

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

10:00 a.m. – 11:25 a.m.

Video Conference

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
 - Last Senate Meeting to Introduce Resolutions - April 28, 2022
 - Faculty Cluster Hire Framework – D. Boschini and C. Catota (Time Certain 10:10) (handout)
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain 10:05)
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
March 15, 2022 Minutes
5. CONTINUED ITEMS
 - a. AS Log (handout)
 - i. AAC (J. Tarjan)
 - ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)
 - iii. FAC (M. Rees)
 - iv. BPC (C. Lam)
Referral #38 Saturday Commencement - Memo (handout)
 - b. Provost Update (V. Harper)
 - i. Summer Compensation – General Faculty and Department Chairs
 - c. Searches (V. Harper)
 - i. AVP GRaSP
 - ii. AVP IRPA
 - iii. Dean BPA
 - iv. Dean NSME
 - v. Dean Antelope Valley
 - vi. Dean Library
 - vii. Associate Dean Undergraduate and Graduate Studies
 - d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation

- e. AB 928
- f. AAC Referrals: Copy Catalog and Special Concerns – J. Tarjan

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain 10:45)

- a. GVAR Policy Revision (handout)
- b. Article 20.37 Applicant List
- c. Academic Integrity Policy (handout)
- d. Accessible Technology Initiative Instructional Materials Task Force
- e. Potential Modifications to Administrator Search & Screening Procedures
- f. General Faculty Meeting, Spring
 - i. RTP rebuttal letter acknowledgement include interpretation of the substance of the letter
 - ii. Modalities moving forward after pandemic – AAC and AS&SS
 - iii. Faculty Rights and disciplinary action (handout)
 - iv. URC workload as campus grows
- g. AP Assessment Quality Feedback (handout)
- h. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth
 - i. Faculty Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change
 - ii. Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Handbook 311.1 (handout)
 - iii. School Elections Committee – Handbook Change 202.7 - Workload
 - iv. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
 - v. Standing Committee Bylaws change – (Section IV)
 - 1. Chair Election Statement of Interest (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
 - 2. Two-years on Senate requirement
 - 3. Structure of BPC
 - 4. Strike “at least” (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
 - vi. Committee proliferation
- i. Dean Professional Development
 - i. Responsiveness
 - ii. Understanding/following the Handbook
 - iii. Understanding/following the CBA
 - iv. Supporting (not undercutting) chairs
- j. Summer Session GE courses (handout)
- k. Exam Modality for Flex Classes

- l. RTP – 3-year Lecturers, PTR Committee
- m. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (handout)
- n. Reconsider Time Blocks
- o. Investment Divestiture
- p. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s)
- q. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC
- r. Distinguished Professor Award – (handout) FAC
- s. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
- t. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)
- u. Assigned Time application revision and timing (Hold pending further information) – FAC

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING April 7, 2021 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

Approval of Minutes

Announcements

- President’s Report – L. Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10-10:15)
- Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth

Approval of Agenda (Time Certain 10:05)

Reports

Resolutions (Time Certain 10:35)

Consent Agenda

New Business

RES 212226 General Studies Review Committee Implementation

RES 212227 Levels in the Performance Review Process

RES 212228 Re-Entry Students Policy

RES 212229 Change of Department Name from Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HDCAFS)

Old Business

RES 212221 Academic Calendar – Fall Recess Schedule

RES 212223 Approval of BA in History with a Concentration in Social Science
Teaching

RES 212224 Completeness of Periodic Performance Review Files

Open Forum (Time Certain 11:15)

8. COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR

9. ADJOURNMENT (Time Certain 11:25 am)

DRAFT

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes

Tuesday, March 15, 2022

10:00 a.m. – 11:32 a.m.

Video Conference

Members: A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair), J. Millar, M. Martinez, E. Correa, C. Lam, M. Rees, J. Tarjan, V. Harper

Visitor: M. Williamson

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK

- Last Senate Meeting to introduce resolutions is April 28, 2022
- EC priorities include
 - 1) Academic Integrity (see 6.c.),
 - 2) UPRC Task Force (see 5.a iv), and
 - 3) Electronic RTP (see 5.a.iii.)
- Course Prefix – The Geology department sent an email in October 2021 to the Academic Senate Chair and the Academic Affairs Committee Chair about GECCo using prefix SCI for GE GEO courses. There is no policy which says GECCo, or anybody has authority over prefixes. It's assumed that if a course is within a department, the department has prefix authority over the course. (A. Hegde) The recommendation was to send the issue back to the NSME Curriculum Committee to work it out internally, which went slowly. It took three years to get course approval from GECCo without any help from anyone else. That's a whole different area that will need to be discussed with GECCo. (M. Danforth) J. Tarjan clarified that GE course appeals go through the Academic Affairs Committee. He is in support of having the school curriculum committee decide on prefixes. (J. Tarjan) Who has oversight of GECCo? (M. Martinez) From an administrative perspective, oversight belongs in the Office of Academic Programs. GECCo does not report to faculty body outside of

GECCo itself. Thus, Referral 2021-2022 #7 GECCo Reporting Structure. There is a suggestion to have the Faculty Director of GECCo added to the AAC as non-voting member. AAC, as interdisciplinary curriculum committee, oversee GST and any appeals. That's how the prefix issue came to EC and AAC. GECCo can't unilaterally change course prefix. went back to GEO, but they were not happy with it. That's how the GEO's appeal came to EC. The EC responded in a memo to the Faculty Director of GECCo. The issue is that there's no policy. (A. Hegde) Any changes to the structure, such as unit distributions and the requirements for any part of the programs, goes through the Academic Senate. Assessment course requirements and learning outcomes and approval and review of courses are the responsibility of GECCo. (J. Tarjan) EC responded to the best of its knowledge. The Academic Senate Chair will talk with A. Gebauer. (A. Hegde)

- Professional Discourse - This is an overall problematic area that seems to be arising. E. Correa has great concern that if we continue to make decisions or to tiptoe around this and not call instances of unprofessional discourse out to stop-people-in-their-tracks, it will be a challenge to move things forward. (E. Correa) Prioritized agenda items for further discussion of this concern. (See 6.d. General Faculty Meeting, ii. and 6.i. Campus Civility – CPR)
- Emergency Operations Committee (EOC) Update – The sub-group is working on a proposal for Cabinet for their review in response to the Governor lifting the requirement to wear masks. The goal is to get feedback from the EC on the options for CSUB. (M. Williamson) Three options were offered. Discussion ensued. Q 1: Is there a policy if cases increase or if there's a new variant where strict measures can be quickly reinstated? Q2: Can instructors impose a masking policy for their own classes? (C. Lam) A: We always have to be ready to pivot if another variant appears. (M. Williamson) The University, through a requirement from the County, State Public Health can require masks, but individual faculty do not have the authorization to do that. (V. Harper) The classroom is faculty's domain. On the syllabus, the instructor states the rules. The student can decide whether to take the class or not. (M. Martinez) The

wearing of the n95 protects the wearer from others. The cloth mask protects the public. The n95 is available from campus. (M. Williamson) Suggestion: 1) The screening process needs to be improved 2) Do an educational campaign where if there is any kind of symptom they should not be on campus, and 3) include the Senate Chair as a sounding board to the message being crafted. (J. Tarjan) There is a problem in many departments that, since the mandates have been lifted, that some faculty want to go all virtual instruction. Think about what we're going to do to prevent faculty from doing that. A. Hegde will relay EC's concerns of using caution before removing beyond the status quo to the Campus Planning Committee. (A. Hegde)

- Faculty Forum with President – March 29, 2022 1:00 – 2:00
- BPA Search – Interviewing of eight candidates start next week. (J. Tarjan)

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain 10:05)

Request to add Summer Senate Retreat to New Discussion. (J. Tarjan) E. Correa moved to approve the agenda as amended. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

E. Correa moved to approve the minutes from February 15, 2022 and March 1, 2022. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS

a. AS Log (handout)

i. AAC (J. Tarjan)

AAC acts as the curriculum committee (CC) for university-wide programs. A. Hegde and J. Tarjan discussed whether any items that are for AAC in their capacity as CC should go to the EC before being referred. It takes time to get through the agenda and the item is generally referred. The EC members were asked, as a practice, if only those items which are going to AAC in their capacity a university-wide CC be referred directly to AAC? They still need to go to the Academic Senate Chair and copy the AS Analyst to record the process step in the

AS log. (A. Hegde) Discussion ensued. Other school CC's have sent the request by email if it's something that does not need extensive discussion. If no one objects within three days, the proposal gets sent directly to AAC. There would be three-days for a member of EC to request it be to put on agenda for discussion. If no objection, the Academic Senate Office sends to AAC. (M. Danforth) The EC is to be copied in the email to AAC. (A. Hegde) The AAC does not have to go back to the Senate when courses are approved. New programs go to the Senate. (J. Tarjan) For anything that comes to AAC in the capacity of the university wide CC, the Senate Office will send to AAC and copy the EC. Remind others to bring things to us in a timely matter. If it doesn't work, we can go back to the way things were. (A. Hegde)

Referral #7 GECCo Reporting Structure – AAC drafted resolution and then sent it to BPC and FAC for their input.

- ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)(deferred)
- iii. FAC (M. Rees)

Referral #3 Electronic RTP as Application Standard – If we're requiring it, faculty need to become familiar with it before Fall '22. There may be Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC) workshops with stipends.

RES 202103 Submission of Electronic RTP Files for Academic Year 2020-21 was a temporary solution during the pandemic. Are we to continue to do RTP electronically while the investigation of software is being conducted? Currently, faculty have a choice about whether to use face to face or electronic SOCIs. There is a concern, especially amongst untenured faculty, about getting more feedback. In BPA, the electronic SOCI completion rate is 35%, at best. Each school will have to decide the instrument for SOCIs, because we don't have a policy. (A. Hegde) Faculty and students were united in the Senate that we want to remain with paper SOCIs. Because of the low electronic SOCI response rates, we want to continue to use paper SOCIs. (J. Tarjan) Other campuses get higher response rates because they have incentives for students to complete SOCIs, like getting their grades earlier. ITS needs to hear again that electronic RTP is an option and not the default. (M. Danforth) ITS did reach out to the schools. The BPA Dean was asked to

write a memo strongly encouraging in-person SOClS. The Nursing Department requires paper SOClS for in-person courses. (A. Hegde)
FAC is close to finishing a resolution. (A. Hegde)

iv. BPC (C. Lam)

Referral #7 GECCo Reporting Structure – the committee will review AAC’s draft resolution at the next meeting.

Referral 2020-2021 #20: The UPRC Task Force has revised three documents which form the new policy. (C. Lam) Return the documents to the AAC and BPC for discussion. A resolution is needed before the end of the semester. (A. Hegde)

b. Provost Update (V. Harper)

- i. Summer Compensation – General Faculty and Department Chairs (deferred)

c. Searches (V. Harper) (deferred)

- i. AVP GRaSP
- ii. AVP IRPA
- iii. Dean BPA
- iv. Dean NSME
- v. Dean Antelope Valley
- vi. Dean Library
- vii. Associate Dean Undergraduate and Graduate Studies

d. Assigned Time 20.37 Review Committee (deferred)

e. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – Budget Forum March 21, 2022 11:00 – 12:00

f. AB 928 (deferred)

g. AAC Referrals: Copy Catalog and Special Concerns – J. Tarjan (deferred)

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain 10:45)

a. Handbook 201.1 – CARS name change to GECCo – CARS is referenced in this section of the Handbook, but CARS no longer exists. The EC will make editorial changes during the summer. ☰

b. Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) Name Change – The request to change the name to the Department of Human Development and CAFS came from E. Correa, CAFS department chair. (A. Hegde) There isn’t any budget involved in making the change. (M. Danforth) Referred to AAC. (A. Hegde)

- c. Academic Integrity – The Academic Integrity Working Group has been working on some suggested language, policy and such. They meet today. A. Hegde informed the committee co-chair, T. Wallace that the Senate is looking for something now. The EC can expect something from them. It will be on the EC agenda for discussion and then referral to AAC and AS&SS. (A. Hegde)
 - i. Academic Integrity Pledge (deferred)
- d. General Faculty Meeting, Spring
 - i. RTP rebuttal letter acknowledgement: include interpretation of the substance of the letter (deferred)
 - ii. Guidelines for Chat during Zoom Senate meetings – According to an email sent recently to the Academic Senate Chair, someone from the gallery individually attacked a Senator rather than speaking on a resolution. At the next Senate, the Chair will announce that the meeting structure will follow its practice of Robert’s Rules and the process will be done with congeniality. If a Senator wants to speak to a resolution, they should preface their point with whether they are in support or in opposition. If someone from the gallery is called on to speak, they need to speak to the resolution, not to the committee or the individual presenting the resolution. It’s part of a larger conversation that the Academic Senate Chair and the Provost had about the lack of civility on campus. The AS Chair’s role is to conduct the meeting. If anyone observes any breach of collegial standards, please send a chat to the Chair, or asked to be recognized. Say, “what just happened is not appropriate”. When attacks and such actions are not addressed, they continue. The AS Chair will address it. Other Senates have disallowed chats between individuals. (A. Hegde) ASCSU has a similar issue. (J. Millar) (See 6. i.)
 - iii. Modalities moving forward after pandemic – AAC and AS&SS (deferred)
 - iv. Faculty Rights and disciplinary action (deferred)
 - v. URC workload as campus grows (deferred)
- e. AP Assessment Quality Feedback (deferred)
- f. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth (deferred)

- i. Faculty Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change
- ii. Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Handbook 311.1
- iii. School Elections Committee – Handbook Change 202.7 - Workload
- iv. Accessible Technology Initiative Instructional Materials Task Force
- v. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
- vi. Standing Committee Bylaws change – (Section IV)
 - 1. Chair Election Statement of Interest (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
 - 2. Two-years on Senate requirement
 - 3. Structure of BPC
 - 4. Strike “at least” (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
- vii. Committee proliferation
- g. Summer Session GE courses (deferred)
- h. Exam Modality for Flex Classes (deferred)
- i. Campus Civility – Committee for Professional Responsibility (CPR) – There seems to be a dynamic of incivility that is pervasive and continuing and not a sense of real action to prevent it from recurring. While we have rules, regulations and professional dispositions, the fact is that when people are speaking with the intent to silence an entire group of people, it is highly problematic. People have the right to speak without being attacked. As academics, we need to be able to engage. More needs to be done. It is not just censoring or an imposed follow-the-rules posture. People should be told before or after the meeting that these types of behaviors are not appropriate and if this continues, there will be consequences. It has to be more than just saying “Please don’t do this”. While everyone has the right to speak, it must be respectful and to be at a point where other people can still engage and not feel attacked. Some people need to be told; your behavior is not appropriate. Perhaps the message has to come from administrators that it’s not the way we treat each other here, even if you’re angry or sad. (E. Correa) This was discussed in one of the Strategic Goal meetings. One of the steps we’re going to take is to reconstitute the CPR. If certain individuals continue certain behaviors, there could be some consequences to that. It’s getting to the point where certain individuals are afraid of being called out. (A.

Hegde) This kind of behavior came up as a theme in the survey made for the General Faculty Spring meeting. M. Danforth embraces the idea of being comfortable with discomfort during the pandemic as long as people aren't mean. Remind people to use diplomacy. (M. Danforth) This is an incredibly important topic. J. Tarjan and another department chair discussed behavior in the context of Title IX with M. Brown. Faculty don't believe there are consequences for their poor behavior. There are a number of instances where faculty feel no consequence when it comes to the very serious issues of academic integrity, even when others feel that faculty member should be dismissed. People don't think things are taken seriously when faculty members misbehave. J. Tarjan asked M. Brown, what does it mean when crime rates increase? Does it mean there's more crime? Often times not, because people start to report things to police. In his opinion, there is pent-up-demand to address professional responsibility, whether it's policing our own or making sure people act within the bounds of proper legal or procedural mandated behaviors. It appears that the administration doesn't take this seriously. (J. Tarjan) Those faculty in CPR are going to see situations from multiple different perspectives. Each person fully believes their perspective, but it may not be the complete perspective. Example: Someone executed their duties as Chair, yet the faculty member felt it was motivated by a personal dislike, even though it was actually motivated by the professional situation: they were not responding to students, not showing up for office hours and late to class. The CPR needs orientation on what would be the appropriate mindset and boundaries they should take, before they start reviewing cases. (M. Danforth) Whatever the reconstituted CPR looks like, those discussions will come from the AS. Keep thinking about those ideas to improve the collegial relationship on campus. Training and having consequences are excellent ideas. (A. Hegde) Q: What is the relationship between the Faculty Ombudsperson and the charge of CPR? (C. Lam) The Ombudsperson is a mediator and would also be involved with the CPR. (A. Hegde) There is a proposal in front of the President that goes further. The CFA union will see the proposal first. That dialogue with the CFA will be about our approach to dealing with faculty-to-faculty conduct. There

are circumstances where we want to hold administrators accountable. The genesis for the proposal was the Campus Climate Survey and what we saw in the situation with Chancellor Castro and other issues. After we get feedback from the CFA, the proposal will be brought to the EC as an informational piece. It is far more comprehensive than what we had in the past. (V. Harper) If the CPR is reconstituted, it would be helpful for the EC to see that information. (A. Hegde) The issues around the return to campus makes this a perfect time to have a program outlining our code of conduct. (M. Martinez) The Provost's Office has examined the Subchapter 7 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code and Handbook 303.8.3 Procedures for the CPR. There is no need for additional policy guidance. The Provost Office is seeking to offer a better enforcement mechanism and to modernize some of the processes in the Faculty Affairs Office. The Provost looked at the Title IX and HR complaints from the last five years to get a sense of the current state of the campus. The President is receptive to the approach. There's been communication with system representatives on how our approach compares with other campuses. We seem to be on the leading edge. (V. Harper) The EC looks forward to seeing it. Thank you. (A. Hegde)

- j. Summer Senate Retreat (deferred)
- k. RTP – 3-year Lecturers, PTR Committee (deferred)
- l. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (handout) (deferred)
- m. Reconsider Time Blocks (deferred)
- n. Investment Divestiture (deferred)
- o. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) (deferred)
- p. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC (deferred)
- q. Distinguished Professor Award – FAC (deferred)
- r. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
- s. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)
- t. Assigned Time application revision and timing (Hold pending further information) – FAC

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING March 17, 2021 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)**

Approval of Minutes

Announcements

- President's Report – L. Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10-10:15)
- Department of Nursing Impacted Status – D. Wilson (Time Certain 10:15)
- Ally Software Pilot Report – F. Gorham (Time Certain 10:20)
- Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth (Time Certain 10:25)

Approval of Agenda (Time Certain 10:05)

Reports

Resolutions (Time Certain 10:35)

Consent Agenda

New Business

RES 212223 Approval of BA in History with a Concentration in Social Science Teaching

RES 212224 Completeness of Periodic and Performance Review Files

RES 212225 Task Stream Usage and Access Policies

Old Business

RES 212220 Formation of a General Studies Review Committee

RES 212221 Academic Calendar – Fall Recess Schedule

Open Forum (Time Certain 11:15)

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

A. Hegde thanked the members for staying over and for the great discussion. He adjourned the meeting at 11:32.

Academic Affairs Cluster Hire Overview

Cluster hiring involves attracting tenure-track faculty to academic departments to foster scholarship, intellectual exploration, service and teaching in relation to a specific theme. In the past five years, three CSUs have conducted faculty cluster hires (CSU San Marcos, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and Cal State Channel Islands). For CSUB, the Fall 2023 cluster hire will be focused on attracting faculty that have scholarly interests in social justice and minoritized communities. This theme was chosen for multiple reasons. First, this approach creates the best opportunity, though it is not guaranteed, to attract diverse faculty to CSUB. From CSUB's own climate surveys, accreditation and student surveys, the need to diversify the faculty to better reflect the student body is repeatedly echoed. For example, CSUB is a Hispanic Serving Institution serving a population that is about 63% Hispanic/Latino, yet our Hispanic/Latino faculty represent 12.4% of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. In addition, these faculty are expected to bring scholarly agendas that elevate the scholarship related to social justice and minoritized communities.

Cluster Hire Details

- ❖ Five Tenure-Track Expansion cluster hire lines will be available for Fall 2023 cycle
 - Additional Tenure-Track lines will be available
- ❖ All Academic Departments are eligible to apply for a cluster hire expansion line
 - Application details will be distributed in April, with a deadline to be announced
- ❖ Departments applying for a cluster hire expansion line must be willing to commit to the following:
 - Joint position posting (All 5 positions will be advertised collectively)
 - Office of the Provost will provide an additional \$5,000 to support job posting
 - Above funding can be used for direct recruitment at other diverse institutions
 - Commitment to the enhanced support measures for the cluster hire cohort (described below)
 - Commitment by the department faculty to review and revise its department's RTP guidelines and align/support diversity equity and inclusive principles
 - Commitment by the department faculty to engage in antiracist /antibias professional development and training
- ❖ Departments may also offer an existing (replacement) tenure-track line into the cluster hire, thereby accessing the below enhance faculty support

Enhanced Year 1-3 Faculty Support for Cluster Hires

- ❖ \$1,000 course development funds to support social justice themed coursework, per faculty member
- ❖ \$1,000 increase in faculty development funds to support travel and scholarship, per faculty member
- ❖ Cohort Specific Faculty Learning Community Coordinated by the Office of Equity and Inclusion
- ❖ Automatic Entry in the Faculty Leadership Program
- ❖ Equity-Minded Faculty Mentoring

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Minutes

Tuesday, March 15, 2022

10:00 a.m. – 11:32 a.m.

Video Conference

Members: A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair), J. Millar, M. Martinez, E. Correa, C. Lam, M. Rees, J. Tarjan, V. Harper

Visitor: M. Williamson

1. CALL TO ORDER

A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK

- Last Senate Meeting to introduce resolutions is April 28, 2022
- EC priorities include
 - 1) Academic Integrity (see 6.c.),
 - 2) UPRC Task Force (see 5.a iv), and
 - 3) Electronic RTP (see 5.a.iii.)
- Course Prefix – The Geology department sent an email in October 2021 to the Academic Senate Chair and the Academic Affairs Committee Chair about GECCo using prefix SCI for GE GEO courses. There is no policy which says GECCo, or anybody has authority over prefixes. It's assumed that if a course is within a department, the department has prefix authority over the course. (A. Hegde) The recommendation was to send the issue back to the NSME Curriculum Committee to work it out internally, which went slowly. It took three years to get course approval from GECCo without any help from anyone else. That's a whole different area that will need to be discussed with GECCo. (M. Danforth) J. Tarjan clarified that GE course appeals go through the Academic Affairs Committee. He is in support of having the school curriculum committee decide on prefixes. (J. Tarjan) Who has oversight of GECCo? (M. Martinez) From an administrative perspective, oversight belongs in the Office of Academic Programs. GECCo does not report to faculty body outside of

GECCo itself. Thus, Referral 2021-2022 #7 GECCo Reporting Structure. There is a suggestion to have the Faculty Director of GECCo added to the AAC as non-voting member. AAC, as interdisciplinary curriculum committee, oversee GST and any appeals. That's how the prefix issue came to EC and AAC. GECCo can't unilaterally change course prefix. went back to GEO, but they were not happy with it. That's how the GEO's appeal came to EC. The EC responded in a memo to the Faculty Director of GECCo. The issue is that there's no policy. (A. Hegde) Any changes to the structure, such as unit distributions and the requirements for any part of the programs, goes through the Academic Senate. Assessment course requirements and learning outcomes and approval and review of courses are the responsibility of GECCo. (J. Tarjan) EC responded to the best of its knowledge. The Academic Senate Chair will talk with A. Gebauer. (A. Hegde)

- Professional Discourse - This is an overall problematic area that seems to be arising. E. Correa has great concern that if we continue to make decisions or to tiptoe around this and not call instances of unprofessional discourse out to stop-people-in-their-tracks, it will be a challenge to move things forward. (E. Correa) Prioritized agenda items for further discussion of this concern. (See 6.d. General Faculty Meeting, ii. and 6.i. Campus Civility – CPR)
- Emergency Operations Committee (EOC) Update – The sub-group is working on a proposal for Cabinet for their review in response to the Governor lifting the requirement to wear masks. The goal is to get feedback from the EC on the options for CSUB. (M. Williamson) Three options were offered. Discussion ensued. Q 1: Is there a policy if cases increase or if there's a new variant where strict measures can be quickly reinstated? Q2: Can instructors impose a masking policy for their own classes? (C. Lam) A: We always have to be ready to pivot if another variant appears. (M. Williamson) The University, through a requirement from the County, State Public Health can require masks, but individual faculty do not have the authorization to do that. (V. Harper) The classroom is faculty's domain. On the syllabus, the instructor states the rules. The student can decide whether to take the class or not. (M. Martinez) The

wearing of the n95 protects the wearer from others. The cloth mask protects the public. The n95 is available from campus. (M. Williamson) Suggestion: 1) The screening process needs to be improved 2) Do an educational campaign where if there is any kind of symptom they should not be on campus, and 3) include the Senate Chair as a sounding board to the message being crafted. (J. Tarjan) There is a problem in many departments that, since the mandates have been lifted, that some faculty want to go all virtual instruction. Think about what we're going to do to prevent faculty from doing that. A. Hegde will relay EC's concerns of using caution before removing beyond the status quo to the Campus Planning Committee. (A. Hegde)

- Faculty Forum with President – March 29, 2022 1:00 – 2:00
- BPA Search – Interviewing of eight candidates start next week. (J. Tarjan)

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain 10:05)

Request to add Summer Senate Retreat to New Discussion. (J. Tarjan) E. Correa moved to approve the agenda as amended. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

E. Correa moved to approve the minutes from February 15, 2022 and March 1, 2022. C. Lam seconded. Approved.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS

a. AS Log (handout)

i. AAC (J. Tarjan)

AAC acts as the curriculum committee (CC) for university-wide programs. A. Hegde and J. Tarjan discussed whether any items that are for AAC in their capacity as CC should go to the EC before being referred. It takes time to get through the agenda and the item is generally referred. The EC members were asked, as a practice, if only those items which are going to AAC in their capacity a university-wide CC be referred directly to AAC? They still need to go to the Academic Senate Chair and copy the AS Analyst to record the process step in the

AS log. (A. Hegde) Discussion ensued. Other school CC's have sent the request by email if it's something that does not need extensive discussion. If no one objects within three days, the proposal gets sent directly to AAC. There would be three-days for a member of EC to request it be to put on agenda for discussion. If no objection, the Academic Senate Office sends to AAC. (M. Danforth) The EC is to be copied in the email to AAC. (A. Hegde) The AAC does not have to go back to the Senate when courses are approved. New programs go to the Senate. (J. Tarjan) For anything that comes to AAC in the capacity of the university wide CC, the Senate Office will send to AAC and copy the EC. Remind others to bring things to us in a timely matter. If it doesn't work, we can go back to the way things were. (A. Hegde)

Referral #7 GECCo Reporting Structure – AAC drafted resolution and then sent it to BPC and FAC for their input.

- ii. AS&SS (E. Correa)(deferred)
- iii. FAC (M. Rees)

Referral #3 Electronic RTP as Application Standard – If we're requiring it, faculty need to become familiar with it before Fall '22. There may be Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC) workshops with stipends. RES 202103 Submission of Electronic RTP Files for Academic Year 2020-21 was a temporary solution during the pandemic. Are we to continue to do RTP electronically while the investigation of software is being conducted? Currently, faculty have a choice about whether to use face to face or electronic SOCIs. There is a concern, especially amongst untenured faculty, about getting more feedback. In BPA, the electronic SOCI completion rate is 35%, at best. Each school will have to decide the instrument for SOCIs, because we don't have a policy. (A. Hegde) Faculty and students were united in the Senate that we want to remain with paper SOCIs. Because of the low electronic SOCI response rates, we want to continue to use paper SOCIs. (J. Tarjan) Other campuses get higher response rates because they have incentives for students to complete SOCIs, like getting their grades earlier. ITS needs to hear again that electronic RTP is an option and not the default. (M. Danforth) ITS did reach out to the schools. The BPA Dean was asked to

write a memo strongly encouraging in-person SOClS. The Nursing Department requires paper SOClS for in-person courses. (A. Hegde) FAC is close to finishing a resolution. (A. Hegde)

- iv. BPC (C. Lam)
 - Referral #7 GECCo Reporting Structure – the committee will review AAC’s draft resolution at the next meeting.
 - Referral 2020-2021 #20: The UPRC Task Force has revised three documents which form the new policy. (C. Lam) Return the documents to the AAC and BPC for discussion. A resolution is needed before the end of the semester. (A. Hegde)
 - b. Provost Update (V. Harper)
 - i. Summer Compensation – General Faculty and Department Chairs (deferred)
 - c. Searches (V. Harper) (deferred)
 - i. AVP GRaSP
 - ii. AVP IRPA
 - iii. Dean BPA
 - iv. Dean NSME
 - v. Dean Antelope Valley
 - vi. Dean Library
 - vii. Associate Dean Undergraduate and Graduate Studies
 - d. Assigned Time 20.37 Review Committee (deferred)
 - e. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – Budget Forum March 21, 2022 11:00 – 12:00
 - f. AB 928 (deferred)
 - g. AAC Referrals: Copy Catalog and Special Concerns – J. Tarjan (deferred)
6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS (Time Certain 10:45)
- a. Handbook 201.1 – CARS name change to GECCo – CARS is referenced in this section of the Handbook, but CARS no longer exists. The EC will make editorial changes during the summer. ☰
 - b. Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) Name Change – The request to change the name to the Department of Human Development and CAFS came from E. Correa, CAFS department chair. (A. Hegde) There isn’t any budget involved in making the change. (M. Danforth) Referred to AAC. (A. Hegde)

- c. Academic Integrity – The Academic Integrity Working Group has been working on some suggested language, policy and such. They meet today. A. Hegde informed the committee co-chair, T. Wallace that the Senate is looking for something now. The EC can expect something from them. It will be on the EC agenda for discussion and then referral to AAC and AS&SS. (A. Hegde)
 - i. Academic Integrity Pledge (deferred)
- d. General Faculty Meeting, Spring
 - i. RTP rebuttal letter acknowledgement: include interpretation of the substance of the letter (deferred)
 - ii. Guidelines for Chat during Zoom Senate meetings – According to an email sent recently to the Academic Senate Chair, someone from the gallery individually attacked a Senator rather than speaking on a resolution. At the next Senate, the Chair will announce that the meeting structure will follow its practice of Robert’s Rules and the process will be done with congeniality. If a Senator wants to speak to a resolution, they should preface their point with whether they are in support or in opposition. If someone from the gallery is called on to speak, they need to speak to the resolution, not to the committee or the individual presenting the resolution. It’s part of a larger conversation that the Academic Senate Chair and the Provost had about the lack of civility on campus. The AS Chair’s role is to conduct the meeting. If anyone observes any breach of collegial standards, please send a chat to the Chair, or asked to be recognized. Say, “what just happened is not appropriate”. When attacks and such actions are not addressed, they continue. The AS Chair will address it. Other Senates have disallowed chats between individuals. (A. Hegde) ASCSU has a similar issue. (J. Millar) (See 6. i.)
 - iii. Modalities moving forward after pandemic – AAC and AS&SS (deferred)
 - iv. Faculty Rights and disciplinary action (deferred)
 - v. URC workload as campus grows (deferred)
- e. AP Assessment Quality Feedback (deferred)
- f. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth (deferred)

- i. Faculty Fourth attempt to fill position turns to EC appointment – Handbook Change
- ii. Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Handbook 311.1
- iii. School Elections Committee – Handbook Change 202.7 - Workload
- iv. Accessible Technology Initiative Instructional Materials Task Force
- v. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
- vi. Standing Committee Bylaws change – (Section IV)
 - 1. Chair Election Statement of Interest (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
 - 2. Two-years on Senate requirement
 - 3. Structure of BPC
 - 4. Strike “at least” (J. Tarjan’s suggestion)
- vii. Committee proliferation
- g. Summer Session GE courses (deferred)
- h. Exam Modality for Flex Classes (deferred)
- i. Campus Civility – Committee for Professional Responsibility (CPR) – There seems to be a dynamic of incivility that is pervasive and continuing and not a sense of real action to prevent it from recurring. While we have rules, regulations and professional dispositions, the fact is that when people are speaking with the intent to silence an entire group of people, it is highly problematic. People have the right to speak without being attacked. As academics, we need to be able to engage. More needs to be done. It is not just censoring or an imposed follow-the-rules posture. People should be told before or after the meeting that these types of behaviors are not appropriate and if this continues, there will be consequences. It has to be more than just saying “Please don’t do this”. While everyone has the right to speak, it must be respectful and to be at a point where other people can still engage and not feel attacked. Some people need to be told; your behavior is not appropriate. Perhaps the message has to come from administrators that it’s not the way we treat each other here, even if you’re angry or sad. (E. Correa) This was discussed in one of the Strategic Goal meetings. One of the steps we’re going to take is to reconstitute the CPR. If certain individuals continue certain behaviors, there could be some consequences to that. It’s getting to the point where certain individuals are afraid of being called out. (A.

Hegde) This kind of behavior came up as a theme in the survey made for the General Faculty Spring meeting. M. Danforth embraces the idea of being comfortable with discomfort during the pandemic as long as people aren't mean. Remind people to use diplomacy. (M. Danforth) This is an incredibly important topic. J. Tarjan and another department chair discussed behavior in the context of Title IX with M. Brown. Faculty don't believe there are consequences for their poor behavior. There are a number of instances where faculty feel no consequence when it comes to the very serious issues of academic integrity, even when others feel that faculty member should be dismissed. People don't think things are taken seriously when faculty members misbehave. J. Tarjan asked M. Brown, what does it mean when crime rates increase? Does it mean there's more crime? Often times not, because people start to report things to police. In his opinion, there is pent-up-demand to address professional responsibility, whether it's policing our own or making sure people act within the bounds of proper legal or procedural mandated behaviors. It appears that the administration doesn't take this seriously. (J. Tarjan) Those faculty in CPR are going to see situations from multiple different perspectives. Each person fully believes their perspective, but it may not be the complete perspective. Example: Someone executed their duties as Chair, yet the faculty member felt it was motivated by a personal dislike, even though it was actually motivated by the professional situation: they were not responding to students, not showing up for office hours and late to class. The CPR needs orientation on what would be the appropriate mindset and boundaries they should take, before they start reviewing cases. (M. Danforth) Whatever the reconstituted CPR looks like, those discussions will come from the AS. Keep thinking about those ideas to improve the collegial relationship on campus. Training and having consequences are excellent ideas. (A. Hegde) Q: What is the relationship between the Faculty Ombudsperson and the charge of CPR? (C. Lam) The Ombudsperson is a mediator and would also be involved with the CPR. (A. Hegde) There is a proposal in front of the President that goes further. The CFA union will see the proposal first. That dialogue with the CFA will be about our approach to dealing with faculty-to-faculty conduct. There

are circumstances where we want to hold administrators accountable. The genesis for the proposal was the Campus Climate Survey and what we saw in the situation with Chancellor Castro and other issues. After we get feedback from the CFA, the proposal will be brought to the EC as an informational piece. It is far more comprehensive than what we had in the past. (V. Harper) If the CPR is reconstituted, it would be helpful for the EC to see that information. (A. Hegde) The issues around the return to campus makes this a perfect time to have a program outlining our code of conduct. (M. Martinez) The Provost's Office has examined the Subchapter 7 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code and Handbook 303.8.3 Procedures for the CPR. There is no need for additional policy guidance. The Provost Office is seeking to offer a better enforcement mechanism and to modernize some of the processes in the Faculty Affairs Office. The Provost looked at the Title IX and HR complaints from the last five years to get a sense of the current state of the campus. The President is receptive to the approach. There's been communication with system representatives on how our approach compares with other campuses. We seem to be on the leading edge. (V. Harper) The EC looks forward to seeing it. Thank you. (A. Hegde)

- j. Summer Senate Retreat (deferred)
- k. RTP – 3-year Lecturers, PTR Committee (deferred)
- l. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (handout) (deferred)
- m. Reconsider Time Blocks (deferred)
- n. Investment Divestiture (deferred)
- o. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) (deferred)
- p. Academic Freedom revisited – FAC (deferred)
- q. Distinguished Professor Award – FAC (deferred)
- r. Faculty Poll regarding online instruction (Hold pending further information)
- s. Alma Mater (Hold pending further investigation)
- t. Assigned Time application revision and timing (Hold pending further information) – FAC

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING March 17, 2021 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)**

Approval of Minutes

Announcements

- President's Report – L. Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10-10:15)
- Department of Nursing Impacted Status – D. Wilson (Time Certain 10:15)
- Ally Software Pilot Report – F. Gorham (Time Certain 10:20)
- Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth (Time Certain 10:25)

Approval of Agenda (Time Certain 10:05)

Reports

Resolutions (Time Certain 10:35)

Consent Agenda

New Business

RES 212223 Approval of BA in History with a Concentration in Social Science Teaching

RES 212224 Completeness of Periodic and Performance Review Files

RES 212225 Task Stream Usage and Access Policies

Old Business

RES 212220 Formation of a General Studies Review Committee

RES 212221 Academic Calendar – Fall Recess Schedule

Open Forum (Time Certain 11:15)

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

A. Hegde thanked the members for staying over and for the great discussion. He adjourned the meeting at 11:32.

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – APRIL 5, 2022

Academic Affairs Committee: John Tarjan/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Nov 18, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
8/24/21	2021-2022 02 Department Formation Criteria Revision		AAC, BPC, FAC The need to clarify and extend the current department formation procedures. Task Force sent recommendations to EC 12/1/ 2021. See EC Agenda 12/7/21. AAC will take up discussion.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 05 EEGO Summer Term Unit Limits	Complete	AAC Consider Summer Session as a single term with a cumulative student workload and what is the maximum number of units which enables student success. RES 212213 Unit Cap During Summer Term	2/17/22	2/25/22	2/28/22
	2020-2021 23 MA INST Moratorium	Complete	AAC Consider the rationale as presented in the attached letter from the Director of INST and the impact on students in the program. RES 212204 MA INST Moratorium	10/7/21	10/15/21	10/15/21
8/31/21	2021-2022 07 GECCo Reporting Structure		AAC, BPC, FAC Where GECCo fits into other committee & program structures and whether to change Handbook 202.1 or Handbook Appendix C Article 8.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 08 Proposal for the Formation of a General Studies (GST) Department	Withdrawn 10/19/21	AAC, BPC, FAC Rationale behind dept. creation, existing support services, additional supports services needed			
8/31/21	2021-2022 09 Proposal to Employ High Impact Practice (HIP) Tracking	Complete	AAC, AS&SS Whether: to use existing code in PeopleSoft, apply AAC&U's definition, there's a campus body that could identify HIPs and can dev & deliver HIPs, need for training guide for analysis & reporting AAC presenting RES 212212 High Impact Practice Designation and Tracking	2/17/22	2/25/22	2/28/22
10/5/21	2021-2022 21 Proposal for Ethnic Studies ETHS 1508 and Change to ETHS Curriculum	Complete	AAC in its capacity as the interschool curriculum committee, approved the ETHS 1508 course proposal for Introduction to Chicana/Chicano/Chicanx Studies and approved the proposed changes to the Ethnic & Area Studies concentration.			
10/5/21	2021-2022 24 BA Sociology Concentration Revision – Racial and Ethnic Dynamics	Complete	AAC Review rationale and impact. RES 212214 Approval of Revised Sociology Concentration in Racial and Ethnic Dynamics	2/17/22	2/25/22	2/28/22

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – APRIL 5, 2022

Academic Affairs Committee: John Tarjan/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Nov 18, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
10/16/21	2021-2022 25 General Studies (GST) Department Formation	Formation approved Implementation First Reading 4/7/22	AAC Lack of home for GST, whether GST more suited as a program, mechanism for GST faculty review, GST report to EC annually RES 212220 – Formation of General Studies Review Committee RES 212226 – General Studies Review Committee Implementation	3/17/22	3/25/22	3/28/22
10/16/21	2021-2022 26 AMP 2022-23 through 2031-32	Complete	AAC BPC RES 212208 Academic Master Plan 2022-23 through 2031-32	12/02/21	12/10/21	12/13/21
10/19/21	2021-2022 29 Task Stream Usage and Access	Second Reading 4/7/22	AAC, AS&SS BPC Whether policy needed from academic, student, and planning perspectives. RES 212225 Task Stream Usage and Access Policies			
12/8/21	2021-2022 32 Undergraduate Re-Enrollment Policy Change	Complete Temp New Policy First Reading 4/7/22	AAC Revising CSUB policy for re-entry and addressing concerns identified by Chancellor Castro. RES 212210 Temporary Suspension of Re-Enrollment Application Policy RES 212228 Re-Entry Students Policy	12/2/21	12/10/21	12/10/21
1/25/22	2021-2022 35 Bachelor of Arts (BA) in History with Social Science Teaching Concentration	Second Reading 4/7/22	AAC Rationale as presented and the impact on students. RES 212223 Approval of BA in History with Social Science Teaching Concentration			
3/15/22	2021-2022 #42 Proposal to Change Department Name from CAFS to HDCAFS	First Reading 4/7/22	AAC Rationale of proposal and the impact on students. RES 212229 Change Dept Name from CAFS to HDCAFS			
3/15/22	2021-2022 #43 Course Prefixes		AAC Who has dominion over course prefixes and where do they reside?			

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – APRIL 5, 2022

Academic Support and Student Services: Elaine Correa/Chair, meets 10:00 via Zoom video conference

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Nov 18, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
	2020-2021 Referral 26 Testing Center	Complete	AS&SS RES 202123 Academic Testing Center approved by Senate 3/18/21. Not by President pending Fall '21 enrollment, need, resources.			
9/28/21	2021-2022 Referral 10 Faculty Advising Structure	Complete	AS&SS Whether there is a need for a change to the advising structure Refer to AS&SS minutes 2021-05-06 for recommendations. See report from Faculty Fellow & AVP AP. AS&SS sent recommendations to EC asking for Task Force. Created.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 09 Proposal to Employ High Impact Practice (HIP) Tracking	Complete	AAC, AS&SS Whether: to use existing code in PeopleSoft, apply AAC&U's definition, there's a campus body that could identify HIPs and can dev & deliver HIPs, need for training guide for analysis & reporting. RES 212212 HIP Designation & Tracking. AS&SS sent memo to EC why it did not support the resolution.	2/17/22	2/25/22	2/28/22
10/19/21	2021-2022 28 Academic Testing Center Exploratory Sub-Committee		AS&SS Reference RES 202123. Form sub-committee & include AVP EM, Director Testing Center, ASI & provide path			
10/19/21	2021-2022 29 Task Stream Usage and Access	First Reading 3/17/22	AAC, AS&SS BPC Whether policy needed from academic, student, and planning perspectives. RES 212225 Task Stream Usage and Access Policies			
1/25/22	2021-2022 36 Appendix K IMAP – Handbook Change		AS&SS Align IMAP with CO's new goals and performance indicators, whether LMS is instructional goal, and identify responsible party of the master textbook list.			

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – APRIL 5, 2022

Faculty Affairs Committee: Mandy Rees/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom video conference

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Nov 18, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
8/24/21	2021-2022 01 Extension of RES 192020 RTP Guidelines for 2020 to 2021		FAC The same factors that restricted or prevented faculty from doing certain activities related to RTP still exist.			
8/24/21	2021-2022 02 Department Formation Criteria Revision	Complete	AAC, BPC, FAC The need to clarify and extend the current department formation procedures. Task Force sent recommendations to EC 12/1/ 2021. See EC Agenda 12/7/21			
8/24/21	2021-2022 03 Electronic RTP as Application Standard	Complete	FAC Whether use of vendor with electronic RTP application platform is viable for CSUB. RES 212219 Submission of Electronic Faculty Performance Review Files	3/3/22	3/11/22	3/11/22
8/24/21	2021-2022 04 Exceptional Service Article 20.37 Application and Screening Process		FAC Research CSU campus' rubrics & applications and establish improvement and consistency to application & screening.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 07 GECCo Reporting Structure		AAC, BPC, FAC Where GECCo fits into other committee & program structures and whether to change Handbook 202.1 or Handbook Appendix C Article 8.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 08 General Studies (GST) Department Formation	Withdrawn 10/19/21	AAC, BPC, FAC Rationale behind dept. creation, existing support services, additional supports services needed			
8/31/21	2021-2022 Referral 12 Criteria and Nomination Process for Faculty Awards		FAC Define meritorious, pressure from senior faculty, confidentiality of process			
	2020-2021 06 CSUB Patent Policy	Complete	FAC RES 202117 CSUB Patent Policy approved by Senate. Not by President pending CO policy update.			
	2019-2020 Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate – Handbook Change	Carry-over from 2 AYS	FAC refer to RES 121329 Procedures for Honorary Doctorate Nominations and Selection REVISED			
8/31/21	2021-2022 13 Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time		FAC Specifying the appropriate timing and notification to the department chair and how the coordination with AA and HR can improve.			
8/31/21	2021-2022 20 Accessibility of Instructional Materials		FAC Identify owner and maintainer of textbook master list, specify policies for adopting a textbook.			

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – APRIL 5, 2022

Faculty Affairs Committee: Mandy Rees/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom video conference

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Nov 18, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
8/31/21	2021-2022 17 Handbook 305.2.4 Early Award of Tenure and 305.3.4 Early Promotion of Probationary and Tenured Faculty	Complete	FAC The language regarding performance differs. Make them consistent. Departments need to have early tenure criteria or revise it. RES 212202 Early Award of Tenure	9/23/21	10/1/21	10/4/21
8/31/21	2021-2022 19 DEI Faculty Fellows Exploratory Group Report		BPC, FAC Review institutional and faculty issues and comment whether there are actionable items.			
8/31/21	2020-2021 14 Proposal for the Creation of Ethnic Studies Department	Complete	FAC RES 212207 Formation of Ethnic Studies Department	12/02/21	12/10/21	12/10/21
9/21/21	2021-2022 23 Faculty Hall of Fame Selection Process Change		FAC Whether selection process should move to FHAC; whether time conflict with Faculty Awards, data transfer			
10/19/21	2021-2022 Referral 15 Sabbatical Application Process Improvement	Complete	FAC Identify what is different or extra between the 1) Faculty Information Bulletin 2) Application Cover Sheet, 3) Handbook with directions for the applicant and 4) directions for the evaluating committee and then make consistent between them, and other considerations. RES 212216 Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leave Policies	2/17/22	2/25/22	2/28/22
10/19/21	2021-2022 27 Composition of Search and Screening Committees – Handbook Change		FAC Handbook 309.5: clarify candidate eligibility, add “General Faculty”, reconstitute committee > 18 months.			
1/25/22	2021-2022 30 Completeness of RTP File – Handbook Change	First Reading 3/17/22	FAC Consider direction, clarification, order of review, include chair letter, timeline, items from PAF to WPAF RES 212224 Completeness of Periodic and Performance Review Files			
3/1/22	2021-2022 #39 The Performance Action File (PAF) and the Working Performance Action File (WPAF) – Handbook Change					
3/1/22	2021-2022 #40 Digitizing the Performance Review Process					
3/1/22	2021-2022 #41 Sixth-year Lecturer Review – Handbook Change					

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – APRIL 5, 2022

Budget and Planning Committee: Charles Lam/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom video conference

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Nov 18, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
2021-2022 02 Department Formation Criteria Revision	Complete	AAC, BPC, FAC The need to clarify and extend the current department formation procedures. Task Force sent recommendations to EC 12/1/ 2021. See EC Agenda 12/7/21			
2021-2022 16 Institutional Research in Response to WSCUC Report	Complete	BPC Feedback from CO, access and permissions to data, what faculty needs, what data department chairs' need. See M. Malhotra's report. BPC decided that there is sufficient ongoing process that no follow-up action is required at this time			
2020-2021 20 UPRC Changes	Pending Task Force. Tabled to 2021-2022	AAC, BPC Combine concerns from 2019-2020 #19 referral and 2020-2021 Addendum with the recommendations from UPRC current Chair and Jinping Sun's report.			
2021-2022 07 GECCo Reporting Structure		AAC, BPC, FAC Where GECCo fits into other committee & program structures and whether to change Handbook 202.1 or Handbook Appendix C Article 8.			
2021-2022 08 General Studies (GST) Department Formation	Withdrawn 10/19/21	AAC, BPC, FAC Rationale behind dept. creation, existing support services, additional supports services needed			
2021-2022 18 CSUB Policy on Use of sUAS – GraSP Update	Complete	BPC Consider whether documents submitted by GraSP are informational or need action. RES 212205 CSUB Policy on Use of sUAS – GRaSP Update	10/7/21	10/15/21	10/15/21
2021-2022 19 DEI Faculty Fellows Exploratory Group Report		BPC, FAC Review institutional and faculty issues and comment whether there are actionable items.			
2021-2022 22 Summer 2022 Schedule EEGO	Complete	BPC Whether unequal days between two summer sessions, eliminate break, reinstate two five-week terms in future. RES 212206 Winter Intersession 2021-2022 Calendar Update	10/7/21	10/15/21	10/15/21
2021-2022 26 AMP 2022-23 through 2031-32	Complete	AAC BPC RES 212208 Academic Master Plan 2022-23 through 2031-32	12/02/21	12/10/21	12/13/21

ACADEMIC SENATE LOG – APRIL 5, 2022

Budget and Planning Committee: Charles Lam/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom video conference

Dates: Sept 2, Sept 16, Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Nov 18, Jan 27, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 10, Mar 24, Apr 21, May 5

Date	Item	Status	Action	Approved by Senate	Sent to President	Approved by President
10/19/21	2021-2022 29 Task Stream Usage and Access	First Reading 3/17/22	AAC, AS&SS BPC Whether policy needed from academic, student, and planning perspectives. RES 212225 Task Stream Usage and Access Policies			
11/2/21	2020-2021 31 Academic Calendar 2022-2023	Complete	BPC RES 212211 Academic Calendar 2022-2023	12/02/21	12/10/21	12/10/21
12/7/21	2021-2022 33 Final Exam Schedule – Interim Policy Change	Complete	BPC Creation of policy that gives students and faculty the option of taking final exam at a time that doesn't conflict with Commencement. RES 212218 Final Exam Policy – Interim Policy Change	3/3/22	3/11/22	3/11/22
1/25/22	2021-2022 34 Academic Calendar Fall Recess Schedule	Second Reading 3/17/22	BPC Consider impact on number of teaching days and survey of other CSUs RES 212221 Academic Calendar – Fall Recess			
1/26/22	2021-2022 37 Addendum to Academic Calendar 2022-2023	Complete	BPC RES 212215 Addendum to Academic Calendar 2022-2023	2/3/22	2/11/22	2/17/22
		Complete	BPC RES 212217 Addendum to Academic Calendar 2021-2022	2/3/22	2/11/22	2/17/22
2/15/22	2021-2022 38 Saturday Commencement		BPC Explore the issues and proposed alternatives to resolve schedule conflict with exam finals and commencement. Memo from BPC sent to EC 4/4/22.			



Date: March 16, 2022

From: Charles Lam,
Chair, Budget and Planning Committee (2021-22)

To: Aaron Hegde, Chair, Academic Senate

On March 10, 2022, Budget and Planning Committee discussed 2021-22 Referral #38 – Saturday Commencement. The Committee considered issues such as students’ final exam conflict and needs, Saturday Commencement costs, weekend staffing, conflicts with cultural ceremonies, as well as faculty and contract hours. BPC decided that a policy is not advisable at this moment so as to provide flexibility for the campus. BPC urges, however, that the Calendar Committee avoids scheduling final exams and Commencement *on the same day*.

Sylvia A. Alva, Ph.D.

Executive Vice Chancellor

CSU Office of the Chancellor

401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, CA 90802

www.calstate.edu

March 24, 2022

MEMORANDUM

TO: CSU Presidents

FROM: Sylvia A. Alva, Ph.D. 
Executive Vice Chancellor

SUBJECT: Upcoming revisions to the CSU Policy on the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (formerly Executive Order 665)

Executive Order 665, published in 1987, established requirements for California State University students to demonstrate writing proficiency at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR), an element of that policy, has since been satisfied by CSU undergraduate students most typically via the completion of a designated upper-division course or in-person examination. Although only a few CSU campuses required the in-person exam, due to the pandemic the GWAR was suspended for *all* students through spring 2022. This pause has provided an opportunity to reconsider the place of GWAR in the CSU.

In a February 23, 2021, memo, Academic and Student Affairs committed to a process in fall 2021 to evaluate the future use of the GWAR. A group composed of writing faculty, administrators and a student representative were asked to review the GWAR in light of discussions regarding potential hardships and inequities brought about by high stakes testing and administrative barriers related to the requirement. Among its recommendations, this group highlighted that:

- If GWAR is to be continued as a CSU requirement, then the CSU needs to consider ending high stakes testing as a means of meeting the GWAR, ending the GWAR for graduate degrees, and aligning the assessment of student learning with other WSCUC core competencies.

The teaching and assessment of writing within the CSU system has evolved considerably over the past four decades since the GWAR was established. Most notably, in 2013 the CSU's regional accrediting body, WSCUC, included writing as one of the core competencies for which campuses are required to ensure students have achieved proficiency as part of the institutional review process for

CSU Campuses

Bakersfield
Channel Islands
Chico
Dominguez Hills
East Bay

Fresno
Fullerton
Humboldt
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Maritime Academy

Monterey Bay
Northridge
Pomona
Sacramento
San Bernardino
San Diego

San Francisco
San José
San Luis Obispo
San Marcos
Sonoma
Stanislaus

Upcoming Revisions to GVAR

March 24, 2022

Page 2

accreditation. This has provided campuses with the necessary impetus and support to require that writing skills be developed and assessed on an ongoing basis for all students. (*Note:* the other WSCUC core competencies are oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy and critical thinking.)

At the same time, the relevance and necessity of the GVAR has come into question. Other than the GVAR, the CSU does not require an additional, systemwide demonstration of competence in any other WSCUC core competency; instead, assessment is managed at the campus level. Moreover, the differential approach to GVAR across the CSU's 23 campuses has raised concerns about its alignment with the CSU's ongoing efforts and significant progress in removing administrative barriers, eliminating high stakes testing and retaining and supporting students of all backgrounds toward timely degree completion.

Based on these considerations, as well as the advisory group's recommendations, the systemwide CSU policy requiring completion of at least one designated 3-unit upper-division writing course to satisfy GVAR has been updated to apply to baccalaureate students *only*, beginning with students with a catalog year of fall 2023 and beyond. Additionally, the use of a stand-alone examination may no longer be used to demonstrate competence in writing under the GVAR; however, writing exams are still allowed under the CSU policy on [Credit for Prior Learning](#). Each campus will continue to have the autonomy to develop an approach to writing instruction and assessment that aligns with their WSCUC-required commitment to continuous improvement throughout a student's educational program on their campus.

If you have questions regarding this policy update, please contact Dr. Alison Wrynn, associate vice chancellor, Academic Programs, Innovations and Faculty Development, at awrynn@calstate.edu.

SAA/aw

- c: Steve Relyea, Acting Chancellor
Robert Keith Collins, Chair, Academic Senate, California State University
Isaac Alferos, President, California State Student Association
Alison M. Wrynn, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs, Innovations and Faculty Development
Nathan Evans, Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief of Staff, Academic and Student Affairs
Provosts and Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
Vice Presidents for Student Affairs
AVPs for Academic Programs and Deans of Undergraduate Studies
Graduate Deans



MEMORANDUM

Date: March 28, 2022

To: Dr. Aaron Hegde
Chair, Academic Senate

From: Dr. Thomas D. Wallace
Vice President for Student Affairs

CC: Academic Integrity Working Group
Co- Chairs, Dr. Thomas D. Wallace, and Dr. Aaron Hegde
Members: Dr. John Stark, Dr. Kim Flachmann, Dr. Melissa Danforth, Dr. Rebecca Weller,
Dr. Maria Palaiologou, Dr. Jim Drnek, Ilaria Pesco, Emily Poole Callahan, Rubicelia Alvarez,
Melisa Medina Cruz, Stephanie Magaña, Ignacio Castillo

Re: Academic Integrity Policy

The Academic Integrity Working Group was formed in July 2021, in response to the request to improve communication and effectiveness once an academic integrity violation occurred. The group met regularly to identify initiatives that focus on educational opportunities, procedures for reporting such violations, and a revision to the existing policy. The current academic integrity policy, last updated in 2011, was used to guide the rewrite of the new policy and procedures. The draft enclosed establishes our campus commitment to academic integrity and provides guidance on what constitutes a violation, procedures for reporting, and recommendations for consequences. The working group members reviewed and unanimously approved this draft and recommends it move forward for adoption by the Academic Senate.

Philosophy on Academic Integrity:

The California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) [Guiding Principles](#) begin with the commitment to academic excellence and pursuit of integrity and truth. CSUB faculty, staff, and students are expected to honor these principles and in so doing protect the integrity of all academic work. A degree at CSUB is a product of our campus's commitment to ethical behavior, academic integrity, and academic excellence. When a violation of academic integrity occurs, it diminishes the value of that degree.

Policy:

Faculty, staff, and students at CSUB are expected to do all their academic work (coursework, assignments, exams, research, etc.) without getting or giving unauthorized assistance. Faculty have the responsibility of planning and supervising academic work so that honest effort is encouraged and positively reinforced.

Catalog Information:

The principles of truth and integrity are recognized as fundamental to our campus community. CSUB faculty, staff, and students are expected to honor these principles and in so doing protect the integrity of all academic work. A degree at CSUB is a product of our campus's commitment to ethical behavior, academic integrity, and academic excellence. When a violation of academic integrity occurs, it diminishes the value of that degree.

Students at CSUB are expected to do all work assigned to them without getting or giving unauthorized assistance. Faculty have the responsibility of planning and supervising academic work so that honest effort is encouraged and positively reinforced.

Types of Academic Integrity Violations:

CSUB is committed to maintaining a safe and healthy learning environment for all faculty, staff, and students. [The Student Conduct Code](#) is the standard for maintaining responsible student behavior while the [University Handbook](#) is the standard for ethical and professional responsibilities for faculty and staff.

Academic integrity violations include, but are not limited to, plagiarizing, cheating, providing unauthorized assistance, collaborating with other students without the approval of the instructor, using technology improperly, and falsifying university documents to gain an unfair academic advantage, improve a grade, or obtain course credit. Academic Integrity violations are listed in the Student Conduct Code and the University Handbook, and all offenses listed below, but not limited to the following, are taken seriously.

Plagiarism is claiming the published or unpublished work of someone else as your own. This includes handing in someone else's work; turning in copied or purchased compositions; using paragraphs, sentences, phrases, words, or ideas, including paraphrasing, written by another writer;

or using data and/or statistics compiled by someone else as your own without giving appropriate credit to the original writer. Plagiarism also includes using work submitted in another class without permission of the instructor.

Cheating includes, but is not limited to, using “cheat (crib) sheets” or notes during an exam without the approval of the instructor, copying from someone else or looking at another student’s answers during an exam, using books or outside sources without permission during an exam or assignment, receiving answers on an exam or assignment from someone else, or using an online source to obtain answers without approval.

Unauthorized Assistance is providing answers or information on an assignment or exam to a fellow student without approval of the instructor.

Unauthorized Collaboration is working with others on an assignment or exam without approval of the instructor and/or copying from someone else without their knowledge.

Both unauthorized assistance and collaboration interfere with the ability of the instructor to evaluate the individual student’s performance in their course.

Improper use of technology includes using computers, computer programs, cell phones, calculators, or other software or electronic aids to gain an unfair academic advantage without permission of the instructor.

Falsification of University Documents includes, but is not limited to, falsifying signatures, such as another student’s signature or a faculty/staff signature, on a university form (for example, an add/drop form).

Procedures for reporting violations of the Academic Integrity Policy:

When a faculty or staff member discovers a violation of the academic integrity policy, they should discuss the violation, including the evidence, with the student(s) involved and allow the student(s) to respond. Any academic penalty, including the student’s potential grade penalty for the offense falls within the purview of the faculty. (See “Recommended Consequences for Academic Dishonesty.”) For further guidance, consult with the appropriate Department Chair, Dean, or Dean of Students’ office.

After the academic penalty has occurred, the incident, with all supporting evidence, should be reported to the Dean of Students Office through the [Academic Integrity Violation Reporting Form](#) and to the applicable academic program(s) to be considered in its totality in order to determine whether the reported incident is part of a larger pattern of misconduct. Disciplinary sanctions for academic dishonesty are processed through the procedures outlined in the [CSU Executive Order 1098, Student Conduct Procedures](#). In addition to the academic penalty assigned by the faculty member, disciplinary sanctions may include educational/plagiarism exercises, probation, suspension, permanent expulsion from the university and from the CSU system, or the withholding of a degree.

Disciplinary probation will be noted on the student's formal academic record only for the duration of the probationary period. Disciplinary suspension of more than an academic year and expulsion will be part of the student's permanent academic record. Once a disciplinary sanction is determined, the outcome will be provided to the instructor who reported the incident and remain in the student's electronic disciplinary file in accordance with the [CSU Records/Information Retention and Disposition Schedule](#). Any repeated violation of the academic integrity policy will result in more serious academic sanctions.

Recommended Consequences for Academic Integrity Violations:

Suggested guidelines for academic penalties within the course can range from oral reprimand to failure of the course depending on the severity of the academic integrity violation. These recommendations are provided to allow for equitable sanctions across campus for all students and are intended to be for a first academic dishonesty offense. Grade penalties are at the sole discretion of the faculty member.

An oral reprimand is appropriate if the violation is a minor, first-time offense in a course and if there is any possibility the student misunderstood how their actions violate the academic integrity policy. This may also be an opportunity for the student to redo the assignment or complete an equivalent assignment with a better understanding of the expectations.

A failing or reduced grade on the assignment/exam/paper/project for the course is recommended for moderate offenses, which could include a first offense, that clearly violate the academic integrity policy but are not planned or premeditated.

A failing grade in the course should be reserved for those violations that are premeditated and planned for the intent of violating the academic integrity policy and gain an unfair advantage in a course.

Levels of offenses:

- Minor first offense: not planned, small amount of plagiarism or cheating
- Moderate first offense: a moderate amount of plagiarism or cheating
- Major first offense: premeditated or planned plagiarism or cheating

For further guidance, faculty should consult with the appropriate Department Chair, Dean, or Dean of Students' office.

*Recommended consequences are borrowed from the Policy on Academic Dishonesty from CSUCI Dated 2-4-2014

Proposed Syllabus Language:

Academic Integrity: Certain forms of conduct violate the university's policy of academic integrity and the student conduct code. Academic dishonesty (cheating) is a broad category of actions that use fraud and deception to improve a grade or obtain course credit. Academic dishonesty is not limited to exams alone but arises whenever students attempt to gain an unearned academic advantage. Plagiarism is claiming the published or unpublished work of someone else as your

own. This includes handing in someone else's work; turning in copied or purchased compositions; using paragraphs, sentences, phrases, words, or ideas, including paraphrasing, written by another writer; or using data and/or statistics compiled by someone else as your own without giving appropriate credit to the original writer. Plagiarism also includes using your work submitted in another class without permission of your current instructor.

When a faculty member discovers a violation of the university's policy of academic integrity, the faculty member will meet with the student(s) involved and is required to notify the Dean of Students' office and detail the alleged violation, including the name(s) of the student(s) suspected, the class in which the alleged violation occurred, the circumstances of the alleged violation, and the evidence (including witnesses) supporting the allegation. The faculty member will also formally notify the student(s) suspected of violating the university's policy of academic integrity, the department chair for the course involved in the incident, and the appropriate school dean. The Dean of Students or designee will investigate; confer with the faculty member, student(s), and any witnesses identified; and review all evidence submitted by the faculty member and student(s) to impose an administrative sanction, beyond the academic penalty already placed by the faculty member. Students who perform dishonestly in this course may earn zero credit on the assignment/exam or a failing grade in the course, depending on the level of the offense.

In this class, students are expected to uphold the standards of academic integrity. Cheating in any form will not be tolerated and will result in a formal report to the University Dean of Students. You are always expected to follow the student conduct code and uphold the CSUB Guiding Principles while in this class and on this campus.



Academic Integrity

The principles of truth and integrity are recognized as fundamental to a community of teachers and scholars. The University expects that both faculty and students will honor these principles and in so doing will protect the integrity of all academic work and student grades. Students are expected to do all work assigned to them without unauthorized assistance and without giving unauthorized assistance. Faculty have the responsibility of exercising care in the planning and supervision of academic work so that honest effort will be encouraged and positively reinforced.

There are certain forms of conduct that violate the university's policy of academic integrity. **ACADEMIC DISHONESTY (CHEATING)** is a broad category of actions that involve fraud and deception to improve a grade or obtain course credit. Academic dishonesty (cheating) is not limited to examination situations alone, but arises whenever students attempt to gain an unearned academic advantage. **PLAGIARISM** is a specific form of academic dishonesty (cheating) which consists of the misuse of published or unpublished works of another by claiming them as one's own. Plagiarism may consist of handing in someone else's work as one's own, copying or purchasing a pre-written composition and claiming it as one's own, using paragraphs, sentences, phrases, words or ideas written by another without giving appropriate citation, or using data and/or statistics compiled by another without giving appropriate citation. Another example of academic dishonesty (cheating) is the **SUBMISSION OF THE SAME, OR ESSENTIALLY THE SAME, PAPER** or other assignment for credit in two different courses without receiving prior approval from the instructors of the affected courses.

When a faculty member discovers a violation of the university's policy of academic integrity, the faculty member is required to notify the Dean of Students Office and the student(s) involved.

A course grade of 'F' may be assigned or another grade penalty may be applied at the discretion of the course instructor. Additional disciplinary sanctions are determined by the Assistant Dean of the Dean of Students Office. Disciplinary sanctions may include disciplinary probation, suspension, permanent expulsion from the university or from the California State University system, administrative hold on the release of records, and withholding a degree. Disciplinary probation shall be noted on the student's formal academic record only for the duration of the probationary period. Disciplinary suspension of more than one academic year and expulsion are a part of the student's permanent record.

The student may pursue a formal hearing or make a settlement agreement with the Dean of Students Office. The Dean of Students shall conduct an investigation, confer with the faculty member, students and any witnesses identified, and review all evidence. The student is entitled to a formal hearing scheduled by the Dean of Students, in which the evidence of the alleged violation shall be presented before an impartial Hearing Officer (appointed by the President) and the student shall be present to provide an explanation or defense. The Hearing Officer shall submit a written report to the President containing the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Alternatively, a settlement agreement may be made with the Dean of Students. The settlement agreement will specify the disciplinary sanctions, the length and terms of disciplinary probation or suspension, and the conditions the student is expected to meet in order to remain in good standing (e.g., training or regular meetings with the Dean of Students). All sanctions are reported to the instructor reporting the incident, the student's Chair, and the student's Dean.

Any repeated violation of academic integrity shall result in more serious academic sanctions. Normally, this will include suspension or expulsion from the university with a note on the student's permanent record.

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-3517-21/FA (Rev)
November 4-5, 2021

**FACULTY RIGHTS TO DUE PROCESS IN DISCIPLINARY ACTION
PROCEDURES WITHIN THE CSU**

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU recommend that CSU Campus Senates address faculty rights to due process in disciplinary action procedures, including but not limited to developing policies regarding the following:

- requirements for notifying faculty when such actions are being considered but before such actions are initiated;
- providing faculty with any written documents, witness statements, or other evidence being considered before such actions are initiated;
- allowing faculty to submit any information or evidence to appropriate CSU administrator(s) before such actions are initiated;
- allowing faculty to meet with appropriate CSU administrator(s) accompanied by California Faculty Association (CFA) and/or faculty representative(s) before such actions are initiated; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Office of the Chancellor, California Faculty Association (CFA), California State Student Association (CSSA), CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, CSU campus Offices of Faculty Affairs, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU College Deans, and the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA).

***RATIONALE:** The United States Constitution guarantees a fundamental right to due process in the 5th and 14th Amendments. Due process includes fair procedures and the right to meaningfully defend oneself and be meaningfully represented against allegations of wrongdoing. Article 19 in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) does not specify rights of faculty to respond to allegations of wrongdoing before disciplinary actions are initiated, only after disciplinary action(s) are already pending, which allows CSU administrators to begin punishments for faculty without ever speaking to them or receiving any information from them. Article 19 specifically allows for creation of additional steps in the disciplinary action process, including opportunities for informal consultation between faculty and appropriate administrators (19.3). Further, CSU Executive Order (EO) 1096-revised indicates that in cases involving accusations of discrimination, harassment, retaliation, dating/ domestic violence, or stalking, investigation procedures must give equal opportunity to complainants and respondents to meet with administrators*

and to provide information and evidence, and give respondents the right to receive information about allegations of wrongdoing against them (Article III, Section C, Campus Investigation Process, Parts 3 {Intake Interview} and 7 {Investigation Procedure}). The Supreme Court decision in National Labor Relations Board v. J. Weingarten Inc. (1975) provides Weingarten Rights to CSU faculty members, including the right to be accompanied by a CFA or faculty representative(s) to any investigatory interviews with CSU administrators, and the right to receive copies of documents, allegations, and any other evidence that is being considered in investigating a possible disciplinary action.

Approved Unanimously – January 20-21, 2022



MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 24, 2022

TO: Dr. Aaron Hegde / Chair, Academic Senate

CC: Dr. Vernon Harper / Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs
Ms. Monica Malhotra / Interim AVP for Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment

FROM: Dr. Debra Jackson / AVP for Academic Affairs, Dean of Academic Programs

RE: Academic Program Assessment Quality Feedback

On behalf of the Strategic Plan Goal 3 workgroup, I request that the Academic Senate develop a formal structure to ensure that academic programs receive regular feedback on the quality of their student learning outcomes assessment efforts. This will assist our campus in achieving Sub-Strategy 3.7.2 of the CSUB Strategic Plan.

One possible structure to consider is the inclusion of the Faculty Assessment Coordinators on their respective School Curriculum Committees in an ex-officio capacity. The FACs could provide the Committees with regular updates about program assessment compliance and the Committees could provide substantive feedback on the quality program assessment efforts.

Background:

In August 2021, Beth Bywaters interpreted the language of Handbook 311.1 as the call for faculty on Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) Provost to be early in Fall '21 semester; the first academic year after the Provost's May 2020 hire. Upon mentioning the Fall '21 formation the AARC to Dee Dee Price, she shared her interpretation, having served as coordinator of many AARCs:

The AARC for Provost would be formed in the Spring of his second year after hire. That would be this semester.

Here is some clarifying language which conforms to the timing and practice of the Academic Administrator Review Committee.

311.1 General Guidelines

Each academic administrator shall be evaluated according to these procedures at three-year intervals. The **first** review **process** should be initiated early in fall semester after their initial hire. **The Academic Administrator Review Committee (AARC) is formed in the following Spring of the administrator's second year.** The President or the President's designee prepares the schedule of the evaluations.

The President may, if he or she believes it is appropriate, call for an evaluation of an individual before a scheduled evaluation.

The supervisor, after consulting with the administrator being evaluated, is responsible for developing the categories to be used for evaluating a director, dean, or academic vice president.

(Revised 12-01-16)

Please consider whether these suggestions go to the EC for discussion and referral.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD ACADEMIC SENATE

WINTER TERM COURSES AND UNITS POLICY
RES 192021

AAC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to the President that the following policies regarding Winter Intersession be enacted, due to the short period of instruction:

- 1) That students not be allowed to take more than two courses, for a total of four units, during Winter Intersession.
- 2) That the classes offered during Winter Intersession be restricted to courses which can be feasibly accomplished in two-and-a-half weeks, such as supplemental courses and special interest courses and activities.
- 3) That courses which cannot be pedagogically accommodated in a two-and-a-half-week session, such as general education courses that require depth and/or breadth, skills courses that develop or reinforce mathematics and/or writing, laboratory courses, and major courses which require extensive depth and/or breadth, not be offered during Winter Intersession.
- 4) That the General Education Director approves any general education courses offered in Winter Intersession, in addition to the normal approval of Extended Education courses by the department chair and school dean.

RATIONALE: Winter Term was originally intended for remedial/supplemental courses and special interest classes. Over time, students have been taking more than one 3- or 4-unit class during this two-and-a-half-week period. This kind of course overload, for such a reduced period, in which students must learn the material and fulfill the requirements of their courses, reduces the students' probability of passing said courses. By limiting students to four units, it is possible to return to the original intention of offering supplemental and/or special interest courses offered during this abbreviated Intersession. By limiting units, students have a higher probability of completing a course successfully.

In terms of special interest classes, students would have the opportunity to study topics that would not ordinarily be available to them, and have experiences that are designed for intellectual/experiential enrichment.

Distribution List:

President

Provost and VP Academic Affairs

AVP Faculty Affairs

Dean Extended Education and Global Outreach

School Deans

Dean Academic Programs

Department Chairs

General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate May 7, 2020

Sent to the President May 18, 2020

Approved by the President June 10, 2020



**California State University, Bakersfield
Division of Academic Affairs**

Policy Title: PROVOST Direct Reports Professional Development Funding

Policy Status: DRAFT

Affected Units

Provost's Council, Provost's Direct Reports

Policy Statement

Professional Development is a critical component of CSUB's success. By investing in people, CSUB internally grows its base of talent.

For professional development expenses above \$500, the Provost must provide written authorization to his/her direct reports before any professional development expense is incurred. A professional development expense would be a workshop or training series designed to enhance an individual's skill or competence. Importantly, regular travel for conference meetings etc. are not included within the scope of this policy.

Consultations

Provost's Council

Approved Date

TBD

Effective Date

TBD

Date Submitted to Policy Portal

TBD

Distinguished Professor

Here is what it refers to (via Anna Jacobsen)

As we look for ways to increase the visibility and support of our scholarship-active faculty, I think that it would be worth examining the creation of the title of "**Distinguished Professor**" on our campus. I am aware of this title being used for "internationally recognized faculty scholars" at CSU MB and LB and there are probably other campuses as well. At some institutions, it seems that these are "funded" positions through donors (often they are named distinguished professorships).

Not sure it is the right thing for our campus, but I think that it would be worth exploring.

This is not from a CSU, but I like the clarity of purpose and eligibility on this

webpage: <http://sphhp.buffalo.edu/home/information-for-faculty-staff/faculty-awards/ub-distinguished-professor.html>