



ACADEMIC SENATE: EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

Location: BDC 134 Conference Room and virtual

Zoom Link: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/81291128392?pwd=MzhRMW50UUJJNIRaMWttMUVESTRSQT09>

Members: A. Hegde (Chair), M. Danforth (Vice-Chair), V. Harper, J. Millar, D. Solano, E. Correa, D. Wu, M. Rush and K. Van-Grinsven (Senate Analyst)

Guest: none

1. CALL TO ORDER
2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain: 10:05 AM)
4. APPROVAL OF EC MINUTES (Tabled)
 - a. September 12, 2023
 - b. September 26, 2023
5. CONTINUED ITEMS
 - a. AS Log and Committee Rosters (**handout – EXCEL document**)
 - i. AAC
 - ii. AS&SS
 - iii. BPC
 - iv. FAC
 1. Addendum to 2023-2024 #02 Digitizing the Performance Review Process sent RE: Faculty Performance Software Review Committee Report (**handout**)
 - b. Provost Update (V. Harper)
 - i. CO Update
 - ii. Reference Letters Policy- Link: Employment Policy Governing the Provision of Employee References <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/12142918/latest/>
 - iii. Policies: Reimbursement Rate, and Professional Development Funding (HOLD- check with Provost)

- c. Summer SOCI Issues: Memorandum to be drafted and distributed (see minutes from 9/26/2023)

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

- a. Request from the Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee – FAC (**handout**)
- b. GE Breadth and taskforce composition (**handout**)
- c. Elections and Appointments – M. Danforth
 - i. ASCSU Senator – urgent call once Simply Voting has been tested.
 - ii.** Additional Administrative Review Committee needed for D. Jackson (**handout**)
 - iii. U-wide RTP criteria taskforce (equity) (HOLD)
- d. Order of Business – Bylaws change (Section III. A.)
- e. Evaluation of Academic Administrators – Handbook 311.1 (**handout**)
- f. Carry-over from 2021-2022 Annual Report (Possible New Referrals)
 - i. Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR) Constitution; academic integrity for faculty –FAC
 - ii. RES 212234 CSUB Faculty Retention and Tenure Density Priority – (HOLD- pending action from President)
- g. Resolution on CCC baccalaureate degrees [AB 927] – EC
- h. Cultural Taxation Award Criteria and Review Committee Structure – BPC and FAC (HOLD- check with Provost on if award still exists)
- i. Strategic Plan Group data gathering instrument(s) - BPC
- j. Investment Divestiture – BPC
- k. Proposals Direct to ASCSU (E. Correa’s request)

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2023

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 A.M.

LOCATION: DEZEMBER LEADERSHIP AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER, ROOM 409-411

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of Minutes (tabled)
 - a. September 28, 2023
- C. Announcements and Information
 - a. President’s Report – L. Zelezny (**Time Certain: 10:10 AM**).
 - b. Respondus Software – J. Paschal and A. Slabey (**Time Certain: 10:20 AM**).
 - c. Elections and Appointments- M. Danforth
- D. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:05 AM**).
- E. Reports

- a. Provost's Report – V. Harper
- b. ASCSU Report - J. Millar
- c. Committee Reports: *(Minutes from AAC, AS&SS, BPC and FAC posted on the Academic Senate webpage; Senate Log attached)*
 - i. ASI Report- D. Alamillo
 - ii. Executive Committee- M. Danforth
 - iii. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) - D. Solano
 - iv. Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS) - E. Correa
 - v. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) - D. Wu
 - vi. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) - M. Rush
 - vii. Staff Report- J. Cornelison

F. Resolutions **(Time Certain: 10:45 AM)**

- a. Consent Agenda
- b. New Business
 - i. RES 232404 Posthumous Degree Policy – AAC **(handout)**
- c. Old Business
 - i. RES 232401 Statement on Campus Modality – EC (table)
 - ii. RES 232402 Statement on Reducing Educational Material Cost at CSUB – AS&SS (table)

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

H. Faculty Recognition **(Time Certain: 11:25 AM)**

I. Adjournment

8. ADJOURNMENT



Dr. Aaron Hegde
Chair CSUB Academic Senate
California State University, Bakersfield
(661)-654-3110
shegde@csub.edu

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Aaron Hegde, Academic Senate Chair
TO: Maureen Rush, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair
DATE: October 2, 2023
cc: Katherine Van Grinsven, Academic Senate Administrative Analyst
Subject: 2023-2024 REFERRAL #02 Digitizing the Performance Review Process -
ADDENDUM



Pursuant to referral 2023-2024 02 Digitizing the Performance Review Process, please consider the recommendation of the Faculty Performance Software Review Committee to conduct a one-year pilot of Interfolio for faculty performance review (RTP, PTR, and PEF¹).

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

Attachments:

- (1) FPSR Committee Report with appendices
- (2) Inferfolio one year quote
- (3) RES 2324XX Pilot of Interfolio- Faculty Performance Software Review Committee
- (4) Watermark Faculty Success RTP Quote
- (5) Hyland Professional Services Proposal-CSUB
- (6) Recommended Qualtrics Questions
- (7) Email_Faculty Performance Software Review Committee Report 10.02.2023

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

Handout: Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee- Handbook Change - FAC

To: Aaron Hegde, Academic Senate Chair

From: Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee

Date: September 16, 2023

The Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee, on behalf of the Graduate Studies Committee, requests that the Academic Senate consider the following University Handbook change. The committee has provided a proposed draft of this handbook change and rationale.

Graduate faculty criteria are required by CSUB for graduate programs, and they delineate the faculty that are eligible to serve as primary/lead mentors and advisors to graduate students. The development and application of criteria differs on a program-by-program basis, which may create confusion and harm, especially in the case when a program denies a faculty member appointment as Graduate Faculty. If a faculty member feels as though they have been wrongly denied standing as Graduate Faculty by members of their program/unit, there should be a university-wide policy that provides an opportunity for them to appeal a potentially unfair decision. This topic emerged as a key area of concern following a retreat and planning meeting of the Graduate Studies Committee during Summer 2023.

The change that we are requesting is for a description of graduate faculty criteria to be added to the handbook that is consistent with existing university policy, with new language that creates an appeals process for faculty if they disagree with a unit decision on their review. This appeal process will occur outside of program. Preliminarily, we suggest that this be contained within section 308 of the University Handbook (i.e., "Review procedures for special awards and appointments"), since appointment to graduate faculty status is a special title of which only faculty within some programs will be eligible.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. Our committee welcomes any additional meetings, information requests, or consultations that may relate to this request.

Respectfully,
Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee

Anna Jacobsen, Chair
Veronica Bethea-Amey
Heidi He
Luis Hernandez
Carmen Padilla
Anthony Pallitto
Adrienne Silva
Dan Zhou

CC:
Denver Fowler, Associate Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies and Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee
Martha Manriquez, Graduate Student Center Coordinator

DRAFT

RES Graduate Faculty

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend revisions to the University Handbook language regarding the Graduate Studies Committee (additions in **bold underline**) as specified below:

308.7 Graduate Faculty

308.7.1 Graduate Faculty criteria and evaluation

Programs offering graduate degrees shall develop qualification criteria and a policy for periodic evaluation for appointment of Graduate Faculty. Only designated Graduate Faculty may serve as the primary supervisor/advisor of a graduate student's culminating experience, and these faculty are responsible for maintaining the quality and standards of teaching and mentoring within the graduate program. Criteria for appointment and renewal of appointment as Graduate Faculty is primarily dependent upon demonstrated current expertise and active practice in the discipline of the relevant graduate program. A term of Graduate Faculty appointment shall not exceed five years.

Graduate faculty qualification criteria and policy for periodic evaluation for appointment shall follow the areas included below. Without altering the scope of the areas listed below, programs/units shall interpret and elaborate these areas in order to assess the eligibility of a faculty member for appointment as Graduate Faculty within their unit/program.

Qualification criteria and the evaluation process shall meet the following:

- a. Graduate faculty are selected from among the tenured and tenure-track faculty from the program/unit in which the graduate degree is to be conferred. At the discretion of programs/units, emeritus faculty from the program/unit in which the degree is to be conferred may also be considered for appointment as Graduate Faculty.**
- b. Faculty must be evaluated based on activities and productivity from only the most recent 5-year period.**
- c. Graduate programs shall develop an evaluation process for the submission and review of Graduate Faculty appointment requests. Faculty may request review or re-review at any time, which may occur in less than a five-year cycle for faculty not currently part of the Graduate Faculty.**
- d. Criteria shall set minimum expectations for qualification to a faculty appointment to Graduate Faculty, including the following:**
 - i. Maintaining/holding a discipline-specific Ph.D. or other appropriate terminal degree related to the graduate degree program in which the Graduate Faculty will serve.**
 - ii. Relevant professional experience and activity within the last 5 years, including with professional societies and organizations, maintenance of professional practice and connections, and evidence of the ability to model appropriate professional and academic behaviors.**
 - iii. Experience participating in graduate programs, including supervision of culminating experiences. This experience does not necessitate experience as**

- primary advisor, and may include experience as a successful and effective graduate committee member or mentor.
- iv. Relevant, and on-going research, scholarship, and creative activities, including the demonstration of significant recent professional peer-reviewed products and/or publications. Criteria related to this area shall be the most rigorous and extensive area of review.
- v. Demonstrated involvement of students in research, scholarship, and creative activities.
- vi. Programs may add additional areas of evaluation as may be required by disciplinary standards, accreditation requirements, or degree certification requirements.
- e. In the event that a graduate program/unit does not have current approved Graduate Faculty evaluation criteria, evaluation shall be based upon the most current criteria required for promotion within the unit under their criteria for RTP evaluation. This evaluation shall be based on only the most recent 5-years of activity. Rank is not an acceptable basis for Graduate Faculty appointment evaluation.
- f. Graduate Program Directors shall maintain documentation of faculty evaluations, including the duration of current appointments for all Graduate Faculty. Graduate Program Directors are responsible for ensuring that Graduate Faculty serve for no more than 5-years before being evaluated for re-appointment.
- g. At the beginning of each academic year, the relevant Graduate Program Director shall forward to the AD Graduate and Undergraduate Studies (AD-GUS) an up-to-date list of all faculty within the relevant graduate program currently appointed as Graduate Faculty.

308.7.2 Graduate Faculty criteria approval and revision

Unit/program Graduate Faculty criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five (5) years. Any unit/program faculty may propose changes in unit/program evaluation criteria at any time. After approval by a majority vote of all Graduate faculty of the relevant graduate program, changes in the Graduate Faculty criteria shall be forwarded to the AD Graduate and Undergraduate Studies (AD-GUS) and the AVP Academic Affairs (AVP AA) for review and approval. In the event that approval is not granted, the AD-GUS, AVP-AA and unit/program shall attempt to resolve any differences of opinion concerning the proposed criteria. In the event that the differences cannot be resolved, the AVP-AA shall request the Graduate Studies Committee to arbitrate and to determine a resolution.

308.7.3 Graduate Faculty appeal of decision

In the event that a faculty member is evaluated and declined appointment as Graduate Faculty they may request a re-evaluation by Graduate Faculty from outside their unit. They shall forward their request, including current unit/program Graduate Faculty criteria, a personal narrative outlining how they meet these criteria, and an up-to-date CV reflecting activity from the most recent 5-years to the AD Graduate and Undergraduate Studies (AD-GUS). An *ad hoc* committee consisting of a minimum of 5 Graduate Faculty selected from the members of the Graduate Studies Committee will be assembled by the AD-GUS to evaluate the faculty's qualifications and make an appointment decision. This

committee shall not include any members from the unit/program of the faculty requesting re-evaluation.

RATIONALE: Graduate faculty criteria are already required for graduate programs, but the development and evaluation of these has been applied on a program-by-program basis. This has led to confusion, and uneven implementation and application. To date, there has been no university-wide policy that provides faculty an option for re-evaluation or appeal when they disagree with the evaluation decision of their unit/program.

The proposed *University Handbook* change adds general language on Graduate Faculty criteria and evaluation for appointment that is consistent with existing university policy. Additionally, new language that creates an appeals process for faculty if they disagree with a unit decision on their evaluation. This appeal process will be independent and will occur outside of unit/program, offering faculty an important avenue to address or remedy potential conflicts within the unit/program.

CSU Bakersfield
Division of Graduate Studies

Reviewed and approved by the Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee on 12/1/2020.
Reviewed by the Graduate Studies Committee on 3/2/2021 and approved on 4/28/2021.

Graduate Program Checklist

A checklist outlining State of California, CSU, EO, and CSUB regulations and policies regarding graduate program culminating experiences and associated requirements for the format, evaluation, and storage/recording for graduate program documentation related to culminating experiences.

Program policy requirements related to Culminating Experience development, oversight, and evaluation:

- ___ Graduate faculty:
 - ___ Criteria are developed for designation of graduate faculty and a policy for periodic review is in place;
 - ___ Graduate faculty are selected from among the tenured and tenure-track faculty from the department/program/unit in which the degree is to be conferred;
 - ___ At the discretion of departments/programs/units and based on their formal criteria and policy for periodic review, emeritus faculty from the department/program/unit in which the degree is to be conferred may also be considered for Graduate faculty standing;
 - ___ Criteria must set minimum expectations for scholarly activity and productivity and may be more rigorous than standard departmental criteria for tenured or tenure-track faculty;
 - ___ Graduate faculty may serve for a limited term (max 5-year) prior to re-evaluation; and
 - ___ Only Graduate faculty may serve as a student's Graduate Committee Chair.

- ___ Graduate Committees:
 - ___ Each student has a Graduate Committee for the development and evaluation of their Culminating Experience.
 - ___ Graduate Committees must be comprised of a **minimum of three members**;
 - ___ Graduate Committee membership must include a **majority of Graduate faculty** from the department/program/unit in which the degree is to be earned;
 - ___ Policy is developed on Graduate Committee member selection:
 - ___ In some programs requiring a culminating thesis or dissertation, students may select the members of their Graduate Committee in consultation with their advisor (provided that individuals meet committee membership requirements), and
 - ___ In some programs requiring a culminating project or examination, Graduate Committee membership may be decided by the program; and
 - ___ Graduate Committee membership must be approved by both the graduate program director and the department chair.

- ___ Culminating experiences must be classified as one of the following products (California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, Subchapter 2, Article 7, (b), (3)):
 - (1) thesis/dissertation,
 - (2) project, or
 - (3) comprehensive examination.

Culminating experiences checklists:

See individual checklists below for each type of culminating experience. Graduate programs should have policies and procedures in place that meet these requirements.

● Thesis/Dissertation

Proposal development and project oversight:

- ___ Graduate Committee Chair (advisor) is assigned to assist the student with their thesis/dissertation proposal and project.
- ___ A Graduate Committee (**with a minimum of 3 members and a majority of Graduate faculty**) is formally assigned to the student and project, overseeing the development, progress, and completion of the student culminating experience.
- ___ The Graduate Committee is responsible for:
 - ___ determining the feasibility and merit of the proposal/plan;
 - ___ reviewing the proposal/plan;
 - ___ familiarizing the student with university policies concerning the handling of dangerous materials, laboratory and fieldwork safety, and maintenance of standards of quality, ethics, and professional performance;
 - ___ reviewing and approving the methodology and any instrument or questionnaire used in data collection; and
 - ___ ensuring that the student project/proposal is reviewed and approved by the appropriate campus-level committee (e.g., IRB or IACUC).
- ___ Students are only permitted to proceed with their proposed project after approval from their Graduate Committee.
- ___ Policies are in place to **document formal approval of a student's plan or proposal** from the Graduate Committee, signifying that the student has permission to proceed with the study as outlined in the proposal or plan.
- ___ **A copy of the student's approved proposal/plan should be retained by the program.**

Format and content:

- ___ The thesis/dissertation represents a written product of a systematic study of a significant problem. It identifies the problem, states the major assumptions, explains the significance of the undertaking, sets forth the sources for and methods of gathering information, analyzes the data, and offers a conclusion or recommendation(s).
- ___ The finished product evidences originality, critical and independent thinking, appropriate organization and format, and thorough documentation.
- ___ **The format of all theses/dissertations must meet the technical requirements established by the university as well as any specific program requirements.**

Evaluation and documentation:

- ___ An oral defense and/or public presentation of the thesis/dissertation is required;
- ___ The Graduate Committee shall determine the final approval of the thesis or dissertation;
- ___ The Graduate Committee shall evaluate the adequacy of the bibliography/literature cited to ensure that theses/dissertations adequately represent the state of knowledge on a topic, represent student expertise in their chosen area of specialty, and fairly present the research of others;

- ___ The Graduate Committee evaluates the culminating experience to determine if it meets university standards;
- ___ Successful completion of the culminating experience and the conferral of a program degree are dependent on **majority approval** from the Graduate Committee and may only be conferred with their **documented approval**;
- ___ **Certification for the completion** of the culminating experience must be provided prior to graduation and the awarding of the graduate degree through:
 - (1) designation of culminating experience course credit, or
 - (2) an alternative acceptable form of reporting to the Evaluations Office and the Office of Academic Programs;
- ___ In consultation with the other members of the Graduate Committee, the chair shall determine the final grade and/or assigning of complete credit for the culminating experience. The Graduate Committee Chair is responsible for accurately reporting the grade/completion status agreed upon by the Graduate Committee; and
- ___ **All final and approved theses/dissertations must be formally filed electronically with the CSUB Library.**

● **Project**

Project development and oversight:

- ___ Graduate Committee Chair (advisor) is assigned to assist student with their culminating project/activity plan;
- ___ A Graduate Committee (**with a minimum of 3 members and a majority of Graduate faculty**) is formally assigned to the student and project, overseeing the development, progress, and completion of the student culminating experience;
- ___ The Graduate Committee, when appropriate and related to the project, is responsible for:
 - ___ determining the feasibility and merit of the proposal/plan,
 - ___ reviewing the proposal/plan,
 - ___ familiarizing the student with university policies concerning the handling of dangerous materials, laboratory and fieldwork safety, and maintenance of standards of quality, ethics, and professional performance,
 - ___ reviewing and approving the methodology and any instrument or questionnaire used in data collection, and
 - ___ ensuring that the student project/proposal is reviewed and approved by the appropriate campus-level committee (e.g., IRB or IACUC).
- ___ Students are only permitted to proceed with their proposed project after a favorable determination has been made by their Graduate Committee;
- ___ Policies are in place to **document formal approval** of a student's plan or project proposal from the Graduate Committee, signifying that the student has permission to proceed with the project as outlined in the proposal or plan; and
- ___ **A copy of the student's approved proposal/plan should be retained by the program.**

Format and content:

- ___ The project demonstrates originality and independent thinking, appropriate form and organization, and an academic rationale; and
- ___ **The finished project must be described and summarized in a written abstract that includes the project's significance, objectives, methodology, and conclusion or recommendation(s).**

Evaluation and documentation:

- ___ An oral defense and/or public presentation of the project is required;
- ___ The Graduate Committee shall determine the final approval of the project;
- ___ The Graduate Committee evaluates the culminating experience to determine if it meets university standards;
- ___ Successful completion of the culminating experience and the conferral of a program degree are dependent on **majority approval** from the Graduate Committee and may only be conferred with their **documented approval**;
- ___ Certification for the completion of the culminating experience must be provided prior to graduation and the awarding of the graduate degree through:
 - (1) designation of culminating experience course credit, or
 - (2) an alternative acceptable form of reporting to the Evaluations Office and the Office of Academic Programs;
- ___ In consultation with the other members of the Graduate Committee, the chair shall determine the final grade and/or assigning of complete credit for the culminating experience. The Graduate Committee Chair is responsible for accurately reporting the grade/completion status agreed upon by the Graduate Committee; and
- ___ **Projects/project abstracts shall be submitted to the CSUB library or retained by the program.**

● **Comprehensive Examination**

Examination preparation:

- ___ Graduate Committee Chair (advisor) is assigned to assist student with their culminating experience planning;
- ___ A Graduate Committee (**with a minimum of 3 members and a majority of Graduate faculty**) is formally assigned to the student and oversees the completion of the student culminating experience;
- ___ The Graduate Committee is responsible for:
 - ___ developing and administering the comprehensive examination, and
 - ___ assisting students in preparation for comprehensive examinations.

Format and content:

- ___ The comprehensive examination is an assessment of the student's ability to integrate the knowledge of the area, show critical and independent thinking, and demonstrate mastery of the subject matter; and
- ___ The results of the examination evidence independent thinking, appropriate organization, critical analysis, and accuracy of documentation.

Evaluation and documentation:

- ___ The Graduate Committee shall determine the final approval of the comprehensive examination;
- ___ The Graduate Committee evaluates the culminating experience to determine if it meets university and professional standards;
- ___ Successful completion of the culminating experience and the conferral of a program degree are dependent on **majority approval** from the Graduate Committee and may only be conferred with their **documented approval**;
- ___ Certification for the completion of the culminating experience must be provided prior to graduation and the awarding of the graduate degree through:
 - (1) designation of culminating experience course credit, or

(2) an alternative acceptable form of reporting to the Evaluations Office and the Office of Academic Programs;

_____ In consultation with the other members of the Graduate Committee, the chair shall determine the final grade and/or assigning of complete credit for the culminating experience. The Graduate Committee Chair is responsible for accurately reporting the grade/completion status agreed upon by the Graduate Committee; and

_____ **A record of the examination questions and responses shall be retained by the respective graduate program.**

Handout: GE Breadth and Task force Composition

From: [Beth Bywaters](#)
To: [Katherine Van Grinsven](#)
Subject: FW: Request to prepare for GE changes
Date: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 10:39:32 AM

From: Debra Jackson <djackson9@csub.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 9:39 AM
To: Aaron Hegde <shegde@csub.edu>
Cc: Vernon Harper <vharper@csub.edu>; Beth Bywaters <ebywaters@csub.edu>
Subject: Request to prepare for GE changes

Dear Aaron,

I would like to request that the Academic Senate form a work group to plan for expected changes to our GE Breadth.

State Assembly Bill 928 (AB 928) calls for the establishment of a “singular lower-division general education pathway” that meets the academic requirements necessary for transfer admission from the California Community Colleges (CCC) to both UC and the California State University (CSU). AB 928 also limits the number of units in the pathway to a 34-unit ceiling. This new lower-division general education pathway goes into effect fall 2025.

While we do not yet have details about how the CSU will adjust our GE Breadth requirements in response to Cal-GETC, I do expect that there will be changes. If not, the lower division requirements for native CSU students will be different from those for transfer students, which creates a troubling inconsistency. Currently, CSU’s Breadth is 39 units, whereas Cal-GETC is 34 units. Cal-GETC has 3 units fewer in lower-division Area C, does not have the 3-unit Area E, and has one unit for B3.

Given that Cal-GETC goes into effect in fall 2025, I believe it behooves us to develop a plan to adopt these changes to the GE curriculum in the likely event that they are adopted across the CSU. Any changes to our GE curriculum would require full senate approval. To prepare for a fall 2025 implementation, we would need to have this in place by early fall 2024 for catalog deadlines.

Thank you for your consideration,
Debra

DEBRA L. JACKSON, Ph.D.
She/her/hers
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dean of Academic Programs
(661) 654-3420

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

Handout: Evaluation of Academic Administrators- Handbook 311.1

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.



Posthumous Degree Policy
RES 232404

AAC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate adopt the “Posthumous Degrees” policy.

RATIONALE: Currently there is no policy for the granting of posthumous degrees, resulting in varying standards across schools, departments, and programs. The “Posthumous Degrees” policy provides clear and consistent standards for granting such honors.

Attachments:

“Posthumous Degrees” policy

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



California State University, Bakersfield
Division of Academic Affairs

Policy Title: Posthumous Degrees

Policy Number: TBD

Policy Status: [Draft]

Affected Units

Cabinet

Deans

Academic Departments and Programs

Policy Statement Text

Students who, at the time of their death, had completed a "substantial portion" of the requirements for graduation may be awarded a posthumous degree by the President upon recommendation of the faculty.

Procedures for Considering and Granting the Posthumous Degree

Baccalaureate Degrees:

The President may, upon recommendation of the faculty, confer a posthumous bachelor's degree to a student who, at the time of death, had completed a "substantial portion" of the requirements for graduation. The request for consideration must come from the dean or associate dean of the student's major school upon the recommendation of the faculty of the student's major program. A "substantial portion" means that at the time of death, the student:

1. was actively matriculated or eligible to be matriculated at the California State University, Bakersfield;
2. was within 30 units of completing their degree;
3. had satisfactorily completed at least 20 semester units of coursework at the University;

4. had a grade-point average of 2.0 or higher for all units used in calculating the student's grade-point average, including those grades received at the University and grades accepted by California State University from other institutions.

Master's and Doctoral Degrees

The President may, upon recommendation of the faculty, confer a posthumous master's or doctoral degree to a student who, at the time of death, had completed a "substantial portion" of the requirements for graduation. The request for consideration must come from the dean or associate dean of the student's major school upon the recommendation of the faculty of the student's graduate program coordinator and department chair. A "substantial portion" means that at the time of death, the student:

1. was actively matriculated or eligible to be matriculated at the California State University, Bakersfield;
2. had completed at least 75% of the required units for the formal program;
3. had a grade-point average of 3.0 or higher in all courses attempted to satisfy requirements for the degree.

Normal processing of requests:

In the case of a student's death, the request for consideration of the posthumous degree can be made by the faculty of the student's program or the family of the student.

Requests are routed through the Office of Academic Programs to the Associate Dean, Department Chair, and, if applicable, Graduate Program Coordinator of the student's program.

Once approved by the School and Department faculty and administration, the Office of Academic Programs notifies the President's Office of the approval. If the President also approves the awarding of the degree, the Office of Academic Programs notifies Enrollment Management and requests the awarding of the degree.

Exceptional Circumstances

The President may, upon consideration of the recommendation of the school and departmental leadership, and the Provost, confer a posthumous degree regardless of completion of the above requirements.

Presentation of the Degree

At the President's discretion, the posthumous bachelor's, master's or doctoral degree will be awarded either at a private ceremony or at the appropriate commencement exercise.

Honors at Graduation

Students receiving a posthumous bachelor's degree under this policy will be awarded honors at graduation for which their academic performance qualifies.

Consultations

Cabinet

Academic Senate

Provost's Council

Policy Foundations and References

Title 5

Approved Date: TBD

Effective Date: TBD

Date Submitted to Policy Portal: TBD