/s	FAC	Consider the request for a Chair/ Director of the Year award and consider whether such an award should be created and if so, what would be the process for nomination and selection.					
9/11/2025	N/A	Complete	EC	Rename the Faculty Leadership and Service Award to "Jacquelyn Kegley Faculty Leadership and Service Award" in recognition of Dr. Kegley's decades of service to and leadership at CSUB, including her role in the creation of CSUB's Academic Senate and service as CSUB Senate Chair.	RES 252601 Renaming of the Leadership and Service Award	Handbook 308.3.2	9/25/2025	10/6/2025	10/15/2025
9/23/2025	N/A	Complete	EC	AB 1400 of 2025 Opposition; Academic Senate of CSUB requests that the Governor of California veto Assembly Bill 1400 of 2025 Community colleges; Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program.	RES 252602 Assembly Bill 1400 of 2025 Opposition	-	9/25/2025	10/6/2025	10/15/2025
10/7/2025	N/A	Complete	EC	RES 252605 Reaffirming Shared Governance and the University Handbook as Policy	RES 252605 Reaffirming Shared Governance and the University Handbook as Policy	No Handbook changes/ but save in Governing Docs	10/23/2025	10/31/2025	11/5/2025
10/7/2025	N/A	Complete	EC	RES 252606 Call for a CSU Chancellor's Office Investigation Regarding Recent Incidents in Athletics	RES 252606 Call for a CSU Chancellor's Office Investigation Regarding Recent Incidents in Athletics	-	11/6/2025	12/1/2025	1/14/2026
10/21/2025	N/A	Complete	EC	Commendation for CSUB CAMP and HEP Programs	RES 252607 Commendation for CSUB CAMP and HEP Programs	-	10/23/2025	10/31/2025	11/5/2025
12/2/2025	N/A	Complete	EC	Commencement - Fall 2025	RES 252619 Commencement-Fall 2025	-	12/4/2025	1/5/2026	1/14/2026
2/3/2026	N/A	RES 252624 Expressions of the Senate (1st Reading scheduled 4/16/2026)	EC	Expressions of the Senate - Bylaws Changes	RES 252624 Expressions of the Senate - Bylaws Changes (1st Reading scheduled 4/16/2026)	Bylaws			
2/3/2026	N/A	Canceled	EC	RES 252625 Term for ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Representative - EC agreed to cancel this resolution (EC 02/10/2026) Note: Later resolution will be needed to align CSUR with ASCSU term requirements	RES 252625 Canceled	-	-	-	-
3/23/2026	n/a	RES 252643 IP (1st reading deferred 04/16/2026)	EC	In response to: "Policies & Procedures for Establishing New Schools," as submitted by the Criteria for Proposing New Schools Task Force	RES 252643 - Policies & Procedures for Establishing New Schools (1st reading deferred 04/16/2026)				
4/7/2026	n/a	RES 252646 IP; (1st reading scheduled for 04/16/2026)	EC	Research Misconduct Policy changes	RES 252646 Research Misconduct Policy (1st reading scheduled for 4/16/2026)				
4/14/2026	n/a	RES 252649 IP (Schedule for consent agenda 04/30/2026)	EC	Commencement - Spring 2026	RES 252649 Commencement, Spring 2026 (Schedule for consent agenda 04/30/2026)	-			



Research Misconduct Policy

RES 252646

EC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of CSUB recommends that the President approves the proposed changes to the attached policy on research misconduct.

RATIONALE: The federal Public Health Services (PHS) has issued required updates for research misconduct policies and procedures. The proposed changes incorporate those requirements into CSUB's current research misconduct policy.

Attachments:

- (1) Overview of 2025-26 PHS RM Policy Updates
- (2) Proposed changes to CSUB's Policy on Research Misconduct

Distribution List:

President
Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs
AVP for Grants, Research and Sponsored Programs
AVP for Faculty Affairs
College Deans
Associate Deans
Dean of Libraries
Dean of Antelope Valley
Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach
Department Chairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Overview of 2025-26 PHS RM Policy Updates

The key changes of the PHS misconduct policy for 2025-26 updates include:

1. **Documentation Requirements:** Institutions must provide detailed reports at every stage of the investigation, including transcripts of interviews, to ensure transparency and fairness.
2. **Procedural Flexibility:** Institutions now have greater discretion in structuring inquiries and investigations, but they must maintain complete institutional records.
3. **Expanded Definitions:** The regulation includes over 25 clear definitions, refining terms like "intentionally," "knowingly," and "recklessly" to align with current research practices.
4. **Timelines:** The investigative window has been extended from 120 to 180 days, reflecting the complexities of modern research misconduct cases.

These changes aim to enhance the integrity of federally funded research and provide clearer guidelines for handling misconduct allegations.

****Effective Date:** The revised regulation will take effect on **January 1, 2026**, with institutions required to apply it to any allegations received on or after this date.

Overview

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Office of Research Integrity (ORI) has issued a revised version of the Public Health Service (PHS) Policies on Research Misconduct ([42 CFR Part 93](#)), which will go into effect on January 1, 2026. These changes are the most substantial updates since the regulation was first adopted in 2005 and reflect a broader effort to promote clarity, consistency, and due process in research misconduct proceedings.

What Is 42 CFR Part 93?

42 CFR Part 93 sets the federal standard for addressing research misconduct in PHS-supported research. The regulation defines research misconduct as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism (FFP) in proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting research. It also outlines:

- The procedural steps for assessing allegations;
- The rights and responsibilities of institutions and individuals;
- The roles of the Research Integrity Officer (RIO), institutional officials, and ORI;
- Timelines and expectations for conducting inquiries and investigations;
- The standards for reporting findings and preserving records.

This regulation, initially issued in 2005, has been central to ensuring the integrity of federally funded biomedical and behavioral research.

Why Are These Changes Happening Now?

Since its implementation, the research landscape has evolved. With increasing collaboration, data-sharing, and digitization, institutions now face more complex misconduct investigations. Additionally, past feedback from the research community revealed that the 2005 guidance left some ambiguity in how to apply the regulations, especially for smaller institutions or those with limited prior experience.

The revised 2024 version of 42 CFR Part 93, slated to take effect in 2026, addresses these gaps by:

- Expanding and clarifying key definitions;
- Extending allowable timelines for procedural steps;
- Strengthening confidentiality and retaliation protections;
- Formalizing expectations for documentation, admissions, and multi-institution coordination.

The overarching goal is to improve the process of responding to misconduct allegations by bringing more structure, clarity, and equity.

What's New in the template that was provided for us to use to make updates:

- **Clarity and Tone** – Much more readable and structured for practical use. Uses plain language and avoids excessive regulatory jargon. Optional sections are minimized and framed more clearly.
- **Document Organization** – Reorganized into clear sections.
- **Expanded Definitions** – Provides over 25 clear, well-defined terms, including “administrative record,” “intentionally,” “recklessly,” “institutional record,” and nuanced takes on “good faith” and “plagiarism” (now explicitly excludes self-plagiarism and authorship disputes).
- **Timelines and Process Requirements** – Inquiry = 90 days, Investigation = 180 days. These timelines align with modern case complexity and allow more realistic procedural windows.
- **Sequestration and Evidence Handling** – A more rigorous, proactive approach, requiring sequestration as soon as possible upon credible allegations and mandating an inventory of what was sequestered and when, with clear references to chain-of-custody expectations.
- **Respondent and Complainant Rights** – Stronger protections and clearer roles.
- **Emphasis on Recordkeeping** – Expands on expectations. Institutions must create and maintain an institutional record with indexes of all evidence reviewed, documentation of decisions not to investigate, descriptions of sequestered but unused evidence, and all transcripts, communications, and ORI notifications.
- **Provides Structured Guidance for Multi-Respondent and Multi-Institution Cases**
- **Handling Respondent Admissions** – Requires a written, signed admission detailing what misconduct occurred, how it was committed (e.g., knowingly, intentionally), and how it diverged from accepted practice. Institutions must notify ORI and receive approval before closing the case.

Institutional Responsibilities Under the New Guidance

The revised guidance underscores critical responsibilities for institutions receiving PHS funding. Institutions must:

- Maintain a publicly accessible policy consistent with 42 CFR Part 93;
- Provide safeguards for both complainants and respondents against retaliation;
- Ensure secure sequestration and preservation of research records;
- Appoint impartial committees or officials with relevant expertise to handle allegations;
- Document every stage of the misconduct proceeding in an organized institutional record;
- Notify ORI at specific intervals, especially when investigations are warranted or closed via respondent admissions.

Institutions are also expected to manage conflicts of interest at all levels of the misconduct process and submit investigation records to ORI, including transcripts, sequestered materials, final reports, and any appeals.



Policy on the Disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct

[This document contains substantial word-for-word excerpts of materials from sources cited in References (Section II)]

I. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that all research and/or scholarly activity conducted under the auspices of California State University Bakersfield (CSUB) (including the CSUB Auxiliary for Sponsored Programs Administration and the CSUB Foundation), adhere to the highest attainable ethical and moral standards, and comply with federal and other government (local and state) regulations, and guidelines required by external sponsors, governing the disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct.

II. References

1. Federal government regulations (42 CFR Part 93 (PHS: Public Health Service) and 45 CFR 689 (NSF: National Science Foundation)) and the California State University Office of the Chancellor (EO890 §3.3.4 and §3.4.1) require that each campus conducting research, instruction, and/or other sponsored work under grants, and other agreements with the Federal government must comply with the specific guidelines required by the external sponsor of a project with regard to the disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct and related matters, as applicable.
2. Other government (local and state) regulations and/or sponsor guidelines may require that each campus conducting research, instruction, and/or other sponsored work under grants, and other agreements with non-Federal governments and/or other external sponsors must comply with the specific guidelines required by the external sponsor of a project with regard to the disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct and related matters, as applicable.

3. Research misconduct policies at the City University of New York (2015), Boston University (2012), and California State University, Fresno, were used as references in the formulation of this policy.

III. Terms and Definitions

1. Accepted practices of the relevant research community. This term means those practices established by 42 CFR Part 93 and by PHS funding components, as well as commonly accepted professional codes or norms within the overarching community of researchers and institutions that apply for and receive PHS awards.

2. Administrative record. The administrative record comprises: the institutional record; any information provided by the respondent to ORI, including but not limited to the transcript of any virtual or in-person meetings under § 93.403(b) between the respondent and ORI, and correspondence between the respondent and ORI; any additional information provided to ORI while the case is pending before ORI; and any analysis or additional information generated or obtained by ORI. Any analysis or additional information generated or obtained by ORI will also be made available to the respondent.

3. Allegation means a disclosure of possible Research Misconduct through any means of communication and brought directly to the attention of an institutional or HHS official. The disclosure may be by written or oral statement or other communication.

4. Assessment. Assessment means a consideration of whether an allegation of research misconduct appears to fall within the definition of research misconduct; appears to involve PHS-supported biomedical or behavioral research, biomedical or behavioral research training, or activities related to that research or research training; and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified. The assessment only involves the review of readily accessible information relevant to the allegation

5. Auxiliary for Sponsored Program Administration means the CSUB Auxiliary for Sponsored Program Administration.

6. Complainant means a person who in good faith makes an Allegation of Research Misconduct.

7. Evidence. Evidence means anything offered or obtained during a research misconduct proceeding that tends to prove or disprove the existence of an alleged fact. Evidence includes documents, whether in hard copy or electronic form, information, tangible items, and testimony. means any document, tangible item, or testimony offered or obtained during a Research Misconduct Proceeding that tends to prove or disprove the existence of an alleged fact.

[8.5. Fabrication](#) means making up data or results and recording or reporting them.

[9.6. Falsification](#) means manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.

[10.7. Good faith.](#) *(a) Good faith* as applied to a complainant or witness, means having a [reasonable](#) belief in the truth of one's allegation or testimony that a reasonable person in the complainant's or witness's position could have, based on the information known to the complainant or witness at the time. An allegation or cooperation with a research misconduct proceeding is not in good faith if made with knowing or reckless disregard for information that would negate the allegation or testimony. *(b) Good faith* as applied to [an institution or](#) committee member means cooperating with the research misconduct proceeding by carrying out the duties assigned impartially for the purpose of helping an institution meet its responsibilities under this policy [\(or 42 CFR Part 93 for PHS funded projects\)](#). A committee member does not act in good faith if her/his acts or omissions on the committee are dishonest or influenced by personal, professional, or financial conflicts of interest with those involved in the research misconduct proceeding.

[11.8. Inquiry](#) means preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding to determine whether an Allegation has substance and if an Investigation is warranted [or that meets the criteria and follows the procedures of 93.307 through 93.309 for PHS funded projects](#). An Investigation must be undertaken if an Inquiry determines an Allegation has substance.

[12. Inquiry Committee](#) means the committee consisting of two or more members of the faculty, together with such technical, administrative, or other staff as may be deemed appropriate, who are appointed by the Provost to conduct the Inquiry of an Allegation.

[913. Institution.](#) Institution means any person who applies for or receives PHS support for any activity or program that involves the conduct of biomedical or behavioral research, biomedical or behavioral research training, or activities related to that research or training. This includes, but is not limited to, colleges and universities, PHS intramural biomedical or behavioral research laboratories, research and development centers, national user facilities, industrial laboratories or other research institutes, research institutions, and independent researchers.

[14. Institutional Deciding Official.](#) Institutional Deciding Official means the institutional official who makes final determinations on allegations of research misconduct and any institutional actions. The same individual cannot serve as the Institutional Deciding Official and the Research Integrity Officer

15. Institutional member. Institutional member and members means an individual (or individuals) who is employed by, is an agent of, or is affiliated by contract or agreement with an institution. Institutional members may include, but are not limited to, officials, tenured and untenured faculty, teaching and support staff, researchers, research coordinators, technicians, postdoctoral and other fellows, students, volunteers, subject matter experts, consultants, or attorneys, or employees or agents of contractors, subcontractors, or sub-awardees.

16. Institutional record. The institutional record comprises: (a) The records that the institution compiled or generated during the research misconduct proceeding, except records the institution did not consider or rely on. These records include but are not limited to (1) documentation of the assessment as required by § 93.306(c); (2) if an inquiry is conducted, the inquiry report and all records (other than drafts of the report) considered or relied on during the inquiry, including, but not limited to, research records and the transcripts of any transcribed interviews conducted during the inquiry, information the respondent provided to the institution, and the documentation of any decision not to investigate as required by § 93.309(c); (3) if an investigation is conducted, the investigation report and all records (other than drafts of the report) considered or relied on during the investigation, including, but not limited to, research records, the transcripts of each interview conducted pursuant to § 93.310(g), and information the respondent provided to the institution; (4) decision(s) by the Institutional Deciding Official, such as the written decision from the Institutional Deciding Official under § 93.314; (5) the complete record of any institutional appeal consistent with § 93.315; (b) a single index listing all the research records and evidence that the institution compiled during the research misconduct proceeding, except records the institution did not consider or rely on; and (c) a general description of the records that were sequestered but not considered or relied on.

17. Intentionally. To act intentionally means to act with the aim of carrying out the act.30 Investigation. Investigation means the formal development of a factual record and the examination of that record that meets the criteria and follows the procedures of §§ 93.310 through 93.317.31 .

~~Inquiry Committee means the committee consisting of two or more members of the faculty, together with such technical, administrative, or other staff as may be deemed appropriate, who are appointed by the Provost to conduct the Inquiry of an Allegation.~~

18. 10. Investigation means the formal development, examination, and evaluation of a factual record to determine whether Research Misconduct has taken place, to assess its extent and consequences, and to evaluate appropriate action.

19. 11. Investigation Committee means the committee consisting of at least three members of University staff and tenured faculty at any School actively involved in research in the same field as the Respondent or a related field who are appointed by the Provost to investigate charges of Research Misconduct against faculty, staff, post-doctoral associates, and/or students.

20. Knowingly. To act knowingly means to act with awareness of the act.

1221. *Legal Affairs Designee* means the individual at the University designated by the President to deal with legal issues at the University in conjunction with the CSU Office of the General Counsel.

22. 13. Plagiarism means the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. -(a) Plagiarism includes the unattributed verbatim or nearly verbatim copying of sentences and paragraphs from another's work that materially misleads the reader regarding the contributions of the author. It does not include the limited use of identical or nearly identical phrases that describe a commonly used methodology. (b) Plagiarism does not include self-plagiarism or authorship or credit disputes, including disputes among former collaborators who participated jointly in the development or conduct of a research project. Self-plagiarism and authorship disputes do not meet the definition of research misconduct.

23. 14. Policy means this Policy regarding the Disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct.

2415. Preponderance of the Evidence *Preponderance of the evidence means proof by evidence that, compared with evidence opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more likely true than not.* ~~means proof by information that, compared with that opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more probably true than not.~~

25. PHS support. PHS support means PHS funding, or applications or proposals for PHS funding, for biomedical or behavioral research, biomedical or behavioral research training, or activities related to that research or training, that may be provided through funding for PHS intramural research; PHS grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts; subawards, contracts, or subcontracts under those PHS funding instruments; or salary or other payments under PHS grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts.

26. Recklessly. To act recklessly means to propose, perform, or review research, or report research results, with indifference to a known risk of fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism.

27 16. Research Integrity Officer ("RIO") means the official designated by the Provost to be responsible for receiving Allegations of Research Misconduct, determining whether such Allegations warrant Inquiries, supporting the Inquiry Committee, receiving the Inquiry reports, recommending to the Provost whether or not Investigations are warranted, and assisting in the investigations by the Investigation Committee. The RIO must be an administrator or tenured faculty member at the University with experience in research and will be provided appropriate training to carry out his or her responsibilities under this Policy. For PHS funded projects the Institutional official responsible for administering the institution's written policies and

[procedures for addressing allegations of research misconduct in compliance with 42 CFR Part 93.](#)

[28.17. Research Misconduct](#) means Fabrication, Falsification, or Plagiarism in proposing or performing research, reviewing research, or in reporting research results when these acts involve a person who, at the time of the alleged misconduct, was employed by, was an agent of, or was affiliated by contract or agreement with CSUB. Research Misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion. A finding of Research Misconduct made under this Policy requires that: (a) there be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; (b) the misconduct be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and (c) the Allegation be proven by a Preponderance of the Evidence.

[29.18. Research Misconduct Proceeding](#) means any action related to alleged Research Misconduct taken under this Policy, including but not limited to, determinations of whether or not an Inquiry is warranted, Inquiries, Investigations, and regulatory agency or research sponsor oversight reviews, hearings, and administrative appeals. [For PHS funded projects, Research misconduct proceeding means any actions related to alleged research misconduct taken under 42 CFR Part 93, including allegation assessments, inquiries, investigations, ORI oversight reviews, and appeals under subpart E of 42 CFR Part 93.39.](#)

[30.19. Research Record](#) ~~means the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from a research inquiry, including, but not limited to, research proposals, laboratory records, both physical and electronic, progress reports, abstracts, theses, oral presentations, internal reports, journal articles, and any documents and materials provided in the course of a Research Misconduct Proceeding.~~ [Research record means the record of data or results that embody the facts resulting from scientific inquiry. Data or results may be in physical or electronic form. Examples of items, materials, or information that may be considered part of the research record include, but are not limited to, research proposals, raw data, processed data, clinical research records, laboratory records, study records, laboratory notebooks, progress reports, manuscripts, abstracts, theses, records of oral presentations, online content, lab meeting reports, and journal articles.](#)

[31.20. Respondent](#) means the person against whom an Allegation of Research Misconduct is directed or who is the subject of a Research Misconduct Proceeding.

[32.21. Retaliation](#) means an adverse action taken against a Complainant, witness, or other participant in a Research Misconduct Proceeding in response to (a) a good faith Allegation of Research Misconduct, or (b) good faith cooperation with a Research Misconduct Proceeding.

[33.22. School](#) means an educational unit of the University, including all research centers and institutes.

[Small institution. Small institution means an institution that may be too small to conduct an inquiry or investigation into an allegation of research misconduct as required by 42 CFR Part 93](#)

[without actual or apparent conflicts of interest.](#)

[34. Suspension and Debarment Official. Suspension and Debarment Official or SDO means the HHS official authorized to impose suspension and debarment, which are the actions that Federal agencies take to disqualify persons deemed not presently responsible from doing business with the Federal Government.](#)

[35. 23. University](#) means the California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB), including the CSUB Auxiliary for Sponsored Program Administration, and the CSUB Foundation.

IV. Statement of Policy

It is the policy of the California State University, Bakersfield, that all research and/or scholarly activity conducted by members of the University community adhere to the highest attainable ethical and moral standards, and comply with federal and other government regulations, and guidelines required by external sponsors, governing the disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct.

V. Statement of Requirements

- A. **Accountability:** The administration, faculty, students, and staff of the University share responsibility for promoting and preserving the integrity of research and scholarly activity, and for holding members of the University community accountable to this policy. Such accountability requires that there be appropriate University procedures by which allegations of misconduct in research and scholarly activity may be fairly and thoroughly examined to expose and correct misconduct, and to protect the researcher, scholar, and other members of the University community against false charges. It also requires that such procedures contain appropriate measures to protect from reprisal those individuals who, in good faith, wish to bring forward evidence of improper conduct, ensuring that all allegations of research misconduct will be reviewed fairly and accurately, and ensuring that scholarship and research performed under the auspices of CSUB meet the standards of academic integrity and truth expected by the academic community. [For PHS funded projects, the institution will respond to each allegation of research misconduct under 42 CFR Part 93 in a thorough, competent, objective, and fair manner. The Institution will take all reasonable and practical steps to ensure the cooperation of respondents and other institutional members with research misconduct proceedings, including, but not limited to, their providing information, research records, and other evidence. The institution agrees to cooperate with ORI during any research misconduct proceeding or compliance review, including addressing deficiencies or additional allegations in the institutional record if directed by ORI and to assist in administering and enforcing any HHS administrative actions imposed on](#)

[institutional members. The institution may also take steps to manage published data or acknowledge that data may be unreliable.](#)

B. **Applicability:** This Policy establishes the procedures to be followed by the University in responding to any Allegation that University faculty, staff, post-doctoral associates, and/or students, whether paid by the University or through other funding sources, may have engaged in Research Misconduct. It will be used, at the discretion of the Provost, to respond to any Allegation of Research Misconduct. It applies to all research and scholarly activity conducted by University faculty, staff, post-doctoral associates, and/or students, regardless of the academic discipline of the researcher or the sponsorship or source of support for the research. This Policy does not supersede or establish an alternative to any existing University or governmental regulations, procedures, or policies regarding fiscal improprieties, conflicts of interest, ethical treatment of human or animal subjects, or criminal matters, all of which remain in effect.

This policy, and the procedures established pursuant to it, do not apply to (a) authorship or credit disputes; (b) conduct which deviates from institutional or governmental standards to protect the safety and well-being of human subjects, animals, or the laboratory work environment; (c) scholarship or research performed by a student for academic credit while not working on a project funded by an external research sponsor and not otherwise engaged to perform services for the University; or (d) misuse of funds dedicated to support research or scholarship.

C. **Public Health Service (PHS) Requirements:** When the procedures established through this policy are being used to carry out CSUB's responsibilities under the PHS regulations, they apply only in the following situations:

- (1) PHS-supported biomedical or behavioral research, research training or activities related to that research or research training, such as the operation of tissue and data banks and the dissemination of research information;
- (2) applications or proposals for PHS support for biomedical or behavioral research, research training or activities related to that research or research training; or
- (3) plagiarism of research records produced in the course of PHS-supported research, research training, or activities related to that research or research training. This includes any research proposed, performed, reviewed, or reported, or any research record generated from that research, regardless of whether an application or proposal for PHS funds resulted in a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other form of PHS support.

- Further, these procedures apply only to Research Misconduct alleged to have occurred within six (6) years of the date CSUB receives an allegation, except to the extent the respondent continues or renews any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred

before the six-year limitation (for example, through citation, republication or reuse of the research record), or if it is determined that the alleged misconduct could have a substantial adverse effect on the health or safety of the public. [For PHS funded projects, the six-year time limitation does not apply if the respondent continues or renews any incident of alleged research misconduct that occurred before the six-year period through the use of, republication of, or citation to the portion\(s\) of the research record alleged to have been fabricated, falsified, or plagiarized, for the potential benefit of the respondent \(“subsequent use exception”\). For alleged research misconduct that appears subject to this subsequent use exception, but CSUB determines is not subject to the exception, the institution will document its determination that the subsequent use exception does not apply and will retain this documentation for the later of seven years after completion of the institutional proceeding or the completion of any HHS proceeding.](#)

- [The six-year time limitation also does not apply if ORI or CSUB, following consultation with ORI, determines that the alleged research misconduct, if it occurred, would possibly have a substantial adverse effect on the health or safety of the public.](#)
- [These policies and procedures do not supersede or establish an alternative to the PHS regulation or any existing regulations for handling research misconduct involving non-PHS supported research. They do not replace the PHS regulation, and in case of any conflict between this document and 42 CFR Part 93, the PHS regulation will prevail. They are intended to enable CSUB to comply with the requirements of the PHS regulation.](#)

D. Responsibility to Report Misconduct: All members of the CSUB community have the responsibility to report observed, suspected, or apparent research misconduct to the RIO. Any other University official who receives an allegation of research misconduct must report it immediately to the RIO. Reports may be made to the RIO by telephone, electronic means, writing in hard-copy, or in-person meeting.

Individuals from outside the University (including other scientists, journal editors, or research subjects) should also report to the RIO any allegations of research misconduct involving persons employed by or affiliated with CSUB.

E. Prohibition of Retaliation for Reporting in Good Faith: Allegations should not be made capriciously, but evidence of misconduct should not be ignored. An individual with information indicating misconduct in scholarship or research should be able to report in good faith such allegations without retribution. This policy prohibits retaliation by the University or one of its members against a complainant because of his or her good faith reporting of an allegation or involvement in an inquiry or investigation. Members of the CSUB community should immediately report any alleged or apparent retaliation to the RIO. Conversely, an individual who makes an allegation that is not in good faith may be referred to the Provost for administrative action.

F. Confidentiality: Because of the potential jeopardy to the reputation of the individual(s) against whom allegations of misconduct have been made, the reporting of allegations and the following procedures for investigating them should be handled with care to

avoid unnecessary disclosure of the identity of respondents, complainants, and research subjects to the maximum extent consistent with the obligations of the University to the academic and scientific community and to any sponsors and external institutions that have provided support for the research.

- G. **Disclosure of Complainant's Identity:** The RIO may disclose the identity of the complainant to the respondent *if* such disclosure is necessary in order for the respondent to be able to defend him- or herself against the charges. Therefore, if a potential complainant wishes to have confidential discussions and consultations about concerns of possible misconduct with an assurance of complete confidentiality, he/she is encouraged to speak with the University Ombudsperson, who does not act as an agent for the University and who can provide confidential informal advice to the potential complainant about options for reporting. All contacts, records and communication with Ombudsperson are confidential within State laws and CSU policies. See [Ombudsperson | California State University, Bakersfield](http://www.csu.edu/counselingcenter/ombudsman/)
<http://www.csu.edu/counselingcenter/ombudsman/>.
- H. **Cooperation with Research Misconduct Proceedings:** Members of the CSUB community will cooperate with the RIO and other institutional officials in the review of allegations and in the conduct of Inquiries and Investigations. Institutional members, including respondents, have an obligation to provide evidence relevant to Research Misconduct Allegations to the RIO or other institutional officials.
- I. **Interim Administrative Actions and Notifications:** Throughout the research misconduct proceeding, the RIO will review the situation to determine if there is any threat of harm to public health, funds and equipment, or the integrity of the research process. In the event of such a threat, the RIO will, in consultation with the Provost, other institutional officials, and the appropriate funding agency, take appropriate interim action to protect against any such threat. Interim action might include additional monitoring of the research process and the handling of funds and equipment, reassignment of personnel or of the responsibility for the handling of funds and equipment, additional review of research data and results or delaying publication. The RIO in consultation with the Provost shall, at any time during a research misconduct proceeding, notify the appropriate funding agency immediately if he/she has reason to believe that any of the following conditions exists:
- Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect human or animal subjects;
 - Funding agency resources or interests are threatened;
 - Research activities should be suspended;
 - There is a reasonable indication of possible violations of civil or criminal law;
 - Funding agency action is required to protect the interests of those involved in the research misconduct proceeding;

- The research misconduct proceeding may be made public prematurely and agency action may be necessary to safeguard evidence and protect the rights of those involved; or

- The research community or public should be informed.

J. **Restoration of the Respondent's Reputation:** If at the end of an investigation, misconduct has not been found, any necessary efforts will be made by the RIO or the Provost, as appropriate, to restore the reputations of individual(s) alleged to have engaged in misconduct.

K. **Determination of Personnel Action:** If at the end of an investigation, misconduct has been found, the Provost in consultation with the University's Legal Affairs Designee, will make a determination of appropriate personnel action to be taken. Appropriate personnel action, including discipline, is governed by California law, university policies, and applicable collective bargaining agreements.

VI. Statement of Procedures

In implementing the processes and procedures established pursuant to this policy, the University and each review committee shall maintain a clear distinction between Inquiry and Investigation: An Inquiry is intended to be a preliminary process leading to a decision that there are, or are not, sufficient grounds to conduct an Investigation. An Investigation is the process that may result in a finding of misconduct.

Consistent with the provisions of this Policy, CSUB's procedure for responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct will consist of at least three distinct phases:

1. **Allegation.** When an Allegation is received, the RIO assesses whether the allegation falls under the definition of Research Misconduct and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified. If these criteria are met, the Provost will establish and charge an Inquiry Committee. The RIO will oversee the sequestration of original documents and materials if necessary to protect the integrity of the proceedings.

2. **Inquiry.** The Inquiry Committee determines whether the Allegation of misconduct provides a sufficient basis to warrant conducting an Investigation. The outcome of an Inquiry is not a finding of guilt, but is a finding that the grounds to proceed to an investigation are either present or absent. The Inquiry Committee will submit a written report of its findings to the RIO, as specified in the University's *Procedure for the Disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct*.

3. **Investigation.** An Investigation is a more exhaustive review of the Allegation: the outcome of an Investigation may be a finding by the University that a researcher is guilty of misconduct and that sanctions are in order, or that a researcher is not guilty of misconduct. If the outcome of an Inquiry is a determination that there is a basis for an Investigation, the Provost will establish and charge an Investigation Committee. Sponsors of research and editors of journals and others may have to be notified about the investigation.

Upon completion of the investigation, the Investigation Committee will submit a written report of its findings to the Provost, as specified in the University's *Procedure for the Disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct*.

The Provost, in consultation with the RIO and other University officials, will take appropriate action to respond to and dispose of the Allegation of Research Misconduct, in accordance with applicable collective bargaining agreements, CSU and governmental regulations, and other external funding agency agreements. Records of all Research Misconduct Proceedings shall be maintained by the RIO for at least seven years.

Detailed information on the procedure for responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct is available in a separate document, *Procedure for the Disposition of Allegations of Research Misconduct*, and on the GRaSP website.



Required Unit RTP Criteria Elements and Guidance on Unit RTP Criteria **Revision –
Handbook Changes**

RES 252632

FAC

RESOLVED: That the Handbook sections in this resolution replace or amend sections 305.3.1, 305.3.4, 305.4.2.4, 305.4.2.5, 305.4.2.8., and 305.4.2.9.

RESOLVED: That Unit RTP Criteria shall be written and maintained in a manner that supports evaluation across the full faculty career progression, including retention, tenure, promotion, early advancement, and post-tenure review. In particular, criteria shall be written with enough clarity and specificity to support evaluation for:

1. Retention decisions of temporary faculty;
2. Retention decisions during the probationary period;
3. Tenure and promotion decisions following the normal probationary timeline (six years);
4. Post-tenure promotion following the normal time in rank (five years);
5. Early tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor;
6. Early promotion from Associate Professor to Professor; and
7. Post-tenure review.

RESOLVED: Unit RTP Criteria should be written with sufficient clarity and stability to promote consistent professional growth over time and to prevent shifting or evolving expectations during the probationary period.

RESOLVED: For the purposes of faculty evaluation and the Unit RTP or PTR Criteria, the terms “acceptable,” “satisfactory,” “meets expectations,” and “essential” may be used interchangeably to describe the minimum level of performance required in the areas of teaching or professional performance, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service. These terms reflect the baseline standards necessary for retention of temporary faculty, retention of

probationary faculty, and the award of tenure and promotion following the normal probationary period. They do not represent aspirational or exemplary levels of performance, but rather the fundamental professional expectations required for continued appointment as a faculty member. Failure to meet these standards indicates that a faculty member has not satisfied the essential professional responsibilities of the position and should result in non-retention, denial of tenure or promotion, or separation from the university consistent with applicable policies and procedures.

RESOLVED: That clarifying Unit RTP Criteria is intended to promote continued professional growth and engagement in teaching or professional performance, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service, while also supporting transparent and consistent evaluation.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate reaffirms that early tenure and promotion should be rare, but attainable when faculty demonstrate clearly defined exceptional performance.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate acknowledges that current policy prevents exceptional faculty from being considered for early tenure and/or promotion in units that lack clearly articulated criteria for exceptional performance, thereby limiting opportunities for advancement and incentives for excellence.

RESOLVED: That Unit RTP Criteria addressing scholarly or creative activity shall reflect discipline-appropriate standards of quality and integrity, including holistic evaluation practices consistent with professional norms.

RESOLVED: Units missing criteria for exceptional performance in teaching, scholarly or creative activities, and professionally related service shall revise their Unit RTP Criteria to include criteria for exceptional performance in these areas.

RESOLVED: Units missing post-tenure review criteria shall revise their Unit RTP Criteria to include post-tenure review criteria.

RESOLVED: That a detailed guide with illustrative examples be included as an attachment to this resolution to assist units in revising Unit RTP Criteria, with emphasis on defining acceptable and exceptional

performance in teaching, scholarly or creative activities, and professionally related service, and in articulating post-tenure review expectations.

RESOLVED: That the guidance document attached to this resolution is advisory in nature and intended to support units in developing discipline-appropriate criteria; it shall not be interpreted as prescriptive or restrictive.

RESOLVED: That compliance with these requirements shall be incorporated into the regular five-year review cycle of Unit RTP Criteria as described in Section 305.4.2.5.

RESOLVED: That a copy of this resolution and its attachments shall be maintained on the Faculty Affairs webpage.

RESOLVED: That a copy of the attached guidance document (“Guidance for Developing Unit RTP Criteria”) shall be included as an Appendix in the University Handbook.

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommends the Office of the Provost, Faculty Affairs, and/or the College Deans ensure that Units are in compliance with the Handbook, which states that “Unit RTP criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five (5) years.”

RESOLVED: That Unit RTP Criteria shall be maintained in a manner that preserves stable expectations for faculty within each rank while ensuring that evaluation standards remain reasonably current with evolving disciplinary norms, institutional priorities, and external accountability expectations; accordingly, the periodic review of Unit RTP Criteria and the limitations on the age of criteria used for evaluation are intended to balance fairness to individual faculty with the need for contemporary and relevant evaluation standards.

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

305.3 Promotion

305.3.1 Performance Review for Promotion of Faculty

Promotion is the advancement of a probationary or tenured faculty who holds a teaching faculty, librarian, or counselor rank to a higher rank. Faculty shall be subject to a performance review for the purpose of being awarded promotion, pursuant to the performance review provisions in Section 305.5.

Elapsed time or number of years in rank will not of itself constitute reason for or against promotion, and a faculty's performance may be judged **acceptable or** satisfactory for a given rank without necessarily warranting promotion to a higher rank.

305.3.2 Promotion of Probationary Faculty

Probationary faculty shall be considered for promotion at the same time they are reviewed for tenure. Probationary faculty shall not ordinarily be promoted before the end of the normal six (6)-year probationary period. Probationary faculty shall not be promoted beyond the rank of associate professor.

305.3.3 Promotion of Tenured Faculty

Promotion of tenured faculty shall ordinarily occur at the beginning of the sixth year after appointment to their current rank or classification. Promotion of tenured faculty occurs within the following guidelines and restrictions.

- a. Tenured faculty wishing to undergo review for promotion shall notify the Office of the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA) in writing by November 1 of their intention to undergo performance review for the purpose of promotion during the Fall review. Tenured faculty who do not notify the Office of the P&VPAA by that date will be ineligible to undergo review for promotion that year.
- b. The performance review for promotion purposes occurs in the Fall review during the academic year in which the tenured faculty requests the review for promotion.

305.3.4 Early Promotion of Probationary and Tenured Faculty

The President may promote probationary faculty before the end of the normal six (6)-year probationary period or in the case of tenured faculty before the lapse of six years since the initial promotion. Early promotion should be rare and occurs only if faculty have compiled a record of discipline-specific exceptional performance while at California State University, Bakersfield in teaching (or the equivalent in the case of librarians and counselors), scholarly/creative activities, and in ~~professionally-related~~ **professionally related** service.

- a. Well defined and specific departmental expectations for the level of “exceptional” performance in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service shall be included in the unit RTP criteria. These criteria shall significantly exceed the typical criteria and shall be of significant rigor that most faculty within the unit who qualify for promotion and/or tenure would not meet exceptional criteria for early promotion and/or tenure. Such criteria shall be regularly reviewed by the unit.
- b. Early tenure and/or promotion of probationary and early promotion of tenured faculty should be a rare event. **Eligibility for early promotion shall not be based on a minimum number of years in rank, but on demonstrated exceptional performance.** The request for early tenure and/or promotion may be initiated either by the probationary faculty member or by the department unit committee. ~~If the request is initiated by the probationary faculty member such request may not occur before the fourth year of the ordinary six-year probationary period. Requests initiated by the unit committee are under no such restriction.~~ In either case the candidate and/or the unit committee must document how the faculty member meets the department’s elaborated definition of “exceptional” performance.
- c. If no criteria for “exceptional” performance for early tenure and/or promotion exists within unit RTP criteria, then requests for early promotion and/or tenure shall not be considered.

305.4.2.4 Unit RTP Criteria

Units may have different perspectives, priorities, or procedures in evaluating the performance or estimating the promise of their members. Without altering the scope of the three areas in 305.4.2.1, 305.4.2.2, and 305.4.2.3 above, units shall interpret and elaborate the three areas in order to assess the level and quality of a unit member’s performance. The unit RTP criteria shall be used at all levels of review for a given faculty.

~~Faculty under consideration for retention, tenure, and promotion shall have the option of a performance review under either the unit RTP criteria operative at the time of their hiring or under any subsequent revision of the unit RTP criteria during the probationary period.~~

A. Faculty undergoing retention, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review shall normally be evaluated under the Unit RTP Criteria in effect at the beginning of their appointment in their current rank.

1. Probationary Faculty

- i. **For faculty in the probationary period, the applicable Unit RTP Criteria shall normally be those in effect at the**

time of the initial probationary appointment, unless the faculty member elects in writing to be evaluated under a subsequent revision adopted during the probationary period.

2. Election of Subsequently Revised Criteria

- i. A faculty member may elect in writing to be evaluated under any subsequent revision of the Unit RTP Criteria adopted during their appointment in that rank.

3. Currency of Unit RTP Criteria

- i. Faculty outside of the probationary period may use the Unit RTP Criteria in effect at the time of their most recent promotion in rank for up to seven (7) years in that rank, and shall not be required to adopt revised criteria prior to the completion of that period.
- ii. After seven (7) years from the faculty member's most recent promotion in rank, subsequent reviews shall use Unit RTP Criteria that were approved and in effect at the time of the faculty member's most recent review.
- iii. This provision (i.e., currency of Unit RTP Criteria) shall go into effect in the 2026-2027 academic year and shall apply prospectively. For faculty in rank as of the effective date, the seven (7) year period described above shall be measured prospectively from that date, and such faculty shall not be required to adopt revised Unit RTP Criteria prior to the completion of that period.

4. Purpose

- i. These provisions are intended to preserve stable expectations for faculty within each rank, while also ensuring that evaluation standards remain reasonably current with evolving disciplinary norms, institutional priorities, and external accountability expectations.

B. For each of the three areas outlined in sections 305.4.2.1, 305.4.2.2, and 305.4.2.3, as applicable, units shall define criteria for (a) acceptable/satisfactory performance and (b) exceptional performance.

1. Acceptable or satisfactory performance shall be required for the award of tenure and promotion of an assistant professor to the rank associate professor, and for the promotion of an associate professors to the rank of professor.

2. Exceptional performance in the areas outlined in 305.4.2.1, 305.4.2.2., and 305.4.2.3, as applicable, shall be required for early tenure and promotion of probationary faculty or early promotion of tenured faculty (see 305.3.4).

C. Unit RTP Criteria shall be written with enough clarity and specificity to support evaluation for:

1. Retention decisions of temporary faculty;
2. Retention decisions during the probationary period;
3. Tenure and promotion decisions following the normal probationary timeline (six years);
4. Post-tenure promotion following the normal time in rank (five years);
5. Early tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor;
6. Early promotion from Associate Professor to Professor; and
7. Post-tenure review.

To be retained during the probationary period, a faculty member is required to demonstrate progress toward tenure such that a positive tenure decision is likely.

D. Each unit shall define (a) criteria for tenure and promotion from assistant professor to associate professor (or equivalent ranks for counselors and librarians), and (b) promotion from associate professor to professor (or equivalent ranks for counselors and librarians).

Further each unit shall define (c) criteria for early tenure and promotion from assistant professor to associate professor (or equivalent ranks for counselors and librarians), and (d) criteria for early promotion from associate professor to professor (or equivalent ranks for counselors and librarians).

E. Post-tenure review is critical for maintaining and improving a tenured faculty member's effectiveness (see 306.3). Therefore, each unit shall include clearly articulated criteria for post-tenure review. These criteria should reflect the ongoing professional expectations of tenured faculty, including continued effectiveness in teaching and meaningful engagement in professionally related service.

Tenured faculty are also expected to maintain meaningful engagement in scholarly or creative activity appropriate to their discipline, rank, and assignment. Consistent with University policy on faculty workload and professional responsibilities, such engagement shall be understood as participation in the ongoing scholarly or creative process rather than as a requirement to produce specific outputs within a fixed period of time.

For post-tenure review conducted in the absence of an application for promotion, evaluations shall focus on acceptable performance in teaching or professional performance and service, and on evidence of continued professional engagement across all areas of responsibility. Scholarly or creative activity shall be evaluated in a developmental and contextual manner, recognizing that contributions may take a variety of forms and may occur across extended timelines.

Engagement in scholarly or creative activity is expected for all tenured faculty; however, the absence of specific scholarly or creative outputs within a given review period shall not, in itself, constitute unsatisfactory performance for post-tenure review.

- F. Unit RTP criteria shall be sufficiently clear and specific to provide faculty, particularly those in the probationary period, with stable and transparent expectations that guide professional development over time. Criteria should support progressive growth and improvement and should not function in a manner that effectively alters performance expectations during an ongoing probationary period.**

Unit criteria should recognize that excellence across teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service represents the strongest case for advancement and professional distinction, and should not be structured in a way that allows for sustained neglect of any of these core areas of faculty responsibility.

305.4.2.5 Revision of Unit RTP Criteria

Unit RTP criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Any faculty may propose changes in unit RTP criteria at any time. **As part of this review, Unit RTP criteria may be revised and updated as appropriate, or formally reaffirmed to indicate continued alignment with disciplinary norms, institutional priorities, and existing policy.**

After approval by a majority vote of all tenured and probationary faculty, changes in the unit RTP criteria shall be forwarded to the ~~school dean~~ **college dean** and the P&VPAA **for review for alignment with the Collective Bargaining Agreement and University Handbook**. Revised RTP criteria cannot apply to an RTP cycle already underway.

Given the critical importance of the RTP process, the P&VPAA, ~~school~~ **college** deans, and units are encouraged to make every attempt to resolve amicably any differences of opinion concerning the proposed criteria. In the event that the differences cannot be resolved, the P&VPAA shall request the University Review Committee to arbitrate and to determine a resolution.

305.4.2.8 Evaluation of Scholarly or Creative Activity

Candidates for tenure or promotion shall demonstrate substantive and sustained contributions to knowledge in the discipline. Candidates for tenure **and promotion** shall demonstrate these contributions via works that have received favorable peer review from individuals outside of CSUB.

In all instances, quality of work shall be considered the primary criterion for evaluating scholarly or creative activity.

Scholarly and creative activity is a core professional expectation of tenure-track and tenured faculty. Unit RTP criteria shall recognize that sustained engagement in scholarship or creative work is essential to maintaining disciplinary expertise, supporting teaching effectiveness, and contributing to the mission of the University. Criteria should encourage continued contributions while recognizing that scholarly activity may take multiple forms across career stages.

Scholarly and creative activity should not be displaced by service commitments or administrative responsibilities, and units should structure expectations to ensure that faculty are supported in maintaining active intellectual engagement appropriate to rank, assignment, and discipline.

Scholarly and creative activity may include a wide range of contributions beyond traditional peer-reviewed works, including but not limited to mentorship of student research and creative projects, applied scholarship, professional engagement, and other discipline-relevant intellectual contributions.

305.4.2.9 Evaluation of ~~Professionally-Related~~ Professionally Related Service

Faculty members shall prioritize their activities so service does not interfere significantly with teaching or scholarly or creative activity. Faculty members shall document active service to the department that includes, at a minimum, collaborative participation in department decision making.

Service expectations shall be appropriate to rank, experience, and assignment, recognizing that early-career faculty may have more limited service responsibilities while developing their teaching and scholarly profiles.

Associate Professors and Professors shall document significant and sustained service to multiple areas, including the school (if applicable), the college, the university, the university system, a professional association, and the community. As faculty advance in rank, service contributions are expected to reflect increasing leadership, responsibility, or broader institutional and professional engagement.

Professionally related service is a core professional responsibility and shall be evaluated as a cumulative body of work over time rather than as a uniform annual obligation. Unit RTP criteria should recognize both acceptable and exceptional service contributions while ensuring that expectations for service, teaching, and scholarly or creative activity remain appropriately balanced.

~~Associate Professors and Professors shall also document significant and sustained service to two or more of the following: the school, the university, the university system, a professional association, or the community.~~

The department or equivalent unit criteria shall determine whether service learning, if included, is evaluated as teaching or as service.

Service expectations should be structured in a manner that encourages sustained participation while maintaining balance across teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service responsibilities.

Appendix G: CONTENTS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE RTP FILE (WPAF)

F. Current Unit RTP Criteria

- 1) After consultation with the Department /Program Chair or Director, the faculty shall place in the file a copy of the unit RTP criteria being used for the current RTP cycle.
- 2) ~~The unit RTP criteria may be those in effect at the time the faculty was hired or any subsequent revision, including those in effect at the beginning of the current RTP review cycle. The faculty has the responsibility and authority to make the choice.~~
- 3) **The Unit RTP Criteria used for evaluation shall normally be those in effect at the beginning of the faculty member's appointment in their current rank. The faculty member may elect in writing to be evaluated under any subsequent revision of the Unit RTP Criteria adopted during their appointment in that rank. Faculty outside of the probationary period may use the Unit RTP Criteria in effect at the time of their most recent promotion in rank for up to seven (7) years in that rank and shall not be required to adopt revised criteria prior to the completion of that period. After seven (7) years from the faculty member's most recent promotion in rank, subsequent reviews shall use Unit RTP Criteria that were approved and in effect at the time of the faculty member's most recent review. Unit RTP Criteria shall not be applied in a manner that alters evaluation expectations within an established review cycle.**
- 2) The unit RTP criteria in the RTP file shall be used by all levels of review for that RTP review cycle.

RATIONALE:

This resolution responds directly to Academic Senate Referral #32, which requested that the Faculty Affairs Committee review and clarify Handbook language related to Unit RTP Criteria, Periodic Evaluation, and Post-Tenure Review, including the development of clearer definitions of “exceptional” performance for early promotion and the creation of a checklist to assist units in revising their criteria. This resolution also partially responds to Referral #43, which calls for review of RSCA reports. The 2025 FAC-4-RSCA Report on Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity recommends rigorous maintenance of requirements for scholarship and creative activities, as well as “clear language in the handbook” about “predatory, for-profit, vanity, and self-publish options” (pp. 27-28).

This resolution responds to an updated, revised version of referral #32 that indicated that the Faculty Affairs Committee should review the issue of currency and applicability of Unit RTP Criteria.

The retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review processes serve not only as evaluative mechanisms but also as developmental structures intended to support continued professional growth and engagement across the full span of a faculty career. Faculty are expected to remain actively engaged in teaching or professional performance, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service, and Unit RTP Criteria play a central role in defining expectations in ways that are discipline-appropriate, transparent, and equitable.

This resolution creates Handbook language and guidance on retention decisions of probationary faculty, such that “to be retained during the probationary period, a faculty member is required to demonstrate progress toward tenure such that a positive tenure decision is likely”. We acknowledge CSU Channel Islands for this language (CSU Channel Islands, Policy SP 17-08, Effective Fall 2018, <https://policy.csuci.edu/sp/17/sp-17-08.htm>)

This resolution strengthens existing Handbook language by ensuring that Unit RTP Criteria clearly articulate expectations for acceptable and exceptional performance in all three areas of evaluation, including criteria for early promotion and post-tenure review. The intent is not to standardize disciplinary standards, but to ensure that units provide sufficient clarity to support consistent, informed, and fair evaluation across all stages of review, including retention decisions, tenure and promotion following the normal probationary timeline, early advancement based on exceptional performance, post-tenure promotion, and post-tenure review.

The RTP process is intended to encourage sustained professional growth and meaningful engagement over time. Teaching effectiveness, scholarly or creative contributions, and professionally related service are not static expectations limited to early career stages; rather, they represent continuing professional responsibilities that evolve across career trajectories. Clear unit criteria help faculty understand how to develop their work in ways that align with disciplinary norms and institutional expectations; while also helping review committees and administrators make thoughtful, contextualized judgments.

Clear and stable unit criteria are particularly important during the probationary period. Faculty must be able to rely on articulated standards when planning their teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service commitments. When criteria lack clarity or appear to shift during the probationary period, faculty may experience uncertainty that undermines professional planning and development. By encouraging units to articulate expectations with sufficient specificity and stability, this resolution promotes fairness, transparency, and consistent growth rather than ad hoc or evolving standards.

The addition of guidance encouraging holistic evaluation of scholarship, recognition of diverse scholarly and creative contributions, and alignment with principles such as those articulated in the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment supports a more nuanced and discipline-sensitive approach to evaluating scholarly impact. At the same time, emphasizing balanced engagement across teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service reinforces the principle that excellence in faculty work is strongest when it reflects meaningful contributions across multiple areas.

Similarly, the inclusion of post-tenure review criteria within Unit RTP documents helps ensure that expectations for continued engagement remain transparent and developmental rather than episodic or unclear. Post-tenure review is intended to support continued effectiveness and professional vitality, not to impose rigid productivity models. Recognizing that scholarly and creative activity may take different forms over time helps units evaluate faculty contributions in context while still maintaining expectations for continued professional involvement.

This resolution is also intentionally aligned with Academic Senate Resolution 252633 on Faculty Workload Clarification. That resolution distinguishes between ongoing engagement in research, scholarship, and creative activity and the production of specific scholarly outputs within fixed time periods. The revisions to post-tenure review language in this policy reflect that distinction by affirming that tenured faculty are expected to remain meaningfully engaged in scholarly or creative activity, while recognizing that such engagement

may occur across extended timelines and should not be reduced to rigid productivity expectations. This alignment helps ensure consistency across University policy, reinforces the developmental purpose of post-tenure review, and supports equitable and discipline-appropriate evaluation practices.

Concisely, a tenured faculty member without peer-reviewed RSCA outputs (as defined by Unit RTP Criteria) should not expect to be promoted to the next rank (e.g., Associate Professor to Professor).

Additionally, the University Handbook and Collective Bargaining Agreement make it clear that engagement in RSCA (e.g., development of scholarly or creative projects; data collection, analysis, and interpretation; preparation or revision of manuscripts or creative works; submission of grant or fellowship proposals; presentation of work at professional conferences; mentorship of student research or creative activity; and participation in scholarly or professional communities) is an expectation of all tenure-track and tenured faculty. Consistent failure to engage in RSCA is not aligned with professional expectations, including expectations for post-tenure review. However, if promotion is not considered, the absence of specific scholarly outputs within a given review period, in and of itself, does not constitute a failure to meet post-tenure review expectations.

Maintaining currency of the RTP criteria is essential. The University Handbook indicates that “Unit RTP criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five (5) years”, reflecting the expectation that evaluation standards evolve over time in response to disciplinary developments, institutional priorities, and external accountability requirements. At the same time, faculty members seeking tenure and promotion must be able to rely on stable and predictable expectations during the periods in which they are evaluated. In particular, the criteria governing evaluation should not be changed once a faculty member has entered the probationary period or begun serving in rank as an Associate Professor (or equivalent) in a way that alters the expectations under which their work is evaluated. In other words, the rules governing evaluation should not be changed once the faculty member is already “in the game.”

These two principles—protecting fairness and stability for individual faculty while maintaining reasonably current evaluation standards—can come into tension if older criteria remain in effect for long periods of time (for example, eight years or more). When such tension arises, the fairness and integrity of the evaluation process should be prioritized. At the same time, policy mechanisms such as periodic review of Unit RTP Criteria and reasonable limits on the age of criteria used for evaluation can help ensure that institutional standards remain current without altering expectations mid-career stage.

Maintaining reasonably current RTP criteria is particularly important when academic programs undergo external accreditation or periodic program review. Accrediting bodies often update expectations regarding assessment practices, scholarly engagement, professional qualifications, or community impact. For example, if a program’s accreditor introduces new expectations related to evidence-based practice, inclusive pedagogy, or student learning assessment, the unit may revise its RTP criteria to reflect those standards. Without a mechanism to ensure that evaluation criteria remain reasonably current, faculty members could potentially seek promotion under guidelines adopted long before those accreditation expectations were incorporated into the program’s standards. Establishing a limited sunset period—such as seven years—helps ensure that RTP criteria used for evaluation remain aligned with contemporary professional expectations while preserving fairness and stability within each rank.

Maintaining reasonably current criteria also supports equity and consistency across faculty cohorts. When evaluation criteria remain in effect for very long periods of time, situations may arise in which faculty members are evaluated under substantially different expectations than those applied to earlier generations of faculty in the same unit. Establishing reasonable limits on the age of RTP criteria helps ensure that expectations for advancement remain broadly comparable across cohorts and that faculty participate in evaluation processes under standards that reflect contemporary disciplinary and institutional expectations.

Further, establishing a sunset period may encourage tenured faculty to strive for and achieve promotion within a seven-year period. Current Handbook language indicates that “promotion of tenured faculty shall ordinarily occur at the beginning of the sixth year after appointment to their current rank or classification” (section 305.3.3), indicating that this is a normative expectation.

An illustrative example helps clarify how these provisions operate in practice.

- A faculty member hired as an Assistant Professor in Fall 2020 would normally be evaluated for retention and tenure under the Unit RTP Criteria in effect at the time of hire, ensuring that expectations remain stable throughout the probationary period. If that faculty member earns tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in AY 2026–2027, the applicable criteria would reset to those in effect at the beginning of their appointment as Associate Professor.
- If the department later revises its Unit RTP Criteria, the faculty member may elect to be evaluated under those revisions. When applying for promotion to Professor, the faculty member may not rely on criteria that are more than seven years older than the RTP cycle in which the review occurs.

This approach preserves stable expectations within each career stage while ensuring that Unit RTP Criteria remain reasonably current over time.

Overall, this resolution is designed to strengthen clarity, transparency, and consistency while preserving disciplinary autonomy. By encouraging units to articulate expectations more clearly, this policy supports faculty in planning their professional development, supports reviewers (e.g., Unit RTP Committees, Deans, the University Review Committee, the Provost) in making informed evaluations, and reinforces accountability structures that promote continued growth, engagement, and excellence across the academic career.

Attachments: Guidance for Developing Unit RTP Criteria

Distribution List:

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

Approved by the Academic Senate: March 26, 2026
Sent to the President: April 10, 2026
President Approved:

Guidance for Developing Unit RTP Criteria

Adopted by the Academic Senate on **March 26, 2026**, RES 252632

This guidance is intended to support units in developing clear, discipline-appropriate Unit RTP Criteria that define acceptable and exceptional performance across teaching or professional performance, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service. Units retain primary responsibility for determining the standards, expectations, and forms of evidence that are most appropriate to their disciplines, professional norms, institutional roles, and the standards, expectations, and resources relevant at California State University, Bakersfield.

These areas will necessarily be interpreted and adapted for non-instructional faculty, including counselors and librarians, whose primary responsibilities may center on professional performance rather than classroom teaching.

The examples provided in this document are illustrative and are intended to support reflection and development; they should not be interpreted as required elements, minimum thresholds, or restrictive definitions.

Unit RTP Criteria shall be sufficiently detailed to allow for consistent and informed evaluation across the full faculty career progression. In particular, probationary faculty should be able to rely on the published criteria as stable benchmarks for professional development throughout the probationary period. In particular, criteria should be written with enough clarity and specificity to support evaluation for:

1. Retention decisions of temporary faculty;
2. Retention decisions during the probationary period;
3. Tenure and promotion decisions following the normal probationary timeline (six years);
4. Post-tenure promotion following the normal time in rank (five years);
5. Early tenure and promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor;
6. Early promotion from Associate Professor to Professor; and
7. Post-tenure review.

Criteria should provide a clear and substantive framework for distinguishing between acceptable/satisfactory performance and exceptional performance in each of the three areas of evaluation so that faculty, review committees, and administrators have a shared understanding of expectations at each stage of review. While criteria should be sufficiently detailed to guide evaluation, units

should preserve flexibility to account for disciplinary differences, varied faculty assignments, and the evolving nature of academic work. The goal is not to create rigid formulas, but to ensure that expectations are transparent, interpretable, and applicable across the range of review processes that occur over the course of a faculty member's career.

Teaching

Unit RTP criteria should clearly describe what constitutes acceptable/satisfactory teaching and what constitutes exceptional teaching, using definitions and forms of evidence appropriate to the discipline. Because teaching is a primary function of faculty, evaluation of teaching effectiveness should rely on multiple measures that together provide a comprehensive view of a faculty member's instructional practice and contributions to student learning. Evidence of teaching effectiveness may include course design, instructional innovation, curriculum development, assessment practices, mentoring of students, and contributions to student success. Units are encouraged to consider evidence reflecting the full range of instructional environments within their disciplines, including classroom, laboratory, clinical, studio, field-based, and online contexts.

Consistent with University policy, evaluation of teaching should include review of course materials and instructional artifacts that demonstrate the structure, preparation, and intentional design of courses. Such materials may include syllabi, assignments, assessments, grading practices, instructional resources, and the alignment between learning objectives, instructional activities, and evaluation methods. Units may also consider evidence of the effective use of learning management systems and related instructional technologies to support communication, organization of course content, accessibility, and student engagement.

Student opinion of teaching, including the Student Opinion on Curriculum and Instruction (SOCI), is a required component of the evaluation process and provides useful information about the student experience in courses. However, student opinion data should be interpreted in context and considered as only one of multiple measures of teaching effectiveness. Consistent with University policy, SOCI should not be given greater weight than other measures of teaching performance, and reviewers should focus on patterns or trends across courses and review cycles rather than isolated scores or comments. Research indicates that student evaluations may be influenced by factors unrelated to instructional quality and may reflect potential biases. For this reason, Unit RTP criteria should

encourage careful and professional interpretation of SOCI data and emphasize the importance of evaluating teaching through a holistic review of multiple sources of evidence.

Additional evidence of teaching effectiveness may include peer observations of teaching, self-reflective statements about instructional practice, formative assessment of teaching and learning, and evidence of engagement with pedagogical development. Reflective statements and teaching philosophies may help reviewers understand a faculty member's instructional goals, responsiveness to feedback, and ongoing efforts to improve teaching practice. Participation in teaching workshops, learning communities, or other professional development activities may also demonstrate a sustained commitment to improving teaching effectiveness.

Examples of exceptional teaching may include sustained instructional innovation, development of new courses or programs, leadership in pedagogical initiatives, development of materials used by others, engagement in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, mentorship of student research or creative work, teaching awards, or other contributions that demonstrate a particularly strong impact on student learning or the educational mission of the unit. Units should determine which indicators of teaching effectiveness and distinction best align with disciplinary values and instructional practices. These examples are intended to illustrate possible forms of evidence rather than prescribe specific requirements.

Scholarly or Creative Activity

Unit RTP criteria should define acceptable and exceptional scholarly or creative activity in ways that are appropriate to the discipline and consistent with professional standards. Scholarship and creative activity are core professional expectations of tenure-track and tenured faculty, and unit criteria should recognize sustained engagement in intellectual and creative work as an important part of maintaining disciplinary expertise, supporting teaching effectiveness, and contributing to the mission of the University. Because the nature of scholarship varies widely across fields, units should identify the types of contributions that are most meaningful within their disciplines.

In evaluating scholarly and creative activity, units are encouraged to adopt a holistic approach that recognizes the quality, rigor, and impact of a faculty member's work rather than relying solely on journal-based metrics. Consistent with the principles

articulated in the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)¹, units should avoid using impact factors or similar journal-level metrics as the primary indicator of scholarly quality. Instead, faculty contributions should be evaluated based on the substance, influence, originality, and disciplinary relevance of the work. Both Unit RTP Criteria and individual faculty may consider emphasizing individual citation achievements (e.g., number of citations, h-index, i-10 index). Faculty should reflect on their contributions.

Holistic evaluation may include consideration of a wide range of scholarly practices and contributions, including but not limited to peer-reviewed publications, juried exhibitions, performances, applied scholarship, professional presentations, grant activity, and collaborative projects. Units are also encouraged to recognize contributions that reflect evolving standards of scholarly rigor and transparency, such as open science practices, preregistration of studies, data sharing, methodological transparency, and efforts that support reproducibility and cumulative knowledge building. These examples are intended to illustrate the range of ways faculty may contribute over the course of a career and should not be interpreted as limiting or exhaustive definitions.

Units should also recognize that mentorship of students in research and creative work, collaborative authorship, and leadership in scholarly or creative initiatives may represent meaningful scholarly engagement, particularly as faculty advance in rank and assume broader mentoring roles.

To support the integrity of scholarly evaluation, units are encouraged to develop shared, discipline-informed understandings of how to assess the credibility and quality of publication venues and other dissemination outlets. Unit RTP criteria may describe general indicators commonly recognized within the field for distinguishing reputable venues from those that engage in predatory or exploitative practices, while acknowledging that standards vary across disciplines and publication models.

Predatory publishing is characterized not by a for-profit or open access business model, but by deceptive practices, lack of meaningful peer review, absence of

¹ The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (<https://sfдора.org/read/>) recommends that institutions “be explicit about the criteria used to reach hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions, clearly highlighting, especially for early-stage investigators, that the scientific content of a paper is much more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published.” In addition, it is recommended to “consider the value and impact of all research outputs (including datasets and software) in addition to research publications, and consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.”

editorial transparency, or failure to adhere to recognized scholarly standards. Units should recognize that for-profit and open access publications are not inherently predatory, and that many highly reputable journals and publishers operate under these models.

Rather than relying solely on lists or rigid exclusions, units are encouraged to articulate discipline-appropriate criteria for evaluating venue quality, such as editorial oversight, peer review rigor, transparency of review processes, reputation within the field, affiliation with professional societies or organizations, and alignment with professional norms. The goal of such guidance is to promote informed scholarly judgment and protect faculty from unintentionally engaging with exploitative outlets, while preserving flexibility for legitimate and emerging forms of dissemination. Overall, the intent of unit criteria should be to promote high-quality, ethical, and impactful scholarly and creative work, evaluated in context and in alignment with disciplinary norms, rather than to rely on narrow metrics or uniform expectations.

Professionally Related Service

Unit RTP criteria should describe acceptable and exceptional service in ways that reflect the responsibilities and opportunities within the discipline and the institution. Professionally related service is a core professional expectation of tenure-track and tenured faculty and plays an important role in supporting shared governance, institutional functioning, and professional engagement. Units should determine what forms of service are most appropriate and meaningful in their context, recognizing that service contributions may occur at the department, college, university, system, professional, or community level.

Acceptable service may include participation in shared governance, committee work, program support, and student advising, while exceptional service may include sustained leadership roles, major institutional contributions, professional association leadership, or community engagement related to the faculty member's expertise. Units should recognize that service expectations may vary across career stages and assignments, and that service contributions often occur unevenly over time. The goal of unit criteria should be to articulate what constitutes meaningful and sustained professional engagement, while maintaining balance across teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service so that no area of faculty responsibility is consistently neglected.

Early Promotion

Unit RTP criteria should include clearly articulated descriptions of the level of exceptional performance required to support early tenure and/or early promotion. Because expectations vary significantly across disciplines, units should define what constitutes a record that substantially exceeds the normal standard for tenure or promotion. Units may consider evidence of sustained excellence across teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service; impact beyond the department or institution; or other indicators of distinction that align with disciplinary norms. The examples considered by units should reflect the culture and expectations of the field and should not be limited to a single model of achievement.

Post-Tenure Review

Unit RTP criteria should include clearly articulated criteria for post-tenure review that reflect the ongoing professional expectations of tenured faculty. These criteria should emphasize continued effectiveness in teaching and meaningful engagement in professionally related service, while recognizing that scholarly or creative activity remains an important component of a faculty member's professional profile.

Tenured faculty are expected to maintain meaningful engagement in scholarly or creative activity appropriate to their discipline, rank, and assignment. Consistent with University policy on faculty workload and professional responsibilities, such engagement should be understood as participation in the ongoing scholarly or creative process rather than as a requirement to produce specific outputs within a fixed period of time.

Evidence of scholarly or creative engagement may include a wide range of documented activities, such as development of scholarly or creative projects; preparation, revision, or submission of manuscripts or creative works; grant or fellowship activity; conference participation; collaboration; mentorship of student research or creative work; peer review or editorial activity; or other contributions appropriate to the discipline. These examples are illustrative and not exhaustive.

For post-tenure review conducted in the absence of an application for promotion, evaluation should focus on acceptable performance in teaching or professional performance and service, and on evidence of continued professional engagement across all areas of responsibility. Scholarly or creative activity should be evaluated in a developmental and contextual manner, recognizing that contributions may take different forms and may occur across extended timelines depending on disciplinary norms and career trajectory.

Units should ensure that post-tenure review criteria support continued professional growth and vitality, and should avoid framing expectations in ways that impose rigid productivity requirements or narrow definitions of scholarly contribution. The purpose of post-tenure review is to encourage sustained engagement and ongoing development, not to replicate promotion-level expectations or to function as a punitive mechanism.



Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty – Handbook Change

RES 252645

FAC

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate approves revisions to section 306 of the University Handbook, “Procedures for Periodic Evaluation of Faculty”.

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate approves the following revisions to the University Handbook regarding the Periodic Evaluation of Faculty at CSUB. Deletions are in ~~strikethrough~~, and additions are in **bold and underlined**.

~~306~~ **PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION OF FACULTY**

~~Periodic evaluations are required for temporary faculty and tenured faculty who are undergoing post-tenure review.~~

~~306.1~~ **Approval of Procedures**

~~The President shall approve periodic evaluation procedures after consideration of recommendations from the appropriate faculty committee(s). Unit procedures may vary but shall include student evaluations of teaching performance, peer review(s), and administrative review(s).~~

~~306.2~~ **Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty**

~~306.2.1~~ **General Provisions**

~~a. Periodic evaluation is required for all temporary faculty appointed by the same department in two or more semesters, full or part-time, regardless of a break in service. For the purpose of this section, temporary faculty with multiple appointments in different departments shall be evaluated based on their service in each department separately.~~

~~For purposes of evaluation only, these faculty are categorized in the following groups:~~

~~Group 1 Temporary faculty, full or part-time, in their first year of a one-year appointment.~~

- ~~Group 2 Temporary faculty, full or part-time, holding 3-year appointments pursuant to Article 12.12 of the collective bargaining agreement.~~
- ~~Group 3 Temporary faculty, full or part-time, holding a one or multiple year appointment, not in Group 1 or 2.~~
- ~~Group 4 Temporary faculty, full or part-time, who do not hold a one or multiple year appointment, but who have taught in 2 or more semesters since last undergoing periodic evaluation.~~
- ~~Group 5 Temporary faculty, faculty, full or part-time, who do not hold a one or multiple year appointment, and who have taught in fewer than 2 semesters since last undergoing periodic evaluation.~~

- ~~b. The P&VPAA annually establishes timelines for the periodic evaluations, after considering recommendations from relevant faculty committees. The timelines shall specify the dates by which the Periodic Evaluation File (PEF) is to be ready for review and the dates by which each level of review is to have completed its work.~~
- ~~c. There are two periodic evaluation cycles for temporary faculty during each academic year:

 - ~~1. Spring RTP cycle – which begins spring semester – review of temporary faculty requiring review that are not in Group 1.~~
 - ~~d. Spring semester PEF cycle – review of temporary faculty in Group 1. Applicable unit RTP criteria shall be used at each level of review for each faculty.~~
 - ~~e. All deliberations and recommendations pursuant to this section shall be confidential.~~~~

~~Only the affected faculty, unit review committee members, and appropriate administrators shall have access to the periodic evaluation documents.~~

306.2.2 Criteria for Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

- ~~a. For temporary teaching faculty, evaluations shall focus on teaching performance. For temporary faculty with non-teaching duties, including temporary librarians and counselors, evaluations shall focus on the performance of assigned duties, which may include teaching. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty member no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term.~~
- ~~b. In the evaluation of the teaching performance of temporary faculty, departments should use the same criteria and processes as used for probationary faculty, and as enumerated in Faculty Handbook section 305.4.2.6, Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness.~~
- ~~c. Evidence of service and scholarly activity that is included in the file should be addressed. However, if service and/or scholarly activity are not part of the temporary faculty member's assigned duties, omission of such evidence is acceptable.~~
- ~~d. The temporary faculty member, with advice and direction from the unit chair, shall be responsible for the preparation of a Periodic Evaluation File (PEF). The temporary faculty~~

shall insert appropriate materials to document teaching or other performance. In selecting the documents, the temporary faculty should refer to Appendix G Contents and Organization of the RTP File (WPAF), and to Faculty Handbook section 305.4.2.6, Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness.

- e. ~~Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCs in accordance with during the fall semester, prior to the beginning of the evaluation process for the first established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle.~~
- f. ~~Temporary faculty in Group 2 shall be reviewed only in their third year, unless the temporary faculty member or the President requests a review in the first or second year. Such faculty shall submit SOCs for a minimum of two classes each year since the most recent review. The review will occur during the Spring RTP cycle.~~
- g. ~~A unit committee elected by the department faculty from the tenured faculty shall review the PEF for faculty in groups 1–3, and prepare a report on the faculty's performance. The report shall be placed in the PEF. For temporary faculty in Group 4 only, a written review may be conducted solely by the chair or other appropriate administrator, and placed in the PEF.~~
- h. ~~The responsible school dean shall review the PEF for temporary faculty in Groups 1–3, and prepare a report on the faculty member's performance. The report shall be placed in the PEF.~~
- i. ~~Temporary faculty in Group 5 shall be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair, the appropriate administrator, or the department or equivalent unit. The faculty member may request that an evaluation be performed.~~
- j. ~~Successful periodic evaluations do not automatically result in range elevations.~~

For information on range elevations, see Section 314.

CLEAN HANDBOOK VERSION

306 PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION OF FACULTY

Periodic evaluations are required for temporary faculty and tenured faculty who are undergoing post-tenure review.

306.1 Approval of Procedures

The Academic Senate shall approve procedures for the periodic evaluation of faculty. Evaluation of temporary faculty shall include the Unit RTP Committee and the college dean. Evaluation of faculty undergoing post-tenure review (without promotion) shall include the Unit PTR committee and college dean.

306.2 Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty

306.2.1 General Provisions

- f. Periodic evaluation is required for all temporary faculty appointed by the same department in two or more semesters, full or part-time, regardless of a break in service. For the purpose of this section, temporary faculty with multiple appointments in different departments shall be evaluated based on their service in each department separately.
- g. For purposes of periodic evaluation of temporary faculty, the “evaluation committee” shall be the Unit RTP Committee, and the “evaluation criteria” shall be the Unit RTP Criteria. These terms reflect the language of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and do not constitute separate committees or criteria. Temporary faculty shall be reviewed according to the following schedule.
 - I. Temporary faculty without a three-year appointment who are appointed for both Fall and Spring shall be reviewed annually during the Spring RTP Cycle.
 - II. Temporary faculty holding a three-year appointment pursuant to Article 12.12 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement shall be reviewed during the Spring RTP Cycle of the third year of the appointment, unless the faculty member or the President requests an additional review.

- III. A temporary faculty unit employee appointed for one (1) semester or two (2) quarters or less shall be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair, the appropriate administrator, or the department or equivalent unit. The employee may request that an evaluation be performed (CBA Article 15.25).
- h. The P&VPAA annually establishes timelines for the periodic evaluations, in accordance with the Unit RTP Cycles (see section 305.6.2 of this Handbook). The timelines shall specify the dates by which the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) is to be ready for review and the dates by which each level of review is to have completed its work.
- i. Temporary faculty are to undergo periodic evaluation by the Unit RTP Committee (serving as the evaluation committee) and the college dean during the Spring RTP Cycle. The Unit RTP Criteria, serving as the evaluation criteria, shall be used at each level of review.
- j. The Unit RTP Committee and the college dean shall review the faculty member's performance based on the WPAF, Personnel Action File, and Unit RTP Criteria. Reports shall be placed in the Personnel Action File.
- k. All deliberations and recommendations pursuant to this section shall be confidential. Only the affected faculty, unit review committee members, and appropriate administrators shall have access to the periodic evaluation documents.

306.2.2 Criteria for Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty

- k. For purposes of clarity and consistency with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the evaluation criteria for the periodic evaluation of temporary faculty are the Unit RTP Criteria used for probationary faculty, with emphasis on assigned duties.
- l. For temporary teaching faculty, evaluations shall focus on teaching performance. For temporary faculty with non-teaching duties, including temporary librarians and counselors, evaluations shall focus on the performance of assigned duties, which may include teaching. Department Unit RTP criteria and university procedures shall be provided by the department chair to the faculty member no later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term.
- m. In the evaluation of the teaching performance of temporary faculty, departments shall use the same criteria and processes as used for probationary faculty, as articulated in Faculty Handbook

section 305.4.2.6 and the Unit RTP Criteria, which serve as the evaluation criteria for periodic evaluation of temporary faculty.

- n. The Unit RTP criteria shall be the basis of all evaluations and recommendations at all levels of review (see section 305.4.6).

Evidence of service and scholarly activity that is included in the file should be addressed. However, if service and/or scholarly activity are not part of the temporary faculty member's assigned duties, omission of such evidence is acceptable.

The temporary faculty member, with advice and direction from the unit chair, shall be responsible for the preparation of a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). The temporary faculty shall insert appropriate materials to document teaching or other performance. Temporary faculty shall prepare their Working Personnel Action File in accordance with their Unit RTP Criteria, and the guidelines found in Appendix G (Contents and Organization of the RTP File [WPAF]). Temporary faculty shall include all SOCs for all courses taught since their previous evaluation (if applicable).

- o. Successful periodic evaluations do not automatically result in range elevations. For information on range elevations, see Section 314.

306.6.2.3 Review Process for Temporary Faculty Applying for 3-Year Appointments

- a. Temporary faculty unit employees (excluding coaches) employed during the prior academic year and possessing six (6) or more years of prior consecutive service on the campus shall be offered a three-year temporary appointment following an evaluation conducted pursuant to Articles 12.12, 15.20(d), and 15.28 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, where there is a determination by the appropriate administrator that the temporary faculty unit employee has performed the duties of their position in a satisfactory manner and absent documented serious conduct problems.
- b. The evaluation shall be conducted using the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), prepared in accordance with the Unit RTP criteria and the guidelines contained in Appendix G of the University Handbook (Contents and Organization of the RTP File). The Unit RTP criteria shall be the basis of all evaluations and recommendations at all levels of review (see sections 305.4.6 and 306.2.2).
- c. Because eligible temporary faculty will typically have undergone periodic evaluations, the WPAF need not include a complete cumulative archive of all materials from prior review cycles. However, for lecturers seeking a three-year appointment, the WPAF shall include materials representing the

faculty member's overall body of work since initial appointment at California State University, Bakersfield, with emphasis on recent accomplishments, consistent with the comprehensive nature of such reviews. Temporary faculty shall provide a brief Personal Statement concisely summarizing their teaching performance, development over time, and responsiveness to prior evaluations.

- d. All SOCI's collected since the most recent review, or since the initial appointment if no prior review has been conducted, shall be included in the WPAF.
- e. Classroom observations, as required by the University Handbook (section 305.4.2.7) and the Unit RTP Criteria, shall be included. Teaching materials shall include a clearly labeled subfolder for Classroom Observations, which shall include all required peer observations conducted during the period under review.
- f. All prior evaluation letters shall be included in the WPAF. These evaluations provide context for the current review and allow reviewers to assess the faculty member's responsiveness to prior recommendations. Accordingly, faculty are not required to re-submit previously reviewed materials unless necessary to demonstrate improvement, continuity, or impact.
- g. The Unit RTP Committee and the college dean shall review the faculty member's performance based on the WPAF, PAF, and Unit RTP Criteria. Reports shall be placed in the Personnel Action File.

RATIONALE:

The Academic Senate Executive Committee referred the report and recommendations of the Task Force for Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty to the Faculty Affairs Committee for review and possible action. The task force was originally charged with reviewing University Handbook Section 306 to improve clarity in procedures governing the periodic evaluation of temporary faculty and to determine whether the six-year review associated with eligibility for three-year appointments should be cumulative.

The Faculty Affairs Committee reviewed the report and its proposed revisions and determined that several recommendations would improve clarity, consistency, and alignment within the University Handbook and Collective Bargaining Agreement. In particular, existing language in Section 306 has historically created confusion among temporary faculty, department chairs, and evaluators regarding the timing of reviews, the structure of the review cycles, and the expected contents of the evaluation file.

The revisions approved in this resolution seek to improve consistency across the Handbook by aligning the procedures for periodic evaluation of temporary faculty with Unit RTP criteria, Appendix G (Contents and Organization of the RTP File [WPAF]), and other related sections of the Handbook governing evaluation procedures. These revisions clarify that temporary faculty should prepare a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) in accordance with their Unit RTP Criteria and the organizational guidance contained in Appendix G, ensuring that evaluation files follow the same structure and evidentiary expectations used in other faculty review processes. The revisions also clarify that Student Opinion of Instruction (SOCIs) for all courses taught since the previous evaluation should be included in the file, reinforcing the central role of teaching performance in the evaluation of temporary faculty. This contrasts with previous Handbook language that sometimes required SOCIs for a minimum of two courses. The Faculty Affairs Committee determined that simply requiring all SOCIs is most consistent with Appendix G, which requires SOCIs for “all courses taught” during the probationary period for probationary faculty.

The revised language streamlines expectations by clarifying that temporary faculty evaluations occur during the Spring RTP Cycle, aligning these evaluations with existing campus review timelines and reducing confusion for faculty and administrators.

In addition, the revisions clarify the evaluation process for temporary faculty eligible for three-year appointments pursuant to Article 12.12 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The revised language emphasizes that the evaluation is conducted using the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), prepared in accordance with Unit RTP Criteria and Appendix G of the University Handbook, ensuring consistency with established evaluation structures. While eligible temporary faculty will typically have undergone regular

periodic evaluations, the WPAF for a three-year appointment review is expected to represent the faculty member's overall body of work since initial appointment at California State University, Bakersfield, with emphasis on recent accomplishments. This approach balances the comprehensive nature of the review with recognition that prior evaluations have already documented performance over time. Consistent with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the evaluation focuses on whether the faculty member has performed assigned duties in a satisfactory manner and whether any documented serious conduct problems exist. Accordingly, the review relies on both current evidence and the cumulative record contained in the Personnel Action File, without requiring a duplicative re-submission of all prior materials.

Importantly, this resolution requires that all prior evaluation letters shall be included in the WPAF. These evaluations provide context for the current review and allow reviewers to assess the faculty member's responsiveness to prior recommendations. This provision reinforces the important duties of the Unit RTP Committees to provide a comprehensive, thoughtful, and thorough evaluation.

Finally, the revisions aim to reduce confusion, improve transparency, and promote consistency across departments. By clarifying terminology, aligning procedures with the CBA and existing Handbook sections, and providing clearer guidance regarding evaluation files and timelines, these revisions support a fair and transparent evaluation process for temporary faculty while maintaining appropriate departmental flexibility within Unit RTP criteria.

Distribution List:

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Policy on Use of Informational Banner Space in Canvas
RES 252627

AS&SS

- RESOLVED:** That the informational banner space in Canvas is designated as instructional space, consistent with faculty academic autonomy in course design and delivery; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That a posting in the Canvas banner space be limited to information that directly supports teaching and learning activities, course structure, and student academic success; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That institution-wide announcements, event promotions, survey distribution, or campus messaging unrelated to the academic content of the course **shall** not be placed in the Canvas banner space, in order to prevent message fatigue and avoid overwhelming students with non-instructional information; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That access to the Canvas banner space for required institutional notices (such as state, federal, CSU, or accreditation-mandated information) be coordinated through the Office of Academic Programs **through a vetted approval process that the office provides to the senate**, ~~will notify faculty in advance and provide consistent messaging language; and be it further~~ **with the exception of emergency notices that require immediate attention.**
- RESOLVED:** That this policy be incorporated into the Academic Catalog and Campus Canvas support documentation for faculty and instructional staff.
- RATIONALE:** Canvas functions as an extension of the instructional environment, and the banner space is a primary location where faculty communicate essential course structure, expectations, and academic guidance. When this space is used for general campus announcements or survey distribution, students may experience message fatigue due to the volume of communication already received through email, portal notifications, and student service platforms. Limiting the Canvas banner to instructional and course-relevant content supports student focus, reduces cognitive overload, and preserves the clarity of academic messaging.

Providing a defined process for cases in which institutionally mandated notices must be displayed ensures compliance while maintaining the instructional integrity of Canvas course spaces and faculty autonomy in course presentation.

Distribution List:

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Guidance on WPAF Contents and Timelines for Review – Handbook Change

RES 252644

FAC

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate recommends revising Sections 305.3.3., 305.5.2., 305.5.3., 305.4.2.10, and Appendix G of the University Handbook to replace outdated guidance regarding WPAF size and content (e.g., the “three-inch binder” limitation) with updated guidelines that reflect electronic file systems and emphasize clarity, organization, and representative evidence aligned with Unit RTP Criteria.
- RESOLVED:** That any change to the platform used for WPAF submission and review shall be implemented in consultation with the Academic Senate, and that the Office of Faculty Affairs shall develop and communicate clear, consistent, and equitable procedures to support faculty and reviewers in the evaluation process.
- RESOLVED:** The Academic Senate approves revisions to the University Handbook regarding the organization of the WPAF. Deletions are in ~~striketrough~~ and additions are in **bold and underlined.**

305.3.3 Promotion of Tenured Faculty

Promotion of tenured faculty shall ordinarily occur at the beginning of the sixth year after appointment to their current rank or classification. **Accordingly, WPAF materials submitted for promotion shall generally reflect approximately five years of accomplishments, typically beginning with the faculty member’s final WPAF submission as a probationary faculty member (i.e., the beginning of the final year as a probationary assistant professor or equivalent).**

WPAF materials submitted for promotion shall be consistent with University Handbook guidance regarding scope of materials, with emphasis on accomplishments since promotion to Associate Professor and demonstrating sustained achievement, impact, and continued professional growth.

Promotion of tenured faculty occurs within the following guidelines and restrictions.

- a. ~~Tenured faculty wishing to undergo review for promotion shall notify the Office of the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA) in writing by November 1 of their intention to undergo performance review for the purpose of promotion during the Fall review. Tenured faculty who do not notify the Office of the P&VPAA by that date will be ineligible to undergo review for promotion that year.~~ **Tenured faculty wishing to undergo review for promotion shall notify the Office of the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA) in writing during the academic year prior to the review cycle, in accordance with timelines established by the Office of the P&VPAA. Faculty who do not provide notice by the established deadline will be ineligible to undergo review for promotion during that review cycle.**
- b. The performance review for promotion purposes occurs in the Fall review during the **following** academic year in which the tenured faculty requests the review for promotion.

305.5.2 Contents and Organization of the RTP File

The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF, sometimes informally referred to as the RTP, PTR, or PEF file) shall be organized to provide a clear, structured, and representative record of the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the applicable Unit RTP Criteria. Materials should be arranged to support a narrative explanation of performance in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service. The WPAF should be thorough yet concise, providing representative rather than exhaustive documentation sufficient for effective review.

(See Appendix G for a detailed description of the required and optional contents of the RTP file and instructions on organizing the RTP file.)

All RTP files shall include the following sections in sequence. **(See Appendix G for a detailed description of the required and optional contents of the RTP file and instructions on organizing the RTP file.)**

- a. Log sheet – lists each document placed in the file **WPAF**, date of insertion, original source, person or authority responsible for inserting the document.

- b. Access sheet – lists each person having access to the file, reason for access, and date of access.
- c. Master index – lists each document in the file arranged chronologically within each area of review—teaching/performance, scholarly/creative activity/ professional growth, and professionally related service.
- d. Assignments – list all courses taught, semester-by-semester (faculty) and all major responsibilities and professional activities (librarians and counselors).
- e. Current vita **curriculum vitae**
- f. Applicable unit RTP criteria.
- g. Previous RTP evaluations and recommendations (all levels).
- h. Personal statement (optional) – ~~concisely describes personal perspective regarding performance in the three areas of review for the current RTP cycle.~~
 - a. **Provides a clear and organized narrative describing the faculty member’s performance in each area of review for the current RTP cycle, addressing the applicable Unit RTP Criteria, highlighting accomplishments, and responding to prior evaluations where appropriate**
- i. Documentation of Teaching or Performance
 - a. **All peer observations of teaching conducted during the period under review shall be included and clearly labeled for reviewers. For promotion reviews, faculty shall include all peer observations conducted during the period in rank.**
- j. Documentation of Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth
- k. Documentation of Professionally Related Services to the University and the Community
- l. Miscellaneous Section

305.5.3 Completeness of the WPAF for periodic and performance review
A complete WPAF includes all required materials as specified in the Unit RTP Criteria and University Handbook and should present those materials in a clear, organized, and representative manner. Completeness refers to the inclusion of required materials and does not imply that the WPAF must include all possible documentation of professional activities.

The unit periodic and performance review committees and the faculty undergoing review shall be responsible for ensuring that the **WPAF Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)** (sometimes informally referred to as the RTP, PTR, or PEF file) is complete and accurate before the start of the review process. No level of review may require that additional materials be included in the file other than those specified in the Unit RTP, PTR, or PEF criteria document(s) or University Handbook. Further, if any level of review believes additional material needs to be included for a full evaluation, that request must go through appropriate campus processes: modification of unit criteria or the University Handbook.

Files are expected to be complete by the posted and announced deadline. The unit committee chair or committee member designee shall inspect the file during the unit review period to determine if any required materials are missing from the file.

If the unit committee determines that the WPAF includes all required materials and is complete, review continues as indicated within the University Handbook.

If the unit committee determines that required materials are missing and the WPAF is incomplete, the committee chair may inform the faculty member of any missing required items. The faculty under review may submit missing requested material to the committee chair to be inserted into the file. Insertion of required missing items by the unit committee shall be recorded on the WPAF Log sheet, following procedures specified in the University Handbook for the insertion of materials.

If the unit committee does not receive requested required materials and/or the WPAF is not received by the deadline, the unit review shall proceed based on materials that were received and those available in the PAF (Personnel Action File). Failure to submit a complete WPAF may result in the unit committee being unable to return a review of 'satisfactory' performance.

Once the relevant unit periodic or performance review committee has determined that the WPAF contains all required elements, any materials to be added to the WPAF must be approved by the University Review Committee (URC) and shall be limited to items that became available only after the date of completion of the file. Only evaluations and recommendations completed by each level of review, any minority reports, and any responses to the evaluations and recommendations may be added to the WPAF

without prior approval by the URC. A copy of all added materials shall be provided to the faculty. ~~Reviewing authorities may disregard any added material that could have been included in the original file at the beginning of the review process.~~

If the URC approves the addition of newly available materials to the WPAF, the file shall be returned to the unit review committee for reconsideration of its initial evaluation and recommendation before subsequent levels of review begin their respective evaluations.

During the review process, no material shall be removed from the WPAF.

305.4.2.10 The RTP File

~~Each faculty member subject to performance review shall prepare a file containing a representative sample of materials from the period under review. Unit RTP criteria may require additional materials. (Added 05-30-2023) The file should be prepared with attention to the demands on reviewers. For example, the file, excluding SOCI's should be no longer than could be held in one three-inch binder. For electronic files, the documents in the electronic file should be capable of being held in one three-inch binder if they were printed. SOCI's may be contained in a separate file.~~

~~The second-year review shall contain documentation from the period under review and shall also contain all materials from the first-year review. This enables the University Review Committee and higher levels who did not participate in the first-year review process to consider the entire first year of probationary faculty.~~

Each faculty member subject to performance review shall prepare a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) that provides a clear, organized, and representative record of accomplishments relevant to the applicable Unit RTP Criteria.

The WPAF shall include materials sufficient to allow reviewers to evaluate the quality, significance, and impact of the faculty member's work in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service. Faculty are expected to address each relevant criterion identified in the Unit RTP Criteria and provide appropriate narrative explanation supported by representative documentation.

All prior evaluation letters shall be included in the WPAF. These evaluations provide context for the current review and allow reviewers to assess the faculty member's responsiveness to prior recommendations. Accordingly, faculty are not required to re-submit previously reviewed materials unless necessary to demonstrate improvement, continuity, or impact.

WPAF materials should be thorough yet concise. Faculty shall exercise professional judgment to ensure that the file is focused, well-organized, and avoids unnecessary or duplicative documentation. The WPAF is intended to provide representative evidence supporting the faculty member's narrative and is not intended to function as a comprehensive archive of all professional activities.

Because Unit RTP Criteria vary across disciplines in their structure and specificity, the length and organization of WPAF materials may reasonably differ across units. As a general guideline, narrative sections often correspond to the scope and number of criteria identified in the applicable Unit RTP Criteria.

The scope of materials included in the WPAF shall align with the type of review being conducted. These shall be interpreted to be minimum requirements; faculty undergoing review may judiciously include additional material to demonstrate their effectiveness in achieving the Unit RTP Criteria.

a. Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty (i.e., lecturers)

1. Materials shall represent the faculty member's work since the most recent WPAF submission, or since initial appointment if no prior review has been conducted. Materials should emphasize teaching effectiveness and any assigned duties, and should demonstrate performance in relation to assigned responsibilities and applicable evaluation criteria.
2. Lecturers seeking an initial three-year appointment shall include materials representing their overall body of work since initial appointment at California State University, Bakersfield, with emphasis on recent accomplishments, consistent with the comprehensive nature of such reviews.
3. Lecturers seeking a subsequent (renewed) three-year appointment shall include materials representing their work since the most recent WPAF submission, while also providing sufficient context to demonstrate sustained performance, development, and responsiveness to prior evaluations.
4. All SOCI's shall be included in a separate folder and shall align with the scope of the review:
 - i. For periodic evaluations without consideration of three-year appointment: SOCI's since the most recent review (or since initial appointment if no prior review has been conducted)
 - ii. For initial three-year appointment: all SOCI's since initial appointment
 - iii. For subsequent three-year appointments: SOCI's since the most recent WPAF submission

b. Retention of Probationary Faculty

1. Materials shall represent the faculty member's work since the most recent WPAF submission, or since initial appointment if no prior review has been conducted, with emphasis on progress toward meeting the applicable Unit RTP Criteria in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service.

- 3. All SOCs since initial appointment are recommended to demonstrate growth and consistency.**

APPENDIX G: CONTENTS AND ORGANIZATION OF THE RTP FILE (WPAF)

In each of the following sections, each document must have a unique identifying code that is also displayed on the Master Index. When a section contains materials from semester-to-semester and/or year-to-year, the materials shall be organized chronologically, preferably “reverse chronology,” with most recent materials toward the front of the respective section.

The WPAF is intended to provide a structured, organized, and representative record of faculty accomplishments in relation to the applicable Unit RTP Criteria. Materials should be selected and organized to support a clear narrative explaining the faculty member’s performance. The WPAF should be thorough yet concise and should include representative rather than exhaustive documentation. Because Unit RTP Criteria vary across disciplines, the length and organization of WPAF materials may reasonably differ across units.

The scope of materials included in the WPAF shall align with the type of review being conducted. These shall be interpreted to be minimum requirements; faculty undergoing review may judiciously include additional material to demonstrate their effectiveness in achieving the Unit RTP Criteria.

Standard Organization of the WPAF (Directory Structure)

To promote consistency, clarity, and ease of review across electronic platforms, WPAF materials shall be organized using a standardized directory structure. Each major section shall be maintained as a clearly labeled folder, with subfolders as appropriate.

The WPAF should generally be organized as follows:

- **Log Sheet**
- **Access Sheet**
- **Master Index**
- **Assignments Sheet**
- **Current Curriculum Vitae**
- **Unit RTP Criteria**
- **Previous and Current RTP Evaluations and Recommendations**

- **Personal Statement**
- **Teaching (or Performance)**
- **Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth**
- **Service**
- **Miscellaneous (optional)**

Within each section, materials should be organized chronologically, preferably in reverse chronological order, unless otherwise specified.

Document Naming Conventions

To ensure clarity and consistency across electronic WPAFs, all documents shall follow a standardized naming convention. Below is a recommended approach.

[Section][Year or Term][Item Type] [Brief Descriptor]

For example:

Teaching 2026 Fall SOCI CSUB1001

RSCA 2026 JournalArticle Einstein et al.

A. Log Sheet

- 1) All documents placed in the RTP file shall be listed chronologically on the Log Sheet, with date of insertion, original source of each document, and person or authority responsible for inserting the material.
- 2) All documents removed from the RTP file shall be listed chronologically on the Log Sheet, with date of removal and person or authority responsible for removing the material.
- 3) The Log Sheet shall be prepared and maintained by the custodian of the PAF, normally the office of the dean or director of the faculty.

A. Access Sheet

- 1) The names of all persons accessing the RTP file shall be recorded on the Access Sheet, with date(s) of access and reason for access.
- 2) Each person accessing the RTP file shall be responsible for recording the necessary information on the Access Sheet.

- 3) The Access Sheet shall be prepared and maintained by the custodian of the PAF, normally the office of the dean or director of the faculty.

B. Master Index

- 1) All documents in the RTP file arranged chronologically within each section of the file shall be so listed on the Master Index, i.e., the Master Index shall be organized by section.
- 2) ~~Each document shall have a unique identifying code, which is also displayed on the Master Index.~~ **Each document shall be clearly labeled using consistent file naming conventions and listed in the Master Index. Unique identifying codes may be used but are not required if file naming conventions provide sufficient clarity.**
- 3) The Master Index shall be prepared and maintained by the faculty.

A. Assignments Sheet

- 1) Faculty shall list all courses taught, semester-to-semester, since the last RTP review on the Assignments Sheet. In addition, faculty shall list all assigned time (including number of units for each reassigned activity), semester-to-semester, since the last RTP review.
- 2) Librarians and counselors shall list all assigned responsibilities since the last RTP review.
- 3) The Assignments Sheet shall be prepared and maintained by the faculty.

B. Current ~~Vita~~ **Curriculum Vitae**

- 1) A current ~~vita~~ **curriculum vitae** should contain the following information:
 - a. formal education, including dates of attendance and degrees awarded;
 - b. employment history, including position titles and dates;
 - c. prior teaching and/or professional experiences;
 - d. instructionally related activities, including, but not limited to, major advising responsibilities, supervising major tutorial programs, curriculum or program development;
 - e. scholarly or creative accomplishments or professional growth accomplishments, including, but not limited to, published journal articles, monographs, books, and presentations of peer reviewed papers at professional meetings;
 - f. funded grants and contracts, including consulting activities;
 - g. professionally related services to university and/or community, including, but not limited to, membership/leadership on university committees and task forces, professional associations and societies, and/or community organizations, and other activities contributing to the enlightenment and enrichment of the community;

- h. major honors and awards, including special leaves or sabbaticals for professional development; and
 - i. other areas of assigned responsibilities.
- 2) The vita shall be prepared and maintained by the faculty.

F. Current Unit RTP Criteria [Subject to revision based on RES 252632]

G. Previous and Current RTP Evaluations and Recommendations

- 1) At each level of review, evaluations and recommendations pertaining to retention, the award of tenure, and promotion shall be placed in the RTP file, as well as entered into the Log Sheet.
- 2) The faculty shall receive a copy of the evaluation and recommendation from each level of review before the RTP file is forwarded to the next level of review.
- 3) The faculty shall have ~~seven (7)~~ ten (10) days from the receipt of the evaluation and recommendation to file a written rebuttal or response.
- 4) ~~All rebuttals or responses shall be placed in the RTP file and entered into the Log Sheet.~~ **All rebuttals or responses shall be included in the WPAF, entered into the Log Sheet, and maintained as part of the complete record of prior and current evaluations.**

H. Personal Statement (~~Optional~~)

- 1) Faculty ~~are encouraged to~~ **shall** prepare a Personal Statement summarizing their perspective of their performance in each of the three areas for the current RTP cycle, highlighting their accomplishments, and addressing any criticisms, concerns, or suggestions for improvement made during previous RTP reviews or by students on the SOCI for the current review.
- 2) **Faculty narratives shall address each relevant criterion identified in the applicable Unit RTP Criteria. As a general guideline, narrative length may correspond to the number and complexity of criteria, often averaging approximately one to two pages per major criterion.**

I. Documentation of Teaching or Performance

- 1) Teaching
 - a. Careful documentation of teaching performance is essential. It is imperative to keep this section current, relevant, and orderly for faculty, teaching success is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion.

- b. Student evaluations of teaching (SOCl) for all courses taught during the probationary period must be included. **Student Opinion of Course Instruction (SOCl) data shall be included in the WPAF in a dedicated folder and organized chronologically. The scope of SOClS included shall align with the type of review being conducted (see section 305.4.2.10 of this Handbook).**
 - c. **Classroom observations, as required by the University Handbook (section 305.4.2.7) and the Unit RTP Criteria, shall be included. Teaching materials shall include a clearly labeled subfolder for Classroom Observations, which shall include all required peer observations conducted during the period under review (or period in rank for promotion reviews).**
 - d. Other evidence illustrating teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - i. representative syllabi, course materials and handouts, quizzes and exams;
 - ii. peer evaluations of teaching, including those conducted by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff;
 - iii. signed letters from current students or alumni;
 - iv. professional development activities for the improvement of teaching performance, including those conducted by the Faculty TLC;
 - v. curriculum development—new courses and/or new pedagogy; and/or
 - vi. significant advising of students in a major/program.
 - e. The use of information or other technologies and involvement in TLC and assessment activities, by themselves, will carry little, if any, weight in the judgment of teaching effectiveness. Reviewers should justify their evaluations regarding such activities and student learning.
 - f. Additional teaching through Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach, including SOCl, must be included in this section.
 - g. Except for the SOCl, no anonymous materials, including letters, notes, e-mails, etc., shall be included in the RTP file.
- 2) Performance (librarians and counselors)
- a. For librarians and counselors, performance is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. Therefore, careful documentation of performance on all assignments during the probationary period is essential. It is imperative to keep this section current, relevant, and orderly.
 - b. Evidence illustrating high levels of performance may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- i. assignments requiring significant leadership skills, analytical and organizational skills, and/or problem solving skills
 - ii. peer evaluations of performance, including those conducted by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff;
 - iii. signed letters from faculty, staff, current students, or alumni; and
 - iv. program development.
- c. The information should be in sufficient detail to substantiate the role of the faculty and his/her contributions.

3) Specific Suggestions for Organizing Teaching Materials

- a. Materials for each course (SOCl, syllabus, handouts, quizzes and exams, peer reviews, etc.) should be included in a single "course file." All course files should be organized in identical fashion.
- b. ~~All course files for a given semester should be grouped together and labeled/coded in some fashion so that reviewers can easily discern semester-to-semester teaching.~~
Teaching materials should be organized by term and course using a consistent folder structure (e.g., Term → Course → Materials), allowing reviewers to easily navigate teaching activities across semesters and years
- c. ~~All course files for a given academic year should be grouped together and labeled/coded in some fashion so that reviewers can easily discern year-by-year teaching.~~
- c. Other evidence supporting teaching effectiveness (signed letters from students, professional development activities, curriculum development, advising, etc.) should be placed in a separate file distinct from course files.
- d. ~~Because of the volume of materials that will accumulate during the probationary period, it is absolutely essential that all materials regarding teaching be organized in the RTP file in chronological order, preferably "reverse chronology," with the most recent materials (current review cycle) being in front.~~ **Because WPAFs may contain substantial documentation, careful organization and selection of representative materials is essential.**

J. Documentation of Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth

- 1) This section must show how the faculty is growing and developing through scholarly/creative activities within the discipline (teaching faculty or librarians) or through professional growth activities within the field (counselors).

- 2) Faculty should include evidence for scholarly/creative activities in accord with their unit RTP criteria, which may include, but is not limited to, published journal articles, monographs, books, papers presented at professional conferences, etc.
- 3) Faculty are responsible for obtaining outside reviews of unpublished scholarly manuscripts in a timely manner so that they can be included in the RTP file before the RTP review cycle begins.
- 4) Scholarly/creative materials that have been neither published nor reviewed by peers in the discipline will carry little, if any, weight in the review process.
- 5) When listing papers presented at a scholarly conference, the faculty must provide information as to whether the paper was selected through a refereed process.
- 6) When listing co-authored books, articles, research projects, and grant proposals, the faculty must clearly indicate the extent of his/her contribution to the joint effort.
- 7) In general, grant/contract proposals that have been funded carry more weight than those that have not been funded. Grant/contract proposals that have been submitted for review but have not yet been evaluated carry little weight in the review process.
- 8) Consulting work (paid or unpaid) in of itself carries little, if any, weight in the review process. Consultant reports, if they have received outside peer review, may carry some weight.
- 9) Reviews of book manuscripts, journal articles, papers being considered for presentation at professional meetings, etc., may carry some weight if there is documentation of the faculty's contributions.
- 10) Under ordinary circumstances, work on accreditation applications and reports should be considered under the category of service to the department and university rather than as scholarly activity. However, in those instances where the products of the accreditation process can be worked into a larger research strategy or design that can lead to or result in the production of an article or monograph published in a peer-reviewed journal, such activities can be considered scholarship.
- 11) Activities currently "in process" or being "planned for the future" may be listed, but such activities carry some weight only in the early stages of the faculty's probationary period. If these activities are listed in this section, then the faculty is obligated to inform all reviewers regarding the outcome of these "in process" or "planned" activities in subsequent review cycles.
- 12) Specific suggestions for organizing materials in this section
 - a. Materials must be organized in chronological order, preferably "reverse chronology," with the most recent materials (current RTP review cycle) in front; and

- b. Versions or revisions of published papers or articles must be carefully cross-referenced in the RTP file (including Log Sheet and Master Index). ~~Earlier versions should be purged from the file to keep physical size manageable.~~
- K. Documentation of Professionally Related Services to the University and to the Community
- 1) This section must show the type and extent of professionally related services the faculty provides to the campus and/or to the community.
 - 2) Faculty should include evidence for professionally related services to the university and to the community in accord with their unit RTP criteria, including, but not limited to, membership/leadership of university committees and task forces, professional associations and societies, and/or community organizations, presentations to community groups, involvement in community projects, etc. Supporting documentation from others knowledgeable about the faculty's level of performance should be included in this section.
 - 3) The professionally related services listed in this section should be related to the faculty's teaching area, field of scholarship/creative activities, or professional assignments.
 - 4) Teaching for additional pay through Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (and other similar academic arrangements) shall not be listed in this section.
 - 5) Consulting activities for which the faculty was paid shall not be listed in this section.
 - 6) Activities for which special assigned time arrangements have been made shall be counted in this section only to the extent that the faculty's performance was exemplary, or his/her efforts significantly exceeded the amount of assigned time. In either case, supporting documentation from others knowledgeable about the assigned time arrangements should be included in this section.
- L. Miscellaneous Section (optional)
- 1) An additional section may be appended to the RTP file to include such materials as:
 - a. large, bulky items, e.g., audio or video tapes, CDs, award plaques, photographs, paintings, and creative "artifacts;"
 - b. unpublished or unreviewed manuscripts;
 - c. unreviewed grant/contract proposals;
 - d. letters/articles published by the local media;
 - e. information on professional conferences, meetings, workshops attended (as opposed to those where a paper was presented); and
 - f. signed thank you notes and cards from other faculty, staff, students, alumni, or individuals from the community.

- 2) Since these materials are usually not considered as significant evidence of the faculty's performance, good judgment must be exercised in creating this additional section.

RATIONALE:

The current University Handbook language governing the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) reflects an earlier paper-based model that relies on physical constraints (e.g., the “three-inch binder” guideline) and does not adequately account for the realities of electronic submission and review systems. In addition, existing language does not consistently differentiate expectations across types of faculty reviews, including retention, tenure and promotion, promotion of tenured faculty, post-tenure review, and lecturer evaluations. As noted in Referral #31, there is a need to clarify both the expected scope of WPAF materials and the timelines associated with faculty reviews. This resolution modernizes Handbook language by replacing outdated size-based limitations with guidance emphasizing clarity, organization, and the use of representative evidence aligned with Unit RTP Criteria.

The proposed revisions establish a more coherent and equitable framework by aligning WPAF expectations with the purpose and scope of each type of review. Developmental reviews (e.g., retention and periodic evaluations) emphasize work since the most recent WPAF submission, while cumulative reviews (e.g., tenure and promotion) appropriately consider the broader body of work over a defined period, such as the probationary period or time in rank. Importantly, the revisions clarify the timeline and scope of materials included in the WPAF, explicitly indicating that materials should generally reflect accomplishments since the most recent WPAF submission. This resolves a common source of confusion in which activities occurring after the most recent submission—but prior to a change in rank or effective date of promotion—may otherwise be omitted. By clarifying that such activities shall be included, the policy ensures that faculty work is fully represented and that no period of professional activity is inadvertently excluded from evaluation.

The revisions also clarify expectations regarding the inclusion of Student Opinion of Curriculum and Instruction (SOCI) data, teaching observations, and prior evaluation letters, ensuring that reviewers have access to a complete record of performance while reducing unnecessary duplication of materials. By emphasizing representative evidence rather than exhaustive documentation, the revised policy improves both faculty preparation of WPAFs and the efficiency and effectiveness of the review process. Finally, the resolution introduces guidance for consistent organization and naming conventions in electronic WPAFs and affirms that future changes to submission platforms will be implemented in consultation with the Academic Senate. Collectively, these updates promote transparency, consistency, and flexibility across disciplines, while supporting meaningful and equitable evaluation of faculty performance.

Distribution List:

President

Provost and VP for Academic Affairs

AVP for Faculty Affairs

College Deans

Dean of the Library

College Associate Deans

General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Acting Appointments – Handbook Changes

RES 252647

FAC

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate approves revisions to the University Handbook regarding the appointment of acting and interim administrators at CSUB. Deletions are in ~~strike through~~, and additions are in **bold and underlined**.

309.7. Appointment of Interim Non-Academic University-Wide Officers

- a. This policy shall apply to the interim appointments of the VPBAS, VPSA, and VPUA. New positions that are similar in nature shall also be subject to this policy.
- b. **Acting appointments may be made when an administrator is temporarily unavailable due to short-term circumstances (e.g., leave, illness, or temporary reassignment), and continuity of operations is required. Acting appointments shall only be made when there is insufficient time to engage in the full consultative process described below. Acting appointments are intended to be brief in duration and shall not exceed 90 calendar days. Acting appointments do not require the full consultation process described below; however, the appointing authority shall notify the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in a timely manner. If the need for administrative coverage extends beyond 90 calendar days, the appointment shall transition to an interim appointment and follow the procedures outlined in this section.**
- c. When a vacancy in one of these positions occurs, the President shall confer with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, to determine if there is sufficient time for recruitment, the appointment of a replacement. If there is insufficient time to find a replacement before the office is vacated, an interim appointment shall be made. Such appointments will be made after consultation with the Executive Committee of the Senate and members of the representative units affected by the appointments. **This consultation requirement shall apply to both initial interim appointments and any subsequent renewal.**

- d. Interim appointments are intended to be temporary, and should not exceed 18 months. These appointments may be renewed after following the above procedures. **The University should make a good-faith effort to initiate a timely search process for a permanent appointment.**

309.8 Appointment of Interim Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs

- a. **Acting appointments may be made when an administrator is temporarily unavailable due to short-term circumstances (e.g., leave, illness, or temporary reassignment), and continuity of operations is required. Acting appointments shall only be made when there is insufficient time to engage in the full consultative process described below. Acting appointments are intended to be brief in duration and shall not exceed 90 calendar days. Acting appointments do not require the full consultation process described below; however, the appointing authority shall notify the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in a timely manner. If the need for administrative coverage extends beyond 90 calendar days, the appointment shall transition to an interim appointment and follow the procedures outlined in this section.**
- b. When a vacancy occurs, the President shall confer with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to determine if there is sufficient time for recruitment and appointment of a replacement. If there is insufficient time to find a replacement before the office is vacated, an interim appointment shall be made. Such appointments will be made after consultation with the Executive Committee of the Senate and members of the representative units affected by the appointments. **This consultation requirement shall apply to both initial interim appointments and any subsequent renewal.**
- c. Interim appointments are intended to be temporary, and should not exceed 18 months. These appointments may be renewed after following the above procedures. **The University should make a good-faith effort to initiate a timely search process for a permanent appointment.**

309.9 Appointment of other Interim University-Wide Academic Administrators

- a. This policy shall apply to the interim appointments of other academic administrators whose responsibilities include making academic policy decisions that affect the entire university which includes the Assistant Vice President for GRASP, the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs, the Associate Vice President for CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley, the

Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs, the Dean of Academic Programs, and the Dean of the Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach. New positions that are similar in nature shall also be subject to this policy.

- b. Acting appointments may be made when an administrator is temporarily unavailable due to short-term circumstances (e.g., leave, illness, or temporary reassignment), and continuity of operations is required. Acting appointments shall only be made when there is insufficient time to engage in the full consultative process described below. Acting appointments are intended to be brief in duration and shall not exceed 90 calendar days. Acting appointments do not require the full consultation process described below; however, the appointing authority shall notify the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in a timely manner. If the need for administrative coverage extends beyond 90 calendar days, the appointment shall transition to an interim appointment and follow the procedures outlined in this section.**
- c. When a vacancy occurs, the P&VPAA shall confer with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to determine if there is sufficient time for recruitment and appointment of a replacement. If there is insufficient time to find a replacement before the office is vacated, an interim appointment shall be made. Such appointments will be made after consultation with the Executive Committee of the Senate and members of the representative units affected by the appointments. **This consultation requirement shall apply to both initial interim appointments and any subsequent renewal.**
- d. Interim appointments are intended to be temporary, and should not exceed 18 months. These appointments may be renewed after following the above procedures. **The University should make a good-faith effort to initiate a timely search process for a permanent appointment.**

309.10 Appointment of Interim School Deans

- a. Acting appointments may be made when an administrator is temporarily unavailable due to short-term circumstances (e.g., leave, illness, or temporary reassignment), and continuity of operations is required. Acting appointments shall only be made when there is insufficient time to engage in the full consultative process described below. Acting appointments are intended to be brief in duration and shall not exceed 90 calendar days. Acting appointments do not require the full consultation process described below; however, the appointing authority shall notify the Executive**

Committee of the Academic Senate in a timely manner. If the need for administrative coverage extends beyond 90 calendar days, the appointment shall transition to an interim appointment and follow the procedures outlined in this section.

- b. When a vacancy occurs in a college dean's position, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall confer with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate to determine if there is sufficient time for recruitment and appointment of a replacement. If there is insufficient time to find a replacement before the office is vacated, the appointment of an interim dean will be made by the Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs. Such appointments will be made after consultation with the Executive Committee of the Senate, Department Chairs, members of the college, and appropriate advising committees. **This consultation requirement shall apply to both initial interim appointments and any subsequent renewal.**
- c. Interim appointments are intended to be temporary, and should not exceed 18 months. These appointments may be renewed after following the above procedures. **The University should make a good-faith effort to initiate a timely search process for a permanent appointment.**

309.11 Appointment of Interim School Associate Deans

- a. **Acting appointments may be made when an administrator is temporarily unavailable due to short-term circumstances (e.g., leave, illness, or temporary reassignment), and continuity of operations is required. Acting appointments shall only be made when there is insufficient time to engage in the full consultative process described below. Acting appointments are intended to be brief in duration and shall not exceed 90 calendar days. Acting appointments do not require the full consultation process described below; however, the appointing authority shall notify the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in a timely manner. If the need for administrative coverage extends beyond 90 calendar days, the appointment shall transition to an interim appointment and follow the procedures outlined in this section.**
- b. When a vacancy occurs in an associate college dean's position, the Dean shall confer with Department Chair to determine if there is sufficient time for recruitment and appointment of a replacement. If there is insufficient time to find a replacement before the office is vacated, the appointment of an interim Associate Dean will be made by the Provost upon recommendation of the Dean. Such appointments will be made only after the Dean has

consulted with the Department Chairs, members of the college, and appropriate advising committees. **This consultation requirement shall apply to both initial interim appointments and any subsequent renewal.**

- c. Interim appointments are intended to be temporary, and should not exceed 18 months. These appointments may be renewed after following the above procedures. **The University should make a good-faith effort to initiate a timely search process for a permanent appointment.**

Rationale:

This resolution clarifies existing Handbook language by distinguishing between acting and interim administrative appointments. Acting appointments are defined as short-term assignments intended to ensure continuity during temporary absences, while interim appointments address longer-term vacancies requiring broader consultation.

The revisions also strengthen shared governance by clarifying that consultation must occur not only at the time of initial interim appointment, but also upon renewal. Finally, the resolution establishes clearer expectations regarding the duration of interim appointments and the importance of timely searches, helping to ensure that temporary appointments remain truly temporary and do not unintentionally substitute for permanent hiring processes.

Distribution List:

- President
- President's Cabinet
- College Deans
- Dean of the Library
- Dean of the Antelope Valley Campus
- Campus Faculty
- Campus Staff



Teaching Modality - Handbook Changes

RES 252648

AAC, FAC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approves revisions to the University Handbook regarding the teaching modality of courses at CSUB. Deletions are in ~~striketrough~~, and additions are in **bold and underlined**.

203.11 Distributed Learning Committee

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

The DLC consists of (1) one faculty member from each of the academic **colleges schools**; (2) **one faculty member at-large** ~~the Faculty Coordinator of Online Instruction from the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC)~~; (3) the Faculty Director of the FTLC; (4) a student representative from ASI; and (5) one staff member with direct responsibilities related to CSUB's learning management system (ex-officio). Additional members may be appointed as ex-officio members by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, at the recommendation of the current DLC members. **The Faculty Director of the FTLC convenes the first meeting of the year, during which the committee elects a chair.**

Faculty members on the committee are expected to have experience with the designing and teaching of online/**flex hybrid** courses and should **have received training in** ~~be certified by CSUB for online/**flex hybrid** instruction~~. Faculty members are elected in accordance with the election procedures in Sections 202.6 and 202.7 and serve on staggered two-year terms. The student representative will be selected by ASI on an annual basis. The staff member will be appointed by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs on an annual basis.

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

If certification for teaching online and/or hybrid courses is available, the DLC shall issue guidance on becoming certified for online and/or hybrid instruction at the beginning of each academic year.

The DLC shall develop and maintain guidance for online and/or flex instruction, including but not limited to professional development pathways, instructional support recommendations, and quality standards. The Committee shall conduct a review of this guidance at least once every two years and revise it as necessary to ensure continued relevance.

The DLC shall meet at least once per semester. Failure to convene shall trigger review by the Academic Senate to ensure that policies governing online and/or flex instruction remain current, functional, and aligned with shared governance principles. The Academic Senate shall initiate steps to reconstitute the Committee or assign interim oversight to an appropriate Senate body to ensure continuity of distributed learning policy review and quality assurance.

303.1.1 Teaching Assigned Courses

Faculty shall teach their assigned courses in accord with the officially approved course descriptions provided in the current university catalog. Unless authorized by the department or program to teach a course in an online or **flex hybrid** format, faculty shall teach in a face-to-face format.

The assignment of courses includes responsibility for the mode of instruction (e.g., face-to-face, flex, or online). The determination of course modality is primarily a departmental or program-level decision, made through established curricular and scheduling processes and grounded in pedagogical appropriateness, disciplinary standards, and student learning outcomes.

Departments and programs shall ordinarily determine the modality of their courses independent of administrative preference, except as provided below. Departments and programs shall ordinarily determine the qualifications of their faculty who teach online courses and are responsible for ensuring the faculty are in compliance with the applicable accreditation and other requirements for that program.

College Deans retain a coordinating role to ensure that instructional offerings within the college are consistent with the University mission, student access needs, and resource constraints. In fulfilling this role, Deans may work collaboratively with departments and programs to ensure that a sufficient proportion of courses are offered in face-to-face format, recognizing that face-to-face instruction is the primary and expected mode of instruction at CSUB.

In the event of a disagreement between a department or program and the College Dean regarding course modality, the parties shall engage in good-faith consultation (e.g., Faculty Ombudsperson, DLC, FTLC Advisory Board, etc.) to resolve the issue. If consensus cannot be reached, the matter may be referred to the Provost or designee for resolution. Any decision that departs from the department's or program's recommendation shall be documented in writing and grounded in academic, operational, or resource-based considerations.

Changes to course modality after registration begins shall require approval of the College Dean.

RATIONALE: Referral 2025-2026-19 calls for clarification of instructional policy and teaching modality authority, particularly with respect to departmental autonomy and the role of administration in modality decisions.

This resolution affirms that teaching modality is fundamentally a pedagogical matter best determined by departments and programs, while also recognizing the responsibility of College Deans to ensure that instructional offerings align with institutional mission and

student expectations, including the University's emphasis on face-to-face instruction as its primary mode of delivery.

The resolution further responds to the prolonged inactivity of the Distributed Learning Committee by reinforcing expectations for its operation and oversight role. The Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) policy has not been updated in more than a decade, and the Faculty Coordinator of Online Instruction position has been discontinued. During this period, instructional modalities have evolved substantially. Online and flex teaching are now integral components of many faculty members' regular teaching assignments, and CSUB no longer requires certification for online instruction. These handbook revisions redefine the role and scope of the DLC to reflect current institutional practices. Maintaining clear, functional, and faculty-driven policies for online and flex instruction is essential to instructional quality, shared governance, and institutional coherence.

Distribution List:

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Expressions of the Senate – Bylaws Changes

RES 252624

EC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approves the attached bylaws to include Expressions of the Senate.

RESOLVED: The following changes be made to the Academic Senate bylaws (additions in underline, deletions in ~~striketrough~~).

RATIONALE: This resolution codifies *Expressions of the Senate* within the Academic Senate bylaws to provide clarity, transparency, and procedural consistency for actions that reflect the collective voice of the Senate but do not constitute formal policy. Without clear bylaw language, there can be ambiguity regarding their purpose, authority, and process.

The inclusion of structured procedures for Statements of the Senate and Votes of No Confidence ensures that these actions are undertaken thoughtfully, with appropriate deliberation, thresholds, and safeguards commensurate with their significance. This framework promotes fairness, protects due process, and reinforces the integrity of Senate actions while preserving the Senate’s ability to communicate positions on matters of academic and institutional importance.

Attachments: Senate Bylaws

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
President’s Cabinet
College Deans
Dean of Libraries
Department Chairs

General Faculty
Campus Staff

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

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
ACADEMIC SENATE BYLAWS**

Sections

I. Governance of Meetings

II. Meeting Times and Dates

III. Order of Business for Meetings

IV. Standing Committees

V. Expressions of the Senate

VI. Amendments

**Approved by the Academic Senate
As Amended XXX XX**

SECTION I: GOVERNANCE OF ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

- A. Robert's Rules of Order, Latest Edition, shall govern the conduct of the meetings of the Academic Senate except insofar as the Bylaws may make express provision to the contrary.
- B. The Academic Senate recognizes the following priorities for motions. For top priority motions, a member can interrupt the current speaker to make the motion to ask the Chair to be recognized.
1. Top Priority: Privileged Motions
 - a. Point of Order
 - b. Point of Information, or Clarification
 - c. Point of Privilege
 - d. Point of Personal Privilege
 - e. Point of Interruption
 2. Second Priority
 - a. Move to amend
 - b. Move a substitute motion
 - c. Move to divide (Division of the Question)
 - d. Move to consider ad seratium (i.e., one after the other)
 - e. Move to refer (e.g., back to a committee)
 - f. Add an item to the agenda
 - g. Move to adjourn – non-debatable (requires a simple majority)
 - h. Move to table (or “lay on the table”) – non-debatable (requires a simple majority)
 - i. Move to postpone (to a specific time, or indefinitely) – debatable
 - j. Challenge ruling of the Chair (Debatable, but only as to whether to sustain the Chair’s ruling, not the issue ruled upon)
 - k. Call the Question/Move the Previous Question
 1. To force a vote on an item (i. e., bring about a vote when there are still names on the speaker’s list), a member must first be recognized by the Chair (usually by rising to the top of the speaker’s list) and then move to close debate (or “move the previous question.”) This is non-debatable and requires a 2/3 vote.
- C. The Senate Chair may appoint an Academic Senate Parliamentarian.
- D. Normally, all members shall attend all scheduled meetings of the Academic Senate. The presence of a majority of the voting members of the Academic Senate shall constitute a quorum.

Senate Bylaws

Approved/Revised XXXX_XX

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

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

SECTION II: ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING TIMES AND DATES

- A. Regular meeting dates and times for the next academic year shall be fixed by a majority vote at the organizational meeting of the new Academic Senate in the Spring.

- B. The Academic Senate, by concurrence of a simple majority vote, may fix a different time for a regular meeting or call a special meeting.

- C. The Chair of the Academic Senate may, with the concurrence of a majority of the members of the Executive Committee, call a special meeting.

SECTION III: ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

- A. The regular order of business for Senate meetings shall be as follows, subject to change by a simple majority vote:
 - 1. Call to Order
 - 2. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting
 - 3. Announcements and Information
 - 4. Approval of Agenda
 - 5. Statewide Academic Senators' Report
 - 6. Provost's Report
 - 7. Committee Reports and Requests
 - 8. Resolutions
 - 9. Expressions of the Senate**
 - 10. Open Forum Items
 - a. Old Business
 - b. New Business
 - 11. Comments from the Floor
 - 12. Adjournment

- B. Fifteen minutes prior to the stated time of adjournment of each regular meeting, the Chair shall ask whether any members of the General Faculty present have matters which they wish to bring before the Academic Senate. Such matters take precedence during the final quarter hour of the meeting. If no such matters are brought to the Academic Senate, discussion will revert to the business at hand.

- C. The deliberative process shall be as follows:
 - 1. Business for consideration shall be addressed to the Chair, who will refer the item to committee, place the item on the Academic Senate Agenda, or consult with the Executive Committee in deciding the item's disposition.
 - 2. Executive Committee Minutes shall list all items and their disposition.
 - 3. Except for items added in consequence of Section III. B., items may be added to a distributed agenda only when the agenda comes up for approval at the beginning of the meeting. Such unscheduled agenda items will require a second reading except when waived by a two-thirds vote.
 - 4. Any changes in the Handbook or Bylaws will require a second reading.

SECTION IV: STANDING COMMITTEES

- A. Regulations Governing Standing Committees
 - 1. Standing Committee Chairs shall be elected by the Academic Senate from its membership at the Organizational Senate meeting at the end of Spring semester. A call for nominations for Standing Committee Chair positions should be posted two weeks prior to the Organizational meeting. Eligible members include those who have served at least one year on the Academic Senate and have served at least one year on the Standing Committee, either presently or in the past, for which the Chair position is sought. Each nominee is expected to express their interest and identify their qualifications at the Organizational meeting (*revised 2023-2024*).
 - 2. The Summer Senate shall appoint members of each Standing Committee, which shall be subject to ratification at the first regular Senate meeting of the Fall semester.
 - 3. Standing Committee operating procedures shall be as follows:
 - a. At the request of the Academic Senate, each Standing Committee shall be responsible for formulating policy recommendations. All recommendations requiring a change in policy shall be presented in writing and in resolution form to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, which shall schedule items for the Senate agenda.
 - b. Standing Committee recommendations that do not require a change in policy shall be reported to the Executive Committee by a memorandum.

- c. Topics for policy recommendations come to a Standing Committee only on referral from the Academic Senate Executive Committee or the Senate Chair. Notice of referral shall be included in the Academic Senate Log, which shall be attached to the next Senate agenda.
 - d. Each Standing Committee Chair may appoint subcommittees without membership restrictions;
 - e. All Standing Committee meetings shall be open. Committees may, by a simple majority vote, go into closed session to consider matters that are required to be held confidential, such as but not limited to appointments, recommendations concerning naming of facilities, or other similar items. However, regular business of each committee shall be in open session.
 - f. The present of a majority of voting Committee members shall constitute a quorum. The exception to this shall be that a quorum requires a majority of voting members when the Academic Affairs Committee meets as the University Curriculum Committee.
 - g. The Executive Committee will replace a Committee member who does not attend, without excuse or notification, three consecutive Committee meetings.
 - h. Standing Committee Chairs shall provide progress reports on the work of their committees at the regular meeting of the Academic Senate.
 - i. Standing Committee members shall identify to the Committee Chair an alternate who will attend meetings in the members' absence.
4. All university-wide committees to which the Senate has major appointing responsibilities and on which there are designated Senate committee representatives will provide to the Senate an annual report of all actions taken by the committee.
5. The Executive Committee may organize university committees as necessary in coordination with other University segments.
- B. The Standing Committees, their membership, and responsibilities shall be as follows:
- 1. Academic Affairs (AAC)
 - a. The Academic Affairs Committee shall consist of the following voting members: seven faculty appointed, and one student representing ASI. In addition, the Faculty Director of General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo), and (a) representative(s) from the Office of Academic Affairs with

responsibilities that include, but are not limited to, Peoplesoft, academic standing, academic master plan, course management activities, articulation agreements, general student program inquiries, graduate program coordination, and academic policies shall serve *ex officio* and non-voting.

- b. The Academic Affairs Committee functions shall be to review and report to the Academic Senate its recommendations regarding:
 1. All new academic policies, procedures, programs, and curricula having inter-school or all-university impact;
 2. Proposed changes to the University Catalog that have inter-school or all-university impact;
 3. The Academic Plan; and
 4. Proposed changes in the implementation of the General Education Program.
 5. In addition, the Academic Affairs Committee shall serve as the University Curriculum Committee for interschool programs that have required courses for majors and/or minors (i.e., not electives) in more than one school; and shall
 6. Recommend to the Academic Senate action to be taken when there is disagreement among faculty involved in proposed changes to the Catalog and/or to academic policies, procedures, programs and curricula having inter-school or all-university impact.
2. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)
 - a. The Faculty Affairs Committee shall consist of the following voting members: seven faculty, including at least one librarian. In addition, the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and a CFA Representative (the CFA President, Vice President, or Faculty Rights Chair as determined by the CFA President) shall serve *ex officio* and non-voting.
 - b. The functions of the Faculty Affairs Committee shall be to
 1. make recommendations to the Academic Senate on all policies and procedures concerning appointment, promotion, tenure, retention, evaluation, and other closely related matters;
 2. review and propose revisions to all sections of the Handbook; and
 3. review and prepare recommendations concerning policies on faculty development, such as the University Research Council.
3. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC)
 - a. The Budget and Planning Committee shall consist of the following voting members: seven faculty, including at least one student services officer, one librarian, one staff member, and the President of the Associated Students or

a designee. In addition, the Academic Senate Chair, the Provost, and Business and Administrative Services (BAS) Chief Financial Officer (CFO) or designee shall serve as ex officio and non-voting.

- b. The functions of the Budget and Planning Committee shall be to make recommendations to the Academic Senate on all policies and procedures related to:
 1. setting institutional priorities,
 2. allocating and utilizing University resources,
 3. jointly with the Academic Affairs Committee, approving the Academic Plan and new academic programs and reviewing existing programs, and
 4. responding to the needs of the University's service region. The committee shall monitor the University's planning processes and coordinate revisions to the Mission and Goals Statement.
4. Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS)
 - a. The Academic Support and Student Services Committee shall consist of the following voting members: seven faculty, including at least one librarian, one student services professional, one staff member and the Vice President of the Associated Students, Inc. or designee. In addition, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Dean of Libraries, the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management and the Executive Director of the Associated Students, Inc. or a designee shall serve ex officio, and nonvoting.
 - b. The Academic Support and Student Services Committee functions shall be to make policy recommendations to the Academic Senate concerning the library, media services, student services, international students, the cafeteria, the bookstore, the computer center, and the campus police. In the performance of this function, the committee shall monitor the University's academic support and student services programs and make recommendations to the appropriate administrator.

Section V: Expressions of the Senate

Expressions of the Senate represent statements of opinion, concern, recognition, or perspective adopted by the Academic Senate. Because these statements reflect the collective voice of the Senate rather than a policy action, Expressions of the Senate do not require approval by the President. The President may, at their discretion, choose to endorse the statement or issue a separate response.

A. Statements of the Senate

A Statement of the Senate is a formal expression of the collective view of the Academic Senate on matters affecting the University, the California State University system, higher education, or issues of academic concern.

Statements of the Senate may be brought forward by the Executive Committee, which retains the authority to place such items on the Senate agenda. Members of the Senate may also request that the Executive Committee consider bringing forward a Statement of the Senate, or request that the proposed Statement of the Senate be added to the agenda for consideration (see Section III. C. 3).

Individuals who are not members of the Senate, including faculty, staff, students, or administrators, may propose a Statement of the Senate by submitting the proposed statement to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will review such submissions and determine whether the item is appropriate to place on a future Senate agenda for consideration by the full Senate.

Statements of the Senate:

- a. **May be advisory in nature.**
- b. **Do not amend University policy unless expressly stated.**
- c. **Shall be presented in written form.**
- d. **Shall follow the same notice and second-reading requirements as resolutions unless waived by a two-thirds vote.**
- e. **Shall require a majority vote of those present and voting.**

B. Votes of No Confidence

- a. **A Vote of No Confidence is an extraordinary and serious expression of the Academic Senate indicating that it has lost confidence in the leadership of a specified administrator or administrators.**
- b. **A Vote of No Confidence shall not be initiated solely on the basis of policy disagreements, differences in administrative judgment, or personal or political disagreement.**
- c. **Initiating a Vote of No Confidence Resolution**
 - i. **A proposed Vote of No Confidence initiated by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate may be brought forward as a resolution adopted by a majority vote of the Executive Committee. The resolution shall include a clear statement of the grounds upon which it is based and a rationale supporting the proposal. Upon adoption by the Executive Committee, the proposed resolution shall be placed on the agenda of a regular Academic Senate meeting.**
 - ii. **A petition for a proposed Vote of No Confidence initiated by members of the General Faculty shall begin with a written notice of intent submitted to the Executive Committee. This notice shall indicate that signatures will be collected in support of a petition and shall include a clear statement of the grounds upon which the proposed Vote of No Confidence is based.**

1. **Following submission of the notice of intent, the petition for a Vote of No Confidence shall be developed in the form of a proposed resolution with a supporting rationale.**
 2. **The petition must bear the dated signatures of at least fifteen percent (15%) of the General Faculty within the relevant constituency of the University.**
 3. **The signature collection period shall begin on the date the notice of intent is submitted to the Executive Committee.**
 4. **All required signatures must be collected within thirty (30) working days of this notification. Only signatures dated within this 30-working day period shall be counted toward the required total.**
 5. **The petition, with dated signatures, shall be submitted to the Executive Committee for review of procedural compliance.**
- iii. **Review for Procedural Compliance**
1. **The Executive Committee shall review proposals submitted under subsection (ii) solely for compliance with the procedural requirements of this section. If the procedural requirements are satisfied, the Executive Committee shall place the item on the agenda of a regular Academic Senate meeting. The Executive Committee shall not make determinations regarding the substantive merits of the proposal.**
 2. **The confidentiality of the dated signatures shall be maintained.**
- iv. **Distribution**
1. **The proposed motion shall be distributed to the Academic Senate membership at least one regular meeting prior to consideration.**
- d. **Senate Action and Ratification**
- i. **The Academic Senate shall deliberate and determine the merits of the Vote of No Confidence. Because such action carries significant institutional implications, a Vote of No Confidence should be considered only in exceptional circumstances. Appropriate grounds may include, but are not limited to:**
 1. **Demonstrated misconduct;**
 2. **Actions that bring material disrepute to the University;**
 3. **Sustained dereliction of duty;**
 4. **Failure to perform the fundamental responsibilities of the office;**
or
 5. **Conduct that substantially impairs the effective functioning of the University.**
 - ii. **Adoption by the Academic Senate shall require:**
 1. **A quorum of the total voting membership;**
 2. **A two-thirds (2/3) vote of the voting members of the Academic Senate; and**
 3. **The resolution for a Vote of No Confidence must have two readings, and the first reading shall not be waived.**

iii. Ratification by the General Faculty.

- 1. If approved by two-thirds (2/3) of the voting members of the Academic Senate, the motion shall be forwarded to the General Faculty for consideration. Ratification shall require a majority vote of the General Faculty members voting.**

SECTION VI: AMENDMENTS

Amendments to these Bylaws must be offered at the regular meeting prior to the regular meeting at which the vote is taken, and this requirement cannot be suspended. A majority vote of the total Academic Senate membership is sufficient to amend these Bylaws.



Academic, Curricular, and Student Support Software Governance

RES 252629

AS&SS

- RESOLVED:** That the Information Technology Committee (ITC) be designated as the shared-governance body responsible for campus-funded academic, curricular, and student support software prioritization and selection decisions; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That faculty representation within ITC be strengthened through Academic Senate-nominated membership, either by replacing existing dean-selected faculty seats with Senate-nominated representatives and/or by adding at least one formally designated Academic Senate-nominated position to ensure direct Senate representation in ITC deliberations; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That when centrally supported academic, curricular, or student support applications with clear instructional impact are under evaluation for renewal, replacement, restructuring, or non-renewal, AS&SS be consulted during the review phase prior to final ITC consideration; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That replacement or restructuring of centrally supported academic, curricular, or student support software follow a representative user review process composed of primary users of the application, with evaluation criteria including instructional impact, accessibility, sustainability, functionality, and cost prior to ITC vote and Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) consideration; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That faculty be formally notified in advance of any approved transition that materially impacts assessment, instruction, student support functions, or academic workflows to ensure transparency and adequate transition planning.

RATIONALE:

Information Technology Services (ITS) recognizes that the Information Technology Committee (ITC) currently serves as the formal governance body responsible for evaluating institutional technology priorities, funding implications, accessibility considerations, sustainability, and instructional impact. Decisions voted on by ITC are forwarded to Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) for final institutional funding guidance. ITS further identifies significant and ongoing cost pressures affecting higher education technology procurement, including annual vendor increases, consolidation of technology providers, reductions in previously free services, and expanded premium licensing models. These pressures necessitate structured governance processes to ensure responsible stewardship of institutional resources while maintaining instructional quality and student support services. ITS indicates that representative user groups are convened when evaluating centrally supported tools and that AS&SS be informed when instructional impact is anticipated. Formalizing this consultative process through Senate action strengthens transparency, clarifies governance pathways, and ensures that faculty perspectives are structurally embedded in decisions affecting instruction and student support. Designating ITC as the primary governance body while strengthening Academic Senate–nominated representation promotes shared governance alignment. Establishing a defined consultative pathway with AS&SS when instructional impact is present ensures that academic and student-support considerations are integrated early in the review process rather than after decisions are finalized. Requiring representative user evaluation and advance faculty notification supports instructional continuity, mitigates disruption, and reinforces trust in campus decision-making processes.

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
VP for Student Affairs and Strategic Enrollment Management
AVP for Faculty Affairs
AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
College Deans
Associate Deans
Dean of Libraries
Dean of Antelope Valley

Dean of Extended University and Global Outreach
Department Chairs
General Faculty

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



**Readmission Requirements Following Academic Disqualification
RES 252641**

AS&SS, AAC

RESOLVED: That the readmission requirements for academically disqualified undergraduate students be revised to provide two clear return pathways applicable to all students regardless of class standing; and be it further

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

~~Students who had completed fewer than 60 semester units (Freshman or Sophomore Standing) before being dismissed must: (one of the two)~~

- ~~a. Have completed college work elsewhere or in CSUB Extended University and brought their total college work completed to 60 or more semester units with an overall grade point average of “C” (2.00) or better and demonstrated above average achievement in recent work or,~~
- ~~b. Attained at least a “B” (3.0) average in not less than 9 academically rigorous semester units.~~

~~Students who had completed 60 semester units or more (Junior or Senior Standing) before being dismissed must: (one of the two)~~

- ~~a. Earned college credit in academically rigorous course elsewhere or in CSUB Extended University and attained at least a “B” (3.0) average in not less than 6 academically rigorous semester units, or~~
- ~~b. Remained absent from the university for at least one year, during which time they have remedied the conditions that contributed to their academic difficulty.~~

All undergraduate students seeking readmission after academic disqualification will follow one of the two pathways below, regardless of class standing:

1. One-semester Readmission Pathway:

A student may request readmission after one semester away from CSUB by completing a minimum of six (6) semester units of transferable, degree-

applicable coursework with a cumulative GPA of 2.00 (“C”) or higher. The coursework must demonstrate academic improvement and readiness to return. Semester units may be completed elsewhere or through CSUB Extended Education.

2. Two-Semester Readmission Pathway:

A student may request readmission after two consecutive terms away from CSUB, which may include summer. Under this pathway, no coursework is required; however, the student must demonstrate that the conditions contributing to their academic difficulty have been addressed.

All petitions for readmission will be evaluated by the Academic Petitions Committee, which may request documentation demonstrating academic readiness.

RATIONALE:

Updating the readmission criteria provides a clear and consistent policy for all undergraduate students returning after academic disqualification. Establishing two pathways—a one-semester option requiring completion of degree-applicable coursework with demonstrated academic improvement, and a two-semester option without coursework requirements—offers flexibility while maintaining academic standards. These changes simplify the readmission process, eliminate inconsistencies between lower- and upper-division requirements, and help students return to degree completion with clearer expectations and a more equitable structure.

Distribution List:

President
Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Vice-President for Student Affairs and Strategic Enrollment Management
AVP for Faculty Affairs
AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
College Deans
Associate Deans
Dean of Libraries
Dean of Antelope Valley
Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach

Department Chairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Other units for consideration for distribution list:

Vice-President for Business and Administrative Services and Chief Financial Officer

Vice-President for University Advancement

Vice-President for People and Culture

Chief of Staff to the President

AVP for Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment

AVP for Grants, Research and Sponsored Programs

AVP for Information Technology Services and Chief Information Officer

AVP for Student Affairs and Dean of Students

AVP for Enrollment Management

Director of Enrollment Management Systems (formerly Academic Operations)

Director of Undergraduate Advising

Executive Director of Associated Students, Inc.

Director of the Center for Accessibility and Essential Needs (formerly SSD)

Director of Athletics



New Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering

RES 252638

AAC, BPC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approves the proposed Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering degree program.

RATIONALE: The Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering program is designed to meet the demand for mechanical engineers by local industries in Kern County and beyond, including but not limited to sustainable and conventional energy (e.g. petroleum), power, construction, aerospace, agriculture, and health and safety. The program curriculum offers students the opportunity to build and develop technical expertise in areas of thermal-fluid sciences, mechanical systems, and material sciences. The Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering program addresses an important community need and every level of review has found it to be sound academically. The proposed degree program can launch with existing resources.

Attachment: Referral 2025-2026 37 New Degree Proposal for Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering

Distribution List:

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:


Academic Senate

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



2025-2026 REFERRAL #37

New Degree Proposal for Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering

From: Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair 

To: Tiffany Tsantsoulas, Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) Chair
Amanda Grombly, Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) Chair

Date: January 20, 2026

cc: Katherine Van Grinsven, Academic Senate Administrative Analyst

At their meeting on December 2, 2025, the Academic Senate Executive Committee requested that the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) and Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) review and address the new proposal for a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering.

During your discussion, please consider:

- rationale as presented in the attached proposal
- impact on students.

Please take up this matter with your committees and get back to me with your recommendations. If your recommendation requires Senate action, please prepare a resolution and the rationale for the resolution.

Thank you.

Attachments:

- (1) Link to view in CIM: <https://next-catalog.csub.edu/programadmin/> Enter 09101 in search box.
- (2) 09101_ Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering.pdf

DR. MELISSA DANFORTH, CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy. • Mail Stop: 20 BDC • Bakersfield, CA 93311

09101: BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MECHANICAL ENGINEERING (BSME)

In Workflow

1. 806 - PHEN Curriculum Review (zliu3@csub.edu)
2. NSM Curriculum Committee (dgilliland@csub.edu)
3. NSM Dean Office (jdong2@csub.edu,klopez@csub.edu)
4. Academic Programs (eadams6@csub.edu)
5. Senate Approval (mdanforth@csub.edu,kvan-grinsven@csub.edu)
6. President (vharper@csub.edu,kvan-grinsven@csub.edu)
7. Academic Operations (amendoza145@csub.edu,czuniga-prado@csub.edu,org-curriculum@csub.edu)

Approval Path

1. Thu, 16 Oct 2025 17:22:13 GMT
Zhongzhe Liu (zliu3): Approved for 806 - PHEN Curriculum Review
2. Fri, 17 Oct 2025 17:06:47 GMT
Denise Gilliland (dgilliland): Rollback to 806 - PHEN Curriculum Review for NSM Curriculum Committee
3. Fri, 24 Oct 2025 01:02:26 GMT
Zhongzhe Liu (zliu3): Approved for 806 - PHEN Curriculum Review
4. Fri, 24 Oct 2025 16:28:29 GMT
Denise Gilliland (dgilliland): Rollback to 806 - PHEN Curriculum Review for NSM Curriculum Committee
5. Fri, 24 Oct 2025 23:49:00 GMT
Zhongzhe Liu (zliu3): Approved for 806 - PHEN Curriculum Review
6. Mon, 27 Oct 2025 16:18:16 GMT
Denise Gilliland (dgilliland): Approved for NSM Curriculum Committee
7. Mon, 27 Oct 2025 23:20:02 GMT
Jane Dong (jdong2): Approved for NSM Dean Office

New Program Proposal

Date Submitted: Tue, 14 Oct 2025 22:11:13 GMT

Viewing: 09101 : Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering (BSME)

Last edit: Mon, 27 Oct 2025 23:19:45 GMT

Changes proposed by: Tat Acharya (001517152)

Contact

User ID

001517152

Proposer Name

Tat Acharya

Proposer E-mail

tacharya@csub.edu

Proposer Department

Physics and Engineering

Program Information

Program Type

Bachelor of Science

Effective Catalog

2026-2027

Effective Term

Spring 2027

College

Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering

Department

Physics and Engineering

Program Title

Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering (BSME)

Program Code

09101

CIP Code

14.1901 - 14.1901

Academic Career

Undergraduate

Support Type

State Support

Delivery Format

Fully Face-to-Face

Is the proposed program subject to WASC Substantive Change?

Yes

Explain

Dr. Elizabeth Adams will submit the Substantive Change Screening Form.

WASC Proposal Attachment

WASC declaration.docx

Program Overview and Rationale

Provide a brief descriptive overview of the program citing its 1) purpose and strengths, 2) fit with the institutional mission or institutional learning outcomes and 3) the compelling reasons for offering the program at this time.

The proposed B.S. Program in Mechanical Engineering is designed to meet the increasing demand for mechanical engineers by the local industries in Kern County and beyond. The educational objective of the program is to prepare students with baccalaureate degrees in mechanical engineering, who will fill in positions involving roles and responsibilities in the government agencies, education, and local industries, including but not limited to sustainable and conventional energy (e.g. petroleum), power, construction, aerospace, agriculture, and public health.

Within the B.S. degree program in Mechanical Engineering, the students will (a) build and develop strong technical expertise in areas of thermal-fluid sciences, mechanical systems, and material sciences, (b) assess the broader impacts of their technical knowledge on economic, environmental, societal, and ethical issues in engineering, (c) learn to effectively communicate with peers, supervisors, clientele, vendors, decision makers, and administrators, (d) commit to lifelong learning, and (e) engage in post-baccalaureate endeavors including engineering practice and/or graduate studies. The educational objectives of the program align with California State University, Bakersfield's institutional mission of providing high-quality, accessible education promoting student success and intellectual development, while fostering community engagement and contributing to regional growth.

In addition to the growing need for mechanical engineers in the region, the baccalaureate degree program will attract many students in Kern County who are unable to leave the region. The CSU campuses closest to Bakersfield that offer a baccalaureate degree program in mechanical engineering are the following: (a) California State University, Northridge (CSUN), which is 95 miles away and will require a student from Bakersfield to drive for 2 hours each way depending on traffic. (b) California State University, Fresno (CSU-Fresno), which is 110 miles away from Bakersfield, and will require a student to drive for 2.5 hours each way depending on traffic. The baccalaureate degree program in mechanical engineering at CSUB will therefore attract many students that are interested in pursuing a mechanical engineering degree but are unable to travel to campuses outside of Bakersfield. In addition, the baccalaureate degree program in mechanical engineering will help students build valuable connections with the local industries and will foster workplace learning.

The establishment of a dedicated mechanical engineering program at CSUB is essential to distinguish and strengthen the academic identity of this discipline within the broader engineering curriculum. While the current engineering program closely mirrors a mechanical engineering degree, the proposed program introduces three new core courses and several specialized electives that will

deepen students' understanding and technical proficiency in key areas of mechanical engineering. Cross-listing existing courses will ensure efficient resource utilization, while the new additions provide a more focused and industry-relevant education. This formal recognition of mechanical engineering as a standalone program will enhance the university's ability to meet ABET accreditation standards, attract high-achieving students, and respond more effectively to the workforce needs of Kern County and surrounding regions.

Program Description (i.e. Catalog Description)

The Bachelor of Science degree program in Mechanical Engineering will educate and train students in areas of thermal and fluid sciences, mechanical systems, and material sciences. The program involves courses designed to develop and strengthen fundamental skills in advanced mathematics including calculus and differential equations, physics, and chemistry. Students will also build hands-on skills in experimentation, scientific computing, numerical simulations, and design and fabrication, through course laboratory assignments and the senior year capstone design project. Finally, the program will also help students learn and develop communication and public speaking skills.

Program Requirements

Code	Title	Units
General Education Requirement		
Subject Area 1A: English Composition		3
Subject Area 1B: Critical Thinking ¹		0
Subject Area 1C: Oral Communication		3
Subject Area 2: Mathematical Concepts & Quantitative Reasoning ¹		0
Subject Area 3A: Arts		3
Subject Area 3B: Humanities		3
Upper Division 3 Arts or Humanities: (3UD) ¹		0
Subject Area 4: Social and Behavioral Sciences ¹		0
Upper Division 4 Social and Behavioral Sciences: (4UD) ¹		0
Subject Area 5A: Physical Science ¹		0
Subject Area 5B: Biological Sciences ¹		0
Subject Area 5C: Laboratory ¹		0
Upper Division 5 Science: (5UD) ¹		0
Subject Area 6: Ethnic Studies		3
<i>General Education Subtotal</i>		<i>15</i>
Campus Requirements		
First-Year Seminar (FYS) ²		0
American Institutions: Government		3
American Institutions: History		3
Junior Year Diversity & Reflection (JYDR)		3
Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) ²		0
Capstone ²		0
<i>Campus Requirement Subtotal</i>		<i>9</i>
Major Requirements		
<i>Lower Division</i>		
MECH 1618	Introduction to Engineering I ^{2,3}	2
MECH 1628	Introduction to Engineering II ^{2,3}	2
MECH 2350	Engineering Graphics ³	2
MECH 2110	Analytic Mechanics, Statics ³	3
MECH 2140	Materials Science and Engineering ³	4
MECH 2070	Electric Circuits ³	4
MECH 2120	Analytical Mechanics, Dynamics ³	3
MECH 2130	Mechanics of Materials ³	3
<i>Upper Division</i>		
MECH 3300	Engineering Modeling and Analysis ³	3
MECH 3110	Thermodynamics ³	4
ECE 3340	Control Systems	4
MECH 3310	Numerical Methods and Applications in Engineering ³	3
MECH 3120	Fluid Mechanics ³	4
MECH 3400	Manufacturing Processes	2
MECH 4610	Thermodynamics II	3
MECH 4110	Heat Transfer ³	4

MECH 4120	Machine Design ³	4
MECH 4900	Senior Design Project A ³	2
MECH 4918	Senior Design Project B ^{1,2,3}	3
<i>Electives</i>		
Select 5 units from the following list of electives		5
MECH 3450	HVAC System Design	
MECH 4500	Computational Fluid Dynamics	
MECH 4700	Special Topics in Engineering ³	
MECH 4800	Research Participation ³	
MECH 4260	Economics of Engineering Design ³	
<i>Cognates</i>		
CHEM 1000	Foundations of Chemistry	3
MATH 2510	Single Variable Calculus I	4
MATH 2520	Single Variable Calculus II	4
CHEM 1001	Foundations of Chemistry Laboratory	2
PHYS 2210	Physics for Scientists and Engineers I	4
PHYS 2220	Physics for Scientists and Engineers II	4
MATH 2533	Multivariable and Vector Calculus	4
MATH 2540	Ordinary Differential Equations	4
PHIL 3318	Professional Ethics ^{1,2}	3
Additional Units Needed Towards Graduation		0
Total Units		120

¹ Some General Education requirements are covered within the major by the standard requirement or General Education Modification (GEM). The GEM used in MECH program is the approved GEM used in the ENGR program, which is as follows:

General Education Modifications (GEMS)

- The required Physics courses (PHYS 2210 (<https://catalog.csub.edu/search/?P=PHYS%202210>) Physics for Scientists and Engineers I or PHYS 2220 (<https://catalog.csub.edu/search/?P=PHYS%202220>) Physics for Scientists and Engineers II) or CHEM 1000 (<https://catalog.csub.edu/search/?P=CHEM%201000>) Foundations of Chemistry will satisfy Subject Area 5A. CHEM 1001 (<https://catalog.csub.edu/search/?P=CHEM%201001>) Foundations of Chemistry Laboratory will satisfy Subject Area 5C.
- Subject Area 1B is satisfied through the following courses: PHYS 2210 or PHYS 2220 or MECH/ENGR/ECE/PHYS 2070.
- Subject Area 5B is satisfied through the following courses: MECH 2140 or MECH 3120 or MECH 4110.
- Subject Area 4 is satisfied by American Institution - Government (American & Constitutional Ideals) or is also met through EAC/ABET Criterion 3 (Student Outcomes) outcome 2 or outcome 4. Outcome 2 is met through MECH/ENGR 4900. Outcome 4 is met through MECH/ENGR 4918.
- Any of the required calculus courses (MATH 2310 (<https://catalog.csub.edu/search/?P=MATH%202310>) Single Variable Calculus I for Engineers or MATH 2320 (<https://catalog.csub.edu/search/?P=MATH%202320>) Single Variable Calculus II for Engineers or MATH 2510 (<https://catalog.csub.edu/search/?P=MATH%202510>) Single Variable Calculus I or MATH 2520 (<https://catalog.csub.edu/search/?P=MATH%202520>) Single Variable Calculus II or MATH 2533 Multivariable and Vector Calculus or MATH 2540 Ordinary Differential Equations) will satisfy Subject Area 2.
- Upper Division Area 4 is met through EAC/ABET Criterion 3 (Student Outcomes) outcomes 2 or 4. Outcome 2 is met through MECH/ENGR 4900. Outcome 4 is met through MECH/ENGR 4918.
- Upper Division Area 5 is satisfied through the following courses: MECH 3110 or MECH 3120 or MECH 3300 or MECH 3310 or MECH 4110, or MECH 4120.
- PHIL 3318 (<https://catalog.csub.edu/search/?P=PHIL%203318>) Professional Ethics must be taken and will satisfy Upper Division Area 3.

² Some Campus Requirements are covered within the major.

- MECH 1618 Introduction to Engineering I and MECH 1628 Introduction to Engineering II satisfy the FYS requirement for entering Freshmen
- GWAR is satisfied with the completion of PHIL 3318 Professional Ethics Course.
- Capstone is satisfied with the completion of MECH 4918 Senior Design Project B.

³ These courses are cross listed with Engineering (ENGR) courses.

Program Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcome. Identify each PLO one by one (select the green "+" to add)

PLO #1: Succeed in the mechanical engineering industry or continue for a position in academia through technical competence, effective communication, leadership skills, and teamwork.

- 1. Goal 1: Critical reasoning and problem solving skills
 - • 1.A Ability to read critically
 - 1.B Ability to write critically
 - 1.C Ability to speak critically
 - 1.D Ability to think critically
 - 1.E Capacity for life-long learning
 - 1.F Critical Problem Solving
- 3. Goal 3: Discipline-based and career knowledge
 - • 3.A Knowledge in the major discipline
 - 3.B Ability to apply knowledge of discipline
 - 3.C Career preparation and planning
- 4. Goal 4: Numerical literacy
 - • 4.A Mathematical calculations and estimation skills
 - 4.B Quantitative reasoning skills.
 - 4.C Apply quantitative reasoning skills to the real world

Program Learning Outcome. Identify each PLO one by one (select the green "+" to add)

PLO#2: Maintain a lifelong interest in learning for professional and personal development.

- 3. Goal 3: Discipline-based and career knowledge
 - • 3.A Knowledge in the major discipline
 - 3.B Ability to apply knowledge of discipline
 - 3.C Career preparation and planning
- 5. Goal 5: Students will become engaged citizens.
 - • 5.A Engage in university and community activities
 - 5.B Interpersonal skills
 - 5.C Knowledge of self
 - 5.D Responsibility in group settings
 - 5.E Ability to work independently
- 6. Goal 6: Students will develop a well rounded skill set.
 - • 6.A Possess and demonstrate an ethical framework
 - 6.B Understanding of cultural and ethnic diversity.
 - 6.C Research methods/analysis/technology for problem solving
 - 6.D Interdisciplinary knowledge

Program Learning Outcome. Identify each PLO one by one (select the green "+" to add)

PLO#3: Practice mechanical engineering in a manner that is ethically responsible and consistent with regulatory and social concerns.

- 6. Goal 6: Students will develop a well rounded skill set.
 - • 6.A Possess and demonstrate an ethical framework

Program Learning Outcome. Identify each PLO one by one (select the green "+" to add)

SLO #1

An ability to identify, formulate, and solve complex engineering problems by applying principles of engineering, science, and mathematics.

1a Use calculus and differential equations to solve complex engineering problems

1b Use physical concepts and laws to solve complex engineering problems

1c Identify and describe a complex engineering problem

- 1. Goal 1: Critical reasoning and problem solving skills
 - • 1.D Ability to think critically
 - 1.F Critical Problem Solving
- 4. Goal 4: Numerical literacy
 - • 4.A Mathematical calculations and estimation skills

- 4.B Quantitative reasoning skills.
- 4.C Apply quantitative reasoning skills to the real world

Program Learning Outcome. Identify each PLO one by one (select the green "+" to add)

SLO#2

An ability to apply engineering design to produce solutions that meet specific needs with consideration of public health, safety, and welfare, as well as global, cultural, social, environmental, and economic factors.

2a. Follow systematic and logical design procedures and define specifications to meet project requirements. Implement, validate, and meet design goals.

2b. Evaluate different alternatives for a design taking into consideration public health, safety, and welfare.

- 3. Goal 3: Discipline-based and career knowledge
 - 3.A Knowledge in the major discipline
- 3.B Ability to apply knowledge of discipline
- 6. Goal 6: Students will develop a well rounded skill set.
 - 6.A Possess and demonstrate an ethical framework

Program Learning Outcome. Identify each PLO one by one (select the green "+" to add)

SLO#3 An ability to communicate effectively with a range of audiences

3a Write quality technical reports or term papers

3b Prepare and deliver well-organized presentations

3c Respond and discuss relevant questions during oral presentations

- 2. Goal 2: Oral and written communication
 - 2.A Writing Skills
- 2.B Oral presentation skills
- 2.C Competence in information management
- 2.D Computer literacy

Program Learning Outcome. Identify each PLO one by one (select the green "+" to add)

SLO#4 An ability to recognize ethical and professional responsibilities in engineering situations and make informed judgements, which must consider the impact of engineering solutions in global, economic, environmental, and societal contexts.

4a Identify ethical issues involved in a professional setting. Discuss related codes of ethics such as NSPE code of ethics.

4b Follow safety standards and procedures

4c Discuss the impact of engineering solutions on society and the environment

4d Discuss the economic impact and constraints of engineering solutions

- 6. Goal 6: Students will develop a well rounded skill set.
 - 6.A Possess and demonstrate an ethical framework

Program Learning Outcome. Identify each PLO one by one (select the green "+" to add)

SLO#5 An ability to function effectively in a team whose members together provide leadership, create a collaborative and inclusive environment, establish goals, plan tasks, and meet objectives.

5a Divide a project into manageable tasks and balance the load among team members.

5b Participate in group meetings, meet deadlines, and achieve project goals.

- 5. Goal 5: Students will become engaged citizens.
 - 5.B Interpersonal skills
- 5.C Knowledge of self
- 5.D Responsibility in group settings
- 6. Goal 6: Students will develop a well rounded skill set.
 - 6.D Interdisciplinary knowledge

PHIL 3318										
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Download the Curriculum Map PDF from the CIM Program Homescreen

Attach Curriculum Map

1Curriculum Map-rev1.docx

Attach 5 Year Assessment Plan

2five-year assessment plan-rev2.docx

Does the program use courses offered by other programs?

Yes

Affected Departments

Department

Mathematics

Computer & Electrical Engr & Computer Science

Chemistry and Biochemistry

Attach letter of support from relevant department(s)

DepartmentSupportLetter_ElectricalEngineering.pdf

Mech_Eng_Degree program_F25_signed_Chemistry.pdf

ME_LetterSupport_Mathematics.pdf

The total number of units required for graduation (not just the total for the major):

120

Does this baccalaureate program require more than 120-semester units?

No

Does this program have any concentrations or emphasis planned under the proposed major?

No

List any new courses that are: (1) needed to initiate the program or (2) needed during the first two years after implementation. Include proposed catalog descriptions for new courses. For graduate program proposals, identify whether each new course would be at the graduate- or undergraduate-level.

MECH 3400: Manufacturing Processes (2), MECH 3450 HVAC System Design (3), MECH 4500 Computational Fluid Dynamics (2).

Attach a proposed course-offering plan for the first three years of program implementation, indicating likely faculty teaching assignments.

3 Proposed course offering plan with teaching assignments-rev2.docx

Please specify the total number of prerequisite units required for the major. Note: The prerequisites must be included in the total program unit count.

29

For undergraduate programs, specify planned provisions for articulation of the proposed major with community college programs.

Roadmaps are attached here.

Academic Roadmap Attachment

4Academic Roadmaps-rev4.docx

For a new program - does this program align with an ADT?

No

Does this program change create new alignment with an ADT?

No

Is this program:

Subject to accreditation

Describe how accreditation requirements will be met, if applicable.

We will apply for ABET accreditation in January 2029. It is currently accredited under WSCUC.

Anticipated Date of Accreditation

2029

Student Demand

Provide compelling evidence of student interest in enrolling in the proposed program. Types of evidence vary and may include (for example), national, statewide, and professional employment forecasts and surveys; petitions; lists of related associate degree programs at feeder community colleges; reports from community college transfer centers; and enrollments from feeder baccalaureate programs.

Student surveys were conducted at Kern High School District and at the local community colleges.

Till now, the survey circulated in Kern High School District has been responded to by 147 students and approximately 66 % of the students suggested that they would be interested in joining the baccalaureate degree program in mechanical engineering if it was offered by CSUB.

The survey conducted among community college students has been responded to by 10 students with 80% indicating that they would be interested in joining the baccalaureate degree program in mechanical engineering at CSUB.

Identify how issues of diversity and access to the university were considered when planning this program. Describe what steps the program will take to insure ALL prospective candidates have equitable access to the program. This description may include recruitment strategies and any other techniques to insure a diverse and qualified candidate pool.

When planning the mechanical engineering program, issues of diversity and access were central considerations to ensure an inclusive and equitable environment. The program incorporates several strategies to promote diversity and widen access. Targeted recruitment campaigns will be implemented, including outreach initiatives aimed at feeder community colleges, partnerships with community organizations, and high schools through open house and college night events. CSUB engineering is not impacted, allowing for the admission of students from diverse backgrounds, experiences, and challenges. To further support underrepresented students, the program will establish mentorship initiatives, peer support networks, and leverage the CSUB resources for students which are designed to foster an inclusive community and provide necessary academic and social support. Financial barriers will be addressed through scholarships (currently NSME has an S-STEM grant) and financial aid targeted at students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, ensuring economic constraints do not hinder access. Additionally, the curriculum will be designed to incorporate diverse perspectives related to engineering challenges, promoting cultural competency and inclusivity. Efforts will also be made to create a welcoming environment through inclusive policies. The program commits to continuous evaluation by regularly reviewing recruitment, retention, and support strategies through data collection and feedback, ensuring ongoing improvement and responsiveness to the needs of diverse applicant pools. Through these comprehensive steps, the program aims to foster a diverse, equitable, and accessible environment where all qualified prospective candidates can succeed and contribute to the new program in mechanical engineering.

Describe professional uses of the proposed degree program.

Graduates of the proposed Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering program at CSU Bakersfield will be well prepared for diverse and high-demand roles across multiple industries. With strong foundational knowledge in thermodynamics, mechanics, materials, fluid systems, and control systems, future graduates will be equipped to work in engineering design, analysis, testing, manufacturing, and operations.

Career opportunities span across traditional and emerging sectors vital to Kern County and Southern California economies, including, but not limited to energy (oil, gas, and renewables), water systems, agriculture technology, aerospace, and transportation. The curriculum also supports pathways to Professional Engineer (PE) licensure and graduate studies in engineering, applied sciences, or business administration.

Potential job outcomes include, but are not limited to:

- Mechanical Engineer
- Design Engineer
- Manufacturing Engineer
- Systems Engineer
- Energy Systems Engineer
- HVAC Engineer
- Product Development Engineer
- Engineering Analyst
- Maintenance Engineer
- Quality Assurance Engineer
- Aerospace Engineer
- Plant Engineer
- Mechatronics or Automation Engineer

- Research and Development Engineer
- Water Resource Engineer
- Thermal Systems Engineer

Additionally, graduates may eventually qualify for leadership roles such as:

- Project Manager
- Technical Sales Engineer
- Engineering Consultant
- Operations Manager

This degree also provides the academic foundation necessary to pursue the Fundamentals of Engineering (FE) exam and eventually obtain a PE license, which enhances career advancement and credential recognition in California and nationwide.

Anticipated Student Demand (Majors)

	At Initiation	After 3 Years	After 5 Years
Number of Majors (Annual)	45	105	135
Number of Graduates (Cumulative)	0	15	45

Attach documentation as needed:

5Anticipated Student Demand.docx

Societal and Public Need for the Proposed Degree Major Program

List other California State University campuses currently offering or projecting the proposed degree major program; list neighboring institutions, public and private, currently offering the proposed degree major program.

Institution(s)
Cal Poly San Luis Obispo
Cal Poly Pomona
Cal State Long Beach
Cal State LA
CSU Northridge
Chico State
Sacramento State
San Diego State
Cal State Fullerton
Cal State East Bay
Cal Maritime

Describe differences between the proposed program and programs listed above.

The proposed Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering at CSUB is not currently offered at CSUB nor at any other public or private institution within immediate proximity to the Bakersfield region. The nearest CSU campus offering a comparable program is California State University, Northridge (CSUN), located approximately 100 miles southeast of Bakersfield—well outside daily commuting range for most students.

While other CSU campuses such as Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, Cal Poly Pomona, and CSU Los Angeles offer accredited mechanical engineering degrees, these institutions are located more than 100 miles away, limiting access for students from Kern County and surrounding areas. Similarly, while community colleges such as Bakersfield College offer preparatory coursework in engineering, they do not provide a pathway to a full baccalaureate degree in mechanical engineering without requiring transfer.

Given the significant regional demand in Bakersfield for mechanical engineers in the energy, agriculture, manufacturing, and water infrastructure sectors, the absence of a local program places an undue burden on students seeking this career path. The proposed program at CSUB will provide affordable, accessible, and high-quality mechanical engineering education to a traditionally underserved region, while also meeting the growing workforce needs of Bakersfield and Kern County.

List other curricula currently offered by the campus that are closely related to the proposed program.

Curricula

B.S. Engineering

Describe community participation, if any, in the planning process. This may include prospective employers of graduates.

The letters are attached. We have support from what company and they specialize in?

Provide applicable workforce demand projections and other relevant data.

Workforce Demand Projections.docx
CSUB Letter of Support_ME Program_WZI.pdf
CSUB Letter of Support_ME Program_CRC.pdf

Existing Support Resources for the Proposed Degree Major Program

List faculty who would teach in the program, indicating rank, appointment status, highest degree earned, date and field of highest degree, professional experience, and affiliations with other campus programs. Note: For all proposed graduate degree programs, there must be a minimum of five full-time faculty members with the appropriate terminal degree.

Tathagata Acharya PhD, Mechanical Engineering, 2014
Galina Dzyubenko PhD, Physics, 1986
Gyeong Sung Kim PhD, Mechanical Engineering, 2022
Yize Li PhD, Physics, 2009
Zhongzhe Liu PhD, Chemical Engineering, 2014
Krishna Prasai PhD, Physics, 2013
Dayanand Saini PhD, Petroleum Engineering 2011
Karim Salehpoor PhD, Mechanical Engineering 2007

Describe facilities that would be used in support of the proposed program.

A. Offices, Classrooms, and Laboratories

The following are the details of the facilities that are available to the B.S. degree program in mechanical engineering at CSUB:

Offices: All full-time faculty members have an office in the Science III building on the CSUB main campus (Bakersfield), while adjunct faculty members have shared offices. The offices provide privacy for meetings and advising sessions with students. Each office has a computer connected to the campus network, allowing faculty access to most software applications required for teaching and faculty research and development. In addition, dedicated offices are available to the department's administrative support coordinator and instructional support technician.

Classrooms: The department does not have sole control of any classrooms, but these are allocated centrally by the Office of Academic Scheduling. Therefore, program classes are scheduled across the campus. All classrooms are "smart" because they are equipped with a network computer and a projector.

Laboratory facilities. The department does not have dedicated computer laboratories. However, the program has access to several computer laboratories across campus that are shared with other departments to teach computer-based laboratories. Table 8 shows the details of these facilities:

In addition, the department keeps a cart with laptops (17 Dell Latitude 6500 and 5 Dell Latitude E5430) running MS Office, MATLAB, NI MultiSim. The cart is rolled into regular laboratories as needed.

The department has scheduling control of the facilities listed below for instructional laboratory courses. Faculty can authorize the use of engineering laboratories outside of class time. However, the faculty must inform the department staff of (a) the list of allowed students and (b) any safety restrictions on access outside of class time, such as requiring an instructional student assistant (CSUB's equivalent of a T.A.) to be present.

EC 102. This is a Properties of Materials laboratory. The room has fume hoods, 223 water, and drains.

EC 103. This is a faculty research laboratory. This room has a Particle Image Velocimetry (PIV) apparatus in addition to a flow rig which can be used for senior design projects within MECH 4900 and MECH 4918.

EC 201. This laboratory is shared with the Department of Computer and Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (CEE/CS). They will teach ECE 3370 Power Systems and MECH/ENGR/ECE 1618, 1628 Introduction to Engineering I & II Activities there. The Department of Physics and Engineering will teach MECH/ENGR/ECE 1618, 1628 Introduction to Engineering I & II Activities, and MECH/ENGR/ECE 2070 Electric Circuits.

EC 202. This is a faculty research laboratory. In addition, certain elective courses may be taught here. The room has fume hoods, water, and drains.

SCI III 106. This room is shared with the Department of CEE/CS. This lab contains remote sensors and calibration instruments.

SCI II 177. Presently this room is being used as the laboratory for ENGR 3120 Fluid Mechanics, which will be cross-listed with MECH 3120.

Fab Lab. This is used by students to aid in their (both freshman and senior) projects. The CSUB Fab Lab is part of the Fab Foundation network. All labs in the network must contain a standard set of hardware and software, at a minimum; items such as a computer-networked controlled (CNC) router, 3D printers, laser cutters, vinyl cutters, milling machine, laptop computers, various circuit boards, and circuitry items, soldering guns, CNC sewing machine, and multiple corresponding software packages. The Fab Lab is staffed by a Fab Lab Specialist, three paid interns, and eleven unpaid interns.

Storage. The department has a storage container ("sea train") where equipment can be stored. Equipment for courses not being taught during a particular term can be stored for optimal use of lab space.

B. Computing Resources

The department does not have specific, dedicated computer resources; however, students in the program will have access to the following resources:

SCI III 324. Mechanical Engineering majors will have access to the CEE/CS Tutoring Center. This is a walk-in lab with twenty-two Linux computers (sixteen Dell Precision T3400 224 and six Dell Optiplex 360) which are available for student use, even if they are not seeking tutoring. The CEE/CS Tutoring Center is open for computer use Monday – Thursday from 8:00am to 5:30pm and on Fridays from 8:00am – 3:30pm.

WSL Computer Lab A. This is a large area in the library with 11 Apple iMacs 21.5, and 68 Dell Optiplex 3030 AIO computers. These are general-purpose computers with internet access with MS Office, and MATLAB. It is available to students 7 AM-10 PM, Monday through Thursday, 7 AM - 5 PM on Friday, 9 AM - 5 PM Saturday, and 11 AM - 7 PM on Sundays.

Computer maintenance is done through the campus ITS Department on an as-needed basis and during campus breaks for upgrades and maintenance. The ITS personnel are solely responsible for handling (i.e., installation and updates) any new software applications needed for instruction purposes. Minor servicing is done through the ITS Help Desk and student employees. Most of these minor service needs are usually addressed remotely from the Help Desk.

Wi-Fi is available throughout the campus. Students can access the network with a NetID provided by the university.

C. Guidance

Every lab course starts with safety training. Students are required to undergo this training on the first day of the lab and sign a document indicating that they did so. The instructor also fills out a corresponding form. This training requirement applies to all students, including those working on research with a faculty mentor and high school students participating in summer research programs. These records are audited by the NSME Lab Safety Coordinator every term and kept by the department's Instructional Support Technician for three years. Students learn how to use the laboratory equipment under the guidance and supervision of a faculty member during the lab session of the associated course. Students are taught the proper inspection and control procedures before being allowed to work with the equipment to ensure the safe operation and handling of the equipment.

All Fab Lab users are required to complete the CSUB Fab Lab safety orientation workshop and comply with all CSUB Fab Lab safety rules (a copy of which is posted in the CSUB Fab Lab) before using any CSUB Fab Lab equipment. The Fab Lab Director or other available staff members conduct these orientations as needed, and a signed CSUB Fab Lab User

See supporting documents for details.

Provide evidence that the institution provides adequate access to both electronic and physical library and learning resources.

The Walter W. Stiern Library opened in 1994 and is the largest building on the California State University, Bakersfield campus. The 150,000-square-foot building houses nearly half a million volumes and provides electronic access to more than 30,000 periodical titles via its hundreds of computer terminals. The library is managed and operated by 29 staff members and faculty librarians.

On the main floor, students can check out books, laptop computers, and iPads, obtain research help from a librarian at the reference desk, borrow reserve materials, or use the reference computers to access resources. The library's users check out more than 200,000 physical and electronic books per year on average. The Interlibrary Loan Department, which performs more than 15,000 borrowing and

lending transactions per year, is located on the first floor, as are the reference, California History, Multicultural, First Year Experience, and law collections. The Resource Sharing Department, which performs more than 4,000 borrowing and lending transactions per year, is located on the first floor, as are the reference, juvenile, California History, Multicultural, career and student success, law, and popular reading collections.

The 2nd floor contains the library's extensive collection of print periodicals. The 3rd and 4th floors house the primary book collections. Computer Science, Engineering, and other technology-related books are located on the 4th floor. Texts related to general Engineering number 634 in-print books and 101 in-print journals. Texts related to Computer Engineering, Electronic Engineering, and Electronics number 1401 in-print books and 466 in-print journals. This circulation collection is the most extensive academic book collection in the southern San Joaquin Valley. Group and individual study rooms are also found on these floors.

Ten full-time Librarians, all of whom hold advanced degrees in library science, on average, answer more than 500 reference questions per week at the reference desk. They also provide online reference assistance through the 24-hour Question Point service and offer in-depth help to students through the Individual Research Assistance Program. There is a tenured Full Librarian assigned to the engineering subject area. Services provided by the Librarian include consultation with students and faculty, both in-person and online, and orientation programs.

Access to the library's collection and electronic resources is provided online via the library's homepage: library.csub.edu. From the homepage, CSUB users can connect to eBooks, research databases and reference resources. All these resources can be accessed off campus by CSUB students and faculty. Faculty and staff have access to materials from across all 23 campuses of the California State University via the system-wide shared library catalog, OneSearch, and the system-wide resource sharing system, CSU+. CSUB users may access a huge collection of electronic engineering books via O'Reilly, ProQuest Academic Complete, and EBSCOhost eBook collections, which are also accessible in OneSearch. Periodical databases, such as EBSCOhost, ScienceDirect, IEEE Xplore Digital Library, ACM Digital Library, ASABE Technical Library, and OnePetro are a few of the 196 different databases CSUB students have access to. These databases cover a wide spectrum of subject areas and provide citations up to full text articles. Users can access over 5000 Engineering journals through the subscribed databases. These databases cover a broad spectrum of engineering areas and provide citations up to full-text articles. Users can access over 5000 engineering journals through these databases. Online reference resources such as Gale eBooks Library allow users to search from anywhere, anytime.

Describe available academic technology, equipment, and other specialized materials.

Students enrolled in the baccalaureate degree program in mechanical engineering will benefit from a wide range of academic technology, equipment, and specialized materials which are as follows:

A. Classroom Technology:

- Smart and Flex Classrooms: These are classrooms equipped with built-in computers, projectors, and easy to control panels.
- Zoom-ready Flex Rooms: These rooms will allow hybrid teaching with remote participation.
- S2 Hybrid Classrooms: These rooms will include cameras and microphones to capture both instructors and students for synchronous hybrid teaching.

B. Computer Laboratories:

- General Use Laboratories: These are open to all students and are equipped with standard software such as Microsoft Office, Zoom, and Adobe Acrobat.
- Program Specific Computer Laboratories: These labs are equipped with software such as the following:
 - AutoCAD: Mechanical engineering software used widely in the industry for engineering drawing and drafting
 - SolidWorks: Mechanical engineering software useful for 3D drawing and solid dynamics.
 - MATLAB: Widely used programming and computing software used by engineers
 - Mathematica: Programming and computing software used by engineers
 - ANSYS Fluent: State-of-the-art and industry standard computational fluid dynamics (CFD) software
- Statistical and Data Analysis: SPSS, R, R-Studio, SAS
- Virtual Computer Laboratory: This is a virtual lab with standard software and engineering software, available to students remotely, and from anywhere.

C. Media and Video Tools:

- Panopto: A video-on-demand platform for uploading and sharing course-related videos within the campus.
- Instructional Television (ITV): Used for distance learning.
- Live Audio/Video Event Support: Available for campus events, including equipment rental and technical staffing.

D. CSUB Information Technology Support: The Information Technology Services (ITS) department at California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) plays a central role in supporting the university's digital infrastructure and academic mission

Additional Support Resources Required

Describe additional faculty or staff support positions needed to implement the proposed program.

We have adequate faculty and staff to initiate the program. As the program grows, we may request hiring new faculty members.

Describe the amount of additional lecture and/or laboratory space required to initiate and to sustain the program over the next five years. Indicate any additional special facilities that will be required. If the space is under construction, what is the projected occupancy date? If the space is planned, indicate campus-wide priority of the facility, capital outlay program priority, and projected date of occupancy. Major capital outlay construction projects are those projects whose total cost is \$610,000 or more (as adjusted pursuant to Cal. Pub. Cont. Code §§ 10705(a); 10105 and 10108).

We will have our energy innovation building. However, what we have presently is adequate to initiate the program.

Include a report written in consultation with the campus librarian which indicates any necessary library resources not available through the CSU library system. Indicate the commitment of the campus to purchase these additional resources.

7Librarian Report.docx

Indicate additional academic technology, equipment, or specialized materials that will be (1) needed to implement the program, and (2) needed during the first two years after initiation. Indicate the source of funds and priority to secure these resource needs.

The NSME Dean's Office has acquired industry donations to establish a machine shop within the first two years after initiation.

Self-Support Program Information

Confirm that the proposed program will not be offered at places or times likely to supplant or limit existing state-support programs.

No

Explain how at least one of the following additional criteria shall be met:

The courses or program are primarily designed for career enrichment or retraining;

No

The location of the courses or program is significantly removed from permanent, state-supported campus facilities;

No

The course or program is offered through a distinct technology, such as online delivery;

No

For new programs, the client group for the course or program receives educational or other services at a cost beyond what could be reasonably provided within CSU Operating Funds;

No

For existing programs, there has been a cessation of non-state funding that previously provided for educational or other services costing beyond what could be reasonably provided within CSU Operating Funds.

No

Specify how all required EO 1099 self-support criteria are met.

Not applicable.

The proposed program does not replace existing state-support courses or programs.

Yes

Academic standards associated with all aspects of such offerings are identical to those of comparable state-supported CSU instructional programs.

Yes

Basic Cost Recovery Budget Elements (Three to five year budget projection)

Student per-unit cost:

0

Number of units producing revenue each academic year:

0

Total cost a student will pay to complete the program:

0

Revenue

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year
Student Fees	0	0	0	0	0
Projected Attrition Numbers	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	0	0	0

Additional Revenue Sources

	1st Year	2nd year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year
Grants	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	0	0	0

Direct Expenses

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year
Instructional costs	0	0	0	0	0
Operational costs	0	0	0	0	0
Extended Education costs	0	0	0	0	0
Technology development and ongoing support	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	0	0	0

Indirect Expenses

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year
Campus Partners	0	0	0	0	0
Campus reimbursement general fund	0	0	0	0	0
Extended Education overhead	0	0	0	0	0
Chancellor's Office overhead	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	0	0	0

Additional Questions

Is this program an accredited educator preparation program?

No

Do you want email notification when the course is fully approved?

Yes

Supporting Documentation

8Supporting Documents-rev2.docx
 csu-new-degree-proposal-for department faculty_finalized-REV18.docx
 BSME New Program Proposal Letter copy.docx
 Support letter for BS in ME (NSME Dean).pdf

Reviewer Comments

Denise Gilliland (dgilliland) (Fri, 17 Oct 2025 17:06:47 GMT): Rollback: Please make changes based on Curriculum Committee 1st reading.

Denise Gilliland (dgilliland) (Fri, 24 Oct 2025 16:28:29 GMT): Rollback: Please make small corrections recommended by the Curriculum Committee on 10/24/2025. Thank you!

Denise Gilliland (dgilliland) (Mon, 27 Oct 2025 16:17:47 GMT): <https://csub.box.com/s/0mzyai37o848bbeepakmgf7uy8hk9esx>

Key: 520



Program Name Change from a Bachelor of Arts in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to a Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS)

RES 252639

AAC, BPC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approves the proposed program name change from a Bachelor of Arts in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to a Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS).

RATIONALE: The proposed new name more accurately reflects the diverse program strands currently offered in the Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) degree program, which include training in the fields of human development and family studies. The proposed name Human Development and Family Studies and CIP code align with disciplinary norms and other similar programs across the CSU, that offer a curriculum spanning infant, child, adolescent, and adult developmental domains. This change would correct the current misalignment between the Department of Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies, which offers a Bachelor of Arts degree in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies. Additionally, the current six letter acronym HD-CAFS is incompatible with CSUB software. The existing program resources are sufficient to support this program name change.

Attachments: Referral 2025-2026 2025-2026 38 New Degree Proposal for Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies

Distribution List:

President
Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Vice-President for Student Affairs and Strategic Enrollment Management
AVP for Faculty Affairs
AVP Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs
College Deans
Associate Deans
Dean of Libraries
Dean of Antelope Valley

Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach
Department Chairs
General Faculty

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



2025-2026 REFERRAL #38

New Degree Proposal for Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies

From: Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair

To: Tiffany Tsantsoulas, Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) Chair
Amanda Grombly, Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) Chair

Date: January 22, 2026

cc: Katherine Van Grinsven, Academic Senate Administrative Analyst

At their meeting on December 2, 2025, the Academic Senate Executive Committee requested that the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) and Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) review and address the new proposal for a Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies.

During your discussion, please consider:

- rationale as presented in the attached proposal
- impact on students.

Please take up this matter with your committees and get back to me with your recommendations. If your recommendation requires Senate action, please prepare a resolution and the rationale for the resolution.

Thank you.

Attachments:

- (1) Link to view in CIM: <https://next-catalog.csub.edu/programadmin/> Enter "HDFS_BA_B" in search box.
- (2) HDFS_BA_B_Human Development and Family Sciences – BA.pdf

DR. MELISSA DANFORTH, CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy. • Mail Stop: 20 BDC • Bakersfield, CA 93311

HDFS_BA_B: HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY SCIENCES - BA

In Workflow

1. 801 - HCAF Curriculum Review (ecorrea1@csub.edu)
2. SS&E Curriculum Committee (mszolowicz@csub.edu)
3. SS&E Dean Office (lvega@csub.edu,agancarz@csub.edu)
4. Academic Programs (eadams6@csub.edu)
5. Academic Operations (amendoza145@csub.edu,czuniga-prado@csub.edu,org-curriculum@csub.edu)

Approval Path

1. Wed, 01 Oct 2025 18:48:19 GMT
Elaine Correa (ecorrea1): Approved for 801 - HCAF Curriculum Review
2. Wed, 05 Nov 2025 18:28:11 GMT
Michael Szolowicz (mszolowicz): Approved for SS&E Curriculum Committee
3. Mon, 10 Nov 2025 18:19:47 GMT
Amy Gancarz-Kausch (agancarz): Approved for SS&E Dean Office

History

1. Jul 29, 2025 by cladmin-sgafrick

New Program Proposal

Date Submitted: Wed, 01 Oct 2025 16:43:50 GMT

Viewing: HDFS_BA_B : Human Development and Family Sciences - BA

Last approved: Tue, 29 Jul 2025 12:42:07 GMT

Last edit: Tue, 23 Dec 2025 22:24:50 GMT

Changes proposed by: Alexander Reid (001962584)

Contact

User ID

001962584

Proposer Name

Alexander Reid

Proposer E-mail

areid2@csub.edu

Proposer Department

Human Dev. & Child, Adolescent, & Family Studies

Program Information

Program Type

Bachelor of Arts

Propose Program Moratorium?

No

Effective Catalog

2026-2027

Effective Term

Fall 2026

College

SSE

Department

Human Dev. & Child, Adolescent, & Family Studies

Program Title

Human Development and Family Sciences - BA

Program Code

HDFS_BA_B

CIP Code

19.0701 - 19.0701

Academic Career

Undergraduate

Support Type

State Support

Delivery Format

Hybrid

Is the proposed program subject to WASC Substantive Change?

No

Program Overview and Rationale

Provide a brief descriptive overview of the program citing its 1) purpose and strengths, 2) fit with the institutional mission or institutional learning outcomes and 3) the compelling reasons for offering the program at this time.

On May 12 2022, the President of CSUB approved our request for a Department name change from Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS). We were informed, however, that the 6-letter name would not work in PeopleSoft and we would need to have the name change be reflected on our degree. At this point, we are in the process of changing our dept name from HD-CAFS to Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS), which aligns with other CSU Departments in our field.

To align the name of our degree with our department, we propose to change the name of our program to Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS).

The rationale for this name change is to service the diverse program strands in which our students seek a B.A. degree aligned with employment opportunities in the fields of Human Development, Resource Management, Teacher Education and Early Childhood and Family Sciences. Currently, our program description reads as follows:

Program Options and Paths

Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Degree in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies. This program is geared towards students interested in working with children and their families in any of the following settings: preschool, childcare center, case management, criminal justice, Head Start, and the Department of Human Services. Students will earn a B.A. Degree in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies.

Our program currently offers classes across the lifespan (i.e., Infancy to Older Adulthood), thus the degree name of "Child and Adolescent" fails to reflect the diverse areas and population groups our program studies. Accurately representing our program through the title and CIP code of the degree ensures that our students can apply for positions that cover the vast range of options available within our field.

Additionally, it should be noted that 3 out of our 4 full-time faculty members hold degrees covered under the area of Human Development. The size of our Department is small, and therefore we cover a range of areas that other CSU's have divided into separate departments. In alignment with other CSU's, our department name should include the Human Development area as well as the Family Sciences domain.

In accordance with other CSU's, for consistency and disciplinary convention, the name change aligns with our other campuses:

- CSU Sacramento (BS in Family Studies and Human Development)
- CSU Monterey Bay (BA in Human Development and Family Studies)
- CSU Long Beach (BA in Human Development)
- CSU East Bay (BA in Human Development)

We propose HDFS as the 4-digit acronym for People Soft, in keeping with other institutions of higher education in the U.S.A. that offer the same degree. For example, Colorado State, Michigan State, University of Connecticut, Penn State, East Carolina University, Florida

State, George Mason University, Georgia Southern, Indiana State, Kansas State, Iowa State, Mississippi State, and North Dakota State all use HDFS as their acronym.

Program Description (i.e. Catalog Description)

Disclaimer. Due to substantial changes in credential legislation and degree programs in the State of California, please check with an official Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS) advisor for current information.

Program Description

The Bachelor of Arts degree in Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS) at California State University, Bakersfield provides breadth and depth in the scientific study of child, adolescent, and adult developmental domains. The program focuses on the biological, cognitive, psychological, and sociological foundations of learning from infant development, through adolescent growth, and adult behavior. The program design is based on contemporary learning theories, application of ethics and values, research methods and diverse family systems/approaches, with practical applications in disciplines that require direct interaction with children and families.

Mission Statement

The Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS) program offers learners specialized knowledge that enhances their skills and abilities to work and advocate in partnerships that foster healthy children, supportive family networks, and interactive community relationships. A social constructivist approach to learning is reinforced in the academic activities that result in superior educational preparation for teachers, parents, and community professionals. The mission of the program is to develop well prepared, highly skilled individuals who can envision, interact, and respond to the needs of diverse populations within the local, regional, national, and global community.

Program Requirements

The Bachelor of Arts Degree with a major in Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS) requires a minimum of 120 units which consists of courses for the HDFS major as well as other university-wide general education graduation requirements. Students pursuing a HDFS major must complete the pre-requisite classes CAFS 1100 Introduction to Child, Adolescent & Family Studies, CAFS 2000 Fundamentals in Developmental Theory, and MATH 1209 Statistics in the Modern World or PSYC 2018 Introduction to Statistical Methods in Psychological Research or SOC 2208 Introduction to Statistics in the Social Sciences which is part of the General Education Requirements. The HDFS major course requirements consist of 51 units. Students will need to complete 21 additional units (courses may be Minor courses or graduate school prerequisites) to earn the required credit units needed for graduation. All HDFS majors must hold a current certificate in First Aid and Adult, Child, and Infant CPR upon graduation. Students are expected to maintain a grade of "C-" or higher in all HDFS courses to count towards graduation.

Code	Title	Units
General Education Requirements		
	Subject Area 1A: English Composition	3
	Subject Area 1B: Critical Thinking	3
	Subject Area 1C: Oral Communication	3
	Subject Area 2: Mathematical Concepts & Quantitative Reasoning ⁴	0
	Subject Area 3A: Arts	3
	Subject Area 3B: Humanities	3
	Upper Division 3 Arts or Humanities: (3UD)	3
	Subject Area 4: Social and Behavioral Sciences	3
	Upper Division 4 Social and Behavioral Sciences: (4UD) ⁴	0
	Subject Area 5A: Physical Science	3
	Subject Area 5B: Biological Sciences	3
	Subject Area 5C: Laboratory	1
	Upper Division 5 Science: (5UD)	3
	Subject Area 6: Ethnic Studies	3
	General Education Subtotal	34
Campus Requirements		
	First-Year Seminar (FYS)	2
	American Institutions: Government ⁶	3
	American Institutions: History	3
	Junior Year Diversity & Reflection (JYDR)	3
	Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)	3
	Capstone ⁵	0
	<i>Campus Requirement Subtotal</i>	14
Major Requirements		
<i>Prerequisites to the Major</i>		
CAFS 1100	Introduction to Child, Adolescent & Family Studies	3

CAFS 2000	Fundamentals in Developmental Theory	3
MATH 1209	Statistics in the Modern World	3
or PSYC 2018	Introduction to Statistical Methods in Psychological Research	
or SOC 2208	Introduction to Statistics in the Social Sciences	
or KINE 2018	Introduction to Statistics for Health Sciences	
<i>Core Courses</i>		
CAFS 2080	Child, Family, and Community	3
CAFS 2500	Child Health, Safety, and Nutrition	3
CAFS 3110	Infant and Toddler Development	3
CAFS 3140	School Aged and Adolescent	3
CAFS 3500	Child Guidance, Supervision and Support	3
CAFS 4000	Introduction to Research Methods	3
CAFS 4100	Research, Assessment and Evaluation of Children and Families	3
CAFS 4908	Senior Seminar and Capstone	3
CAFS 3800	Multiple Perspectives on the Importance of Play	3
or CAFS 3550	Adulthood and Aging	
CAFS 3650	Risk and Resilience in Children	3
or CAFS 3560	Aging and the Family	
<i>Major Electives</i>		
Select two lower division of the following: ¹		6
CAFS 1050	Practicum in Early Childhood Education	
CAFS 1250	Teaching in a Diverse Society	
CAFS 2100	Observation of Children	
CAFS 2200	Curriculum, Procedures, and Laboratory Experience for the Child	
CAFS 2300	Curriculum, Procedures, and Laboratory Experience in the Elementary School	
CAFS 2400	Introduction to Administration of Child and Family Programs	
CAFS 2620	Philosophy for Children	
CAFS 2800	Multicultural Children's Literature	
Select two upper division of the following: ²		6
CAFS 3200	Individual and Family Development in Diverse Cultures	
CAFS 3300	Supporting Multilingual Learners: Context and Approaches	
CAFS 3600	Parenting and Family Relations	
CAFS 3620	P4C: Practicum	
CAFS 4140	Advanced Practicum	
CAFS 4200	Advanced Techniques for Working in Child and Family Programs	
CAFS 4300	School, Community, and Family Collaborations	
CAFS 4400	Advanced Practicum for Adult Education and Supervision	
<i>Major Subtotal</i>		57
Additional Units Needed Towards Graduation ³		21
Total Units		120

¹ Select two lower division courses.

² Select two upper division courses

³ Additional units needed to meet the 120 units graduation requirement.

⁴ Subject Area 2 is met through prerequisite coursework in the major.

⁵ Capstone is covered in the major.

⁶ American Institution - Government (American & Constitutional Ideals) satisfies one course of the two required in Subject Area 4.

Note: The following 3 courses are needed to meet the core requirements for CCTC Child Development Master Teacher Permit.

Code	Title	Units
The following 3 Courses are needed to meet the core requirements for the CCTC Child Development Masters Teacher Permit		
CAFS 2000	Fundamentals in Developmental Theory	3
CAFS 2080	Child, Family, and Community	3
CAFS 2200	Curriculum, Procedures, and Laboratory Experience for the Child	3
Total Units		9

Program Learning Outcomes

Program Learning Outcome. Identify each PLO one by one (select the green "+" to add)

1. Goal 1: Critical reasoning and problem solving skills
 - 1.A Ability to read critically
 - 1.B Ability to write critically
 - 1.C Ability to speak critically
 - 1.D Ability to think critically
 - 1.E Capacity for life-long learning
 - 1.F Critical Problem Solving
2. Goal 2: Oral and written communication
 - 2.A Writing Skills
 - 2.B Oral presentation skills
 - 2.C Competence in information management
 - 2.D Computer literacy
3. Goal 3: Discipline-based and career knowledge
 - 3.A Knowledge in the major discipline
 - 3.B Ability to apply knowledge of discipline
 - 3.C Career preparation and planning
4. Goal 4: Numerical literacy
 - 4.A Mathematical calculations and estimation skills
 - 4.B Quantitative reasoning skills.
 - 4.C Apply quantitative reasoning skills to the real world
5. Goal 5: Students will become engaged citizens.
 - 5.A Engage in university and community activities
 - 5.B Interpersonal skills
 - 5.C Knowledge of self
 - 5.D Responsibility in group settings
 - 5.E Ability to work independently
6. Goal 6: Students will develop a well rounded skill set.
 - 6.A Possess and demonstrate an ethical framework
 - 6.B Understanding of cultural and ethnic diversity.
 - 6.C Research methods/analysis/technology for problem solving
 - 6.D Interdisciplinary knowledge

- 1. Goal 1: Critical reasoning and problem solving skills
 - 1.A Ability to read critically
 - 1.B Ability to write critically
 - 1.C Ability to speak critically
 - 1.D Ability to think critically
 - 1.E Capacity for life-long learning
 - 1.F Critical Problem Solving
- 2. Goal 2: Oral and written communication
 - 2.A Writing Skills
 - 2.B Oral presentation skills
 - 2.C Competence in information management
 - 2.D Computer literacy
- 3. Goal 3: Discipline-based and career knowledge
 - 3.A Knowledge in the major discipline
 - 3.B Ability to apply knowledge of discipline
 - 3.C Career preparation and planning
- 4. Goal 4: Numerical literacy
 - 4.A Mathematical calculations and estimation skills
 - 4.B Quantitative reasoning skills.
 - 4.C Apply quantitative reasoning skills to the real world
- 5. Goal 5: Students will become engaged citizens.
 - 5.A Engage in university and community activities
 - 5.B Interpersonal skills
 - 5.C Knowledge of self
 - 5.D Responsibility in group settings
 - 5.E Ability to work independently

- 6. Goal 6: Students will develop a well rounded skill set.
- • 6.A Possess and demonstrate an ethical framework
- 6.B Understanding of cultural and ethnic diversity.
- 6.C Research methods/analysis/technology for problem solving
- 6.D Interdisciplinary knowledge

Learning Outcomes Display (show only)

Course Code	PLO 1
CAFS 1100	
CAFS 2000	
MATH 1209	
PSYC 2018	
SOC 2208	
KINE 2018	
CAFS 2080	
CAFS 2500	
CAFS 3110	
CAFS 3140	
CAFS 3500	
CAFS 4000	
CAFS 4100	
CAFS 4908	
CAFS 3800	
CAFS 3550	
CAFS 3650	
CAFS 3560	
CAFS 1050	
CAFS 1250	
CAFS 2100	
CAFS 2200	
CAFS 2300	
CAFS 2400	
CAFS 2620	
CAFS 2800	
CAFS 3200	
CAFS 3300	
CAFS 3600	

CAFS 3620	
CAFS 4140	
CAFS 4200	
CAFS 4300	
CAFS 4400	
CAFS 2000	
CAFS 2080	
CAFS 2200	

Download the Curriculum Map PDF from the CIM Program Homescreen

Attach Curriculum Map

Current Curriculum Map.pdf

Attach 5 Year Assessment Plan

5 year report working document draft 2016-2022 (final)(2).pdf

Does the program use courses offered by other programs?

No

The total number of units required for graduation (not just the total for the major):

120

Does this baccalaureate program require more than 120-semester units?

No

Does this program have any concentrations or emphasis planned under the proposed major?

No

List any new courses that are: (1) needed to initiate the program or (2) needed during the first two years after implementation. Include proposed catalog descriptions for new courses. For graduate program proposals, identify whether each new course would be at the graduate- or undergraduate-level.

n/a

Attach a proposed course-offering plan for the first three years of program implementation, indicating likely faculty teaching assignments.

Placeholder.docx

Please specify the total number of prerequisite units required for the major. Note: The prerequisites must be included in the total program unit count.

9

For undergraduate programs, specify planned provisions for articulation of the proposed major with community college programs.

no change

Academic Roadmap Attachment

Placeholder.docx

For program revision - does this change negatively impact the alignment with the current ADT?

No

Does this program change create new alignment with an ADT?

No

Is this program:

Currently accredited

Describe how accreditation requirements will be met, if applicable.

Program currently accredited.

Student Demand

Provide compelling evidence of student interest in enrolling in the proposed program. Types of evidence vary and may include (for example), national, statewide, and professional employment forecasts and surveys; petitions; lists of related associate degree programs at feeder community colleges; reports from community college transfer centers; and enrollments from feeder baccalaureate programs.

This program is currently offered. Our Department is requesting a change to the degree name and CIP code to reflect the current courses and training offered in our program.

Identify how issues of diversity and access to the university were considered when planning this program. Describe what steps the program will take to insure ALL prospective candidates have equitable access to the program. This description may include recruitment strategies and any other techniques to insure a diverse and qualified candidate pool.

This program is currently offered. Our Department is requesting a change to the degree name and CIP code to reflect the current courses and training offered in our program.

Describe professional uses of the proposed degree program.

This program is currently offered. Our Department is requesting a change to the degree name and CIP code to reflect the current courses and training offered in our program.

Anticipated Student Demand (Majors)

	At Initiation	After 3 Years	After 5 Years
Number of Majors (Annual)	350	380	410
Number of Graduates (Cumulative)	80	270	500

Attach documentation as needed:

Placeholder.docx

Societal and Public Need for the Proposed Degree Major Program

List other California State University campuses currently offering or projecting the proposed degree major program; list neighboring institutions, public and private, currently offering the proposed degree major program.

Institution(s)
Sacramento State
CSU Monterey Bay
Cal State Long Beach
Cal State East Bay

Describe differences between the proposed program and programs listed above.

Similar programs.

List other curricula currently offered by the campus that are closely related to the proposed program.

Curricula
n/a

Describe community participation, if any, in the planning process. This may include prospective employers of graduates.

no change

Provide applicable workforce demand projections and other relevant data.

Placeholder.docx

Existing Support Resources for the Proposed Degree Major Program

List faculty who would teach in the program, indicating rank, appointment status, highest degree earned, date and field of highest degree, professional experience, and affiliations with other campus programs. Note: For all proposed graduate degree programs, there must be a minimum of five full-time faculty members with the appropriate terminal degree.

Dr. Elaine Correa, Ph.D. - Chair and Professor

Dr. Alexander Reid, Ph.D. - Associate Professor
 Dr. Tzu-Fen Chang, Ph.D. - Associate Professor
 Dr. Anna Catalan, Ph.D. - Full-time Lecturer

Describe facilities that would be used in support of the proposed program.

No change

Provide evidence that the institution provides adequate access to both electronic and physical library and learning resources.

No change

Describe available academic technology, equipment, and other specialized materials.

No change

Additional Support Resources Required

Describe additional faculty or staff support positions needed to implement the proposed program.

no change

Describe the amount of additional lecture and/or laboratory space required to initiate and to sustain the program over the next five years. Indicate any additional special facilities that will be required. If the space is under construction, what is the projected occupancy date? If the space is planned, indicate campus-wide priority of the facility, capital outlay program priority, and projected date of occupancy. Major capital outlay construction projects are those projects whose total cost is \$610,000 or more (as adjusted pursuant to Cal. Pub. Cont. Code §§ 10705(a); 10105 and 10108).

no change

Include a report written in consultation with the campus librarian which indicates any necessary library resources not available through the CSU library system. Indicate the commitment of the campus to purchase these additional resources.

Placeholder.docx

Indicate additional academic technology, equipment, or specialized materials that will be (1) needed to implement the program, and (2) needed during the first two years after initiation. Indicate the source of funds and priority to secure these resource needs.

no change

Self-Support Program Information

Confirm that the proposed program will not be offered at places or times likely to supplant or limit existing state-support programs.

No

Explain how at least one of the following additional criteria shall be met:

The courses or program are primarily designed for career enrichment or retraining;

Yes

Explain:

Our program will continue to serve as a feeder program to the teaching credential programs.

The location of the courses or program is significantly removed from permanent, state-supported campus facilities;

No

The course or program is offered through a distinct technology, such as online delivery;

Yes

Explain:

The current program does offer a selection of online courses.

For new programs, the client group for the course or program receives educational or other services at a cost beyond what could be reasonably provided within CSU Operating Funds;

No

For existing programs, there has been a cessation of non-state funding that previously provided for educational or other services costing beyond what could be reasonably provided within CSU Operating Funds.

No

Specify how all required EO 1099 self-support criteria are met.

no change

The proposed program does not replace existing state-support courses or programs.

No

Academic standards associated with all aspects of such offerings are identical to those of comparable state-supported CSU instructional programs.

Yes

Basic Cost Recovery Budget Elements (Three to five year budget projection)

Student per-unit cost:

0

Number of units producing revenue each academic year:

0

Total cost a student will pay to complete the program:

0

Revenue

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year
Student Fees	0	0	0	0	0
Projected Attrition Numbers	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	0	0	0

Additional Revenue Sources

	1st Year	2nd year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year
Grants	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	0	0	0

Direct Expenses

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year
Instructional costs	0	0	0	0	0
Operational costs	0	0	0	0	0
Extended Education costs	0	0	0	0	0
Technology development and ongoing support	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	0	0	0

Indirect Expenses

	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year	5th Year
Campus Partners	0	0	0	0	0
Campus reimbursement general fund	0	0	0	0	0
Extended Education overhead	0	0	0	0	0
Chancellor's Office overhead	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	0	0	0	0	0

Additional Questions

Is this program an accredited educator preparation program?

No

Do you want email notification when the course is fully approved?

Yes

Supporting Documentation

Placeholder.docx

Key: 49



Department Name Change from Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS) to Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS)

RES 252640

AAC, BPC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approves the proposed department name change from the Department of Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS) to the Department of Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS).

RATIONALE: The proposed new department name more accurately reflects the diverse program strands currently offered in the Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies degree program, which include training in the fields of human development and family studies. The new department name also aligns with the proposed new degree program title. This would correct the current misalignment between the Department of Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies, which offers a Bachelor of Arts degree in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies. Additionally, the current six letter acronym HD-CAFS is incompatible with CSUB software. Finally, the name change aligns with similar departments across the CSU. The existing department resources are sufficient to support this department name change.

Attachment: Referral 2025-2026 40 Department Name Change Request for HD-CAFS

Distribution List:

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

Academic Senate

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



2025-2026 REFERRAL #40

Department Name Change Request for HD-CAFS

From: Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair

To: Tiffany Tsantsoulas, Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) Chair
Amanda Grombly, Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) Chair

Date: January 20, 2026

cc: Katherine Van Grinsven, Academic Senate Administrative Analyst

At their meeting on December 2, 2025, the Academic Senate Executive Committee requested that the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) and Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) review and address the new proposal Department name change from Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS) to Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS).

During your discussion, please consider:

- rationale as presented in the attached proposal
- impact on students in the department.

Please take up this matter with your committees and get back to me with your recommendations. If your recommendation requires Senate action, please prepare a resolution and the rationale for the resolution.

Thank you.

Attachments:

- (1) Department of HD_CAFS name change.doc

DR. MELISSA DANFORTH, CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy. • Mail Stop: 20 BDC • Bakersfield, CA 93311

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 5:00 PM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven
Cc: Danielle Solano
Subject: FW: Dept of HD-CAFS name change request
Attachments: Department of HD_CAFS name change .docx

Hi Katie,

Here's an item for the EC agenda.

Melissa

From: Alexander Reid <areid2@csb.edu>
Date: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 at 4:39 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>
Cc: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csb.edu>, Elaine Correa <ecorrea1@csb.edu>, Elizabeth Adams <eadams6@csb.edu>
Subject: re: Dept of HD-CAFS name change request

Dear Melissa,

On behalf of the Department of Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies, please accept our request for Senate Approval of our Department name change.

We consulted with Dr. Adams and our interest to begin the process of changing our Department name first with Senate approval and then we anticipate submitting a request to SSE Curriculum Committee to move forward with our degree name aligned with our Department name.

Please see attached for our name change approval request.
Please let me know if there is any additional information needed.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Alexander

Alexander Reid, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, Department of Human Development and Child, Adolescent and Family Studies
California State University Bakersfield

Department of Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS)
Name Change Approval Request

Dear Colleagues,

On May 12 2022, the President of CSUB approved our request for a Department name change from Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS). We were informed, however, that the 6-letter name would not work in PeopleSoft and we would need to have the name change be reflected on our degree. At this point, we would like to start with a name change from HD-CAFS to Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS), which aligns with other CSU Departments in our field.

The Department of Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS) faculty unanimously voted to change to Human Development and Family Sciences (HDFS).

The rationale for this name change was to service the diverse program strands in which our students seek a B.A. degree aligned with employment opportunities in the fields of Human Development, Resource Management, Teacher Education and Early Childhood and Family Sciences. Currently, our program description reads as follows:

Program Options and Paths

Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Degree in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies This program is geared towards students interested in working with children and their families in any of the following settings: preschool, childcare center, case management, criminal justice, Head Start, and the Department of Human Services. Students will earn a B.A. Degree in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies.

To ensure that our students can apply for positions that cover the vast range of options available with a CAFS degree, we would like to ensure that our Department's name reflects the diverse areas for which we serve as a feeder program.

Additionally, it should be noted that 3 out of our 4 full time faculty members hold degrees covered under the area of Human Development. The size of our Department is small, and therefore we cover a range of areas that other CSU's have divided into separate departments. In alignment with other CSU's, our department name should include the Human Development area as well as the Family Sciences domain. In accordance with other CSU's, for consistency and disciplinary convention, the name change aligns with our other campuses:

CSU Sacramento (BS in Family Studies and Human Development)
CSU Monterey Bay (BA in Human Development and Family Studies)
CSU Long Beach (BA in Human Development)
CSU East Bay (BA in Human Development)

We propose HDFS as the 4-digit acronym for People Soft, in keeping with other institutions of higher education in the U.S.A. that offer the same degree. For example, Colorado State, Michigan State, University of Connecticut, Penn State, East Carolina University, Florida State, George Mason University, Georgia Southern, Indiana State, Kansas State, Iowa State, Mississippi State, and North Dakota State. All these institutions use HDFS as their acronym.

Once we have approval from the Senate for a Department name change, we will begin the process of aligning the Department name to the degree with submission to the SSE Curriculum Committee.



Policies & Procedures for Establishing New Schools

RES 252643

EC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Bakersfield, adopt the document entitled “Policies & Procedures for Establishing New Schools,” as submitted by the Criteria for Proposing New Schools Task Force.

RATIONALE: Currently, there are no formal policies governing the establishment of new schools at CSUB. The proposed guidelines address this gap by providing a comprehensive framework for the formation of new schools, modifications to existing schools, and the procedures required to establish such entities.

The Criteria for Proposing New Schools Task Force, composed of representatives from the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), Budget & Planning Committee (BPC), Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS), and Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), conducted an extensive review of policies and procedures from other California State University (CSU) campuses to inform its work. The resulting document reflects consensus-based recommendations and establishes a formal policy to guide future decisions regarding the creation and modification of academic schools.

Attachment: Final Report_Policies and Procedures for Establishing New Schools.pdf

Distribution List:

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Academic Senate

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

Academic Senate Task Force

School Formation Criteria

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

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

Composition of Criteria for Proposing New Schools Task Force:

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

CSU Bakersfield
Policies and Procedures for Establishing New Schools

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

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

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

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

IV. Procedures for Establishing a New School

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

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

ii. Faculty Composition

Include the following information:

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

C. Budgetary, Financial, and other Resource Considerations

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

D. Planned Implementation and Timeline

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


V. New School Proposal: Procedure for Review

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

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

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

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

Signature: 
Email: yko@csub.edu


Signature: 
Email: lbishop@csub.edu

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

Signature: 
Email: rdugan2@csub.edu

Signature: 
Email: hhe@csub.edu

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

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