



Academic Senate: Executive Committee

AGENDA

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2026

10:00 A.M. – 11:30 AM

Location: BPA Conference Room 134 and virtual.

Zoom Link: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/85981842316?pwd=M2QqHBl2e0S3BPLhSFGMavtTVfDYbA.1>

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

1. Call to Order
2. Announcements and Information
 - A. Prioritize New and Continued items
 - B. Spring 2026 Guests
 - i. EC Guests
 - a. President attending EC on March 24
 - ii. Senate Guests
 - a. J. Watkins – Center for Accessibility and Essential Needs
 - b. K. De Young – Facilities
 - iii. Annual Reports to Senate
 - a. FTLC, GECCo, GRaSP, UPRC, URC (?), etc.
 3. Approval of Agenda (Time Certain: 10:05 AM)
 4. Approval of Minutes (Tabled)
 - A. January 20, 2026 (handout)
 - B. January 27, 2026 (handout)
 - C. February 3, 2026 (handout)
 - D. February 10, 2026 – pending (deferred)
 5. Continued Items (Time Certain: 10:30 AM)
 - A. AS Referral Log (see BOX folder; handout)
 - i. AAC (T. Tsantsoulas)
 - ii. AS&SS (L. Kirstein)

- iii. BPC (A. Grombly)
- iv. FAC (Z. Zenko)

B. Provost Report (D. Thien) **(Time Certain: 10:15 AM)**

- i. Updates/ Status:
 - a. Academic Administrator Searches
 - b. Academic Administrator Reviews
- ii. Additional Items

C. Reports and Recommendations

- i. Criteria for Proposing New Schools Taskforce (handout)
- ii. Scholarship and Creative Activities Task Force (handout)

D. RES 252624 - Codifying Procedures for Statements of the Senate and Votes of No Confidence – EC (handout)

E. Calendar Committee – A. Grombly, BPC Chair (HOLD)

F. ASI Resolution: SB 104 ASI and Shared Governance (handout) (HOLD; waiting for ASI's revisions)

6. New Discussion Items **(Time Certain: 11:00 AM)**

A. Elections and Appointments- D. Solano (HOLD)

- i. Exceptional Service Award: Committee work in progress
- ii. Open Calls: College Senators – in progress
- iii. Develop formal procedures for appointments for the CSU Fong and Fetterly Award (handout)
- iv. ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Representative term (?)

B. Items from Advising Council

- i. OnBase vs. Runner Connect
- ii. CSU-wide Degree Audit and Planner Tool – AS&SS and (?)
 - a. uAchieve (software the Chancellor's Office has chosen)
- iii. Faculty advising holds

C. Development of a Senate Recording Retention Policy for recordings that are intended to develop Minutes

D. ASI Requests – AS&SS and AAC (?) (handout)

- i. Office Hours
- ii. Reporting Grades

E. Handbook and Bylaws Project – EC (handout)

F. Updates to Handbook Appendices B and C to address inconsistencies – EC (handout)

G. Updates to the Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) Membership and Description – AAC, AS&SS and FAC (?) (handout)

H. Proposed updates to 308.2.4 Emeriti Privileges and Public Announcement (handout)

I. Dean's List policy – AAC (?) (handout)

J. Concerns about CHRS Page Up

K. ***NEW*:**

- i. Lecturer Title Change (handout)
- ii. ATI-IM Working Group Item (handout)

iii. ATI 5-year plan

7. Agenda Items for Senate (deferred)

8. Adjournment



ACADEMIC SENATE

CSU BAKERSFIELD

Codifying Procedures for Statements of the Senate and Votes of No Confidence

RES 252624

EC

RESOLVED: The Academic Senate approves revisions to the Constitution of the Academic Senate to establish procedures for Statements of the Senate and Votes of No Confidence. Deletions are in ~~strikethrough~~, and additions are in **bold and underlined**.

APPENDIX C: CONSTITUTION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Constitution of the Academic Senate

Article 2 Functions and Responsibilities

Section 1 The Academic Senate shall have the following functions and responsibilities relating to university matters not subject to collective bargaining:

A. The Academic Senate shall carry out those responsibilities vested in the faculty by Trustee policy and State law for developing policies and making recommendations to the University President on the following matters:

- 1) criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, awarding of tenure, promotion and evaluation of academic employees including preservation of the principle of peer evaluation and provision for the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions;
- 2) curricular policies, such as admission and degree requirements, approval of new courses and programs, discontinuance of academic programs, and academic standards;
- 3) fiscal policies and budgetary priorities;
- 4) the awarding of grades;
- 5) faculty appointments to institutional task forces, advisory committees, and auxiliary organizations;
- 6) academic standards and academic policies governing athletics.

Academic Senate

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

B. The Academic Senate shall be the primary source of policy recommendations to the University President on decisions related to the following matters:

- 1) establishment of campus-wide committees on academic or professional matters;
- 2) the academic role of the library;
- 3) academic awards, prizes, and scholarships;
- 4) the academic conduct of students and means for handling infractions;
- 5) development of institutional missions and goals.

C. The Academic Senate shall be a source of policy recommendations to the University President on decisions related to the following:

- 1) the academic calendar and policies governing the scheduling of classes;
- 2) policies governing the appointment and review of academic administrators.

D. The Academic Senate shall organize itself, adopt procedures, and appoint Chairs and members of its standing committees in accordance with its Bylaws.

E. This outline of functions and responsibilities is intended to provide the essentials for a satisfactory system of shared governance but should not necessarily be viewed as a comprehensive enumeration of those functions and responsibilities.

Section 2 The Academic Senate shall act for the General Faculty to formulate and to recommend policies to the University President or to other appropriate agents. The Academic Senate shall also consider and respond to policy recommendations submitted by individual members, by the General Faculty, or by the University President. The Academic Senate may refer the matter to an appropriate committee for study and recommendation, or it may refer it to the General Faculty. If any matter is referred from any source to the General Faculty and the referred matter is not acted on by the General Faculty due to lack of a quorum, then such matters will be referred to the Academic Senate for final disposition.

Section 3 All members of the General Faculty have the right to attend Academic Senate meetings and may address the Senate with the consent of the Chair, but they shall not vote. Other persons may attend at the discretion of the Academic Senate.

The Academic Senate, upon a two-thirds vote of its members present, may declare a closed session.

Section 4 Any action taken by the Academic Senate is subject to review by General Faculty. Any member of the General Faculty may require such review by (a) filing a notice of Intent to Seek Review with the Academic Senate office no later than five (5) calendar days after a report of the Academic Senate action has been distributed to the faculty and (b) filing a Petition Requesting Review, containing signatures of at least 15 percent of the members of the General Faculty, with the Academic Senate office no later than ten (10) calendar days after a report of the Academic Senate action has been distributed to the faculty. Execution of the Intent and Petition documents as specified shall result in the conduct of a referendum in which the General Faculty by vote of a majority of those voting may return the action to the Academic Senate for its reconsideration. Reconsideration may also occur if so moved by any of the Senators who voted in favor of approving the resolution(s) subject to review.

Section 5 Actions in the form of recommendations to the University President are forwarded to the President when any one of the following has occurred:

- A. No notice of Intent to Seek Review is received at the Academic Senate office by the fifth calendar day following distribution to the faculty of a report of that action; or
- B. No valid Petition Requesting Review is received at the Academic Senate office by the tenth calendar day following distribution to the faculty of a report of that action; or
- C. A referendum fails to achieve a majority in favor of reconsideration of that action by the Academic Senate. In order to provide for a timely review, actions taken by the Academic Senate shall be reported promptly to the General Faculty.

Section 6 Statements of the Senate

The Academic Senate may adopt Statements of the Senate to express the position, perspective, or concerns of the faculty on matters within the Senate's jurisdiction. These position statements are intended to reflect the opinions of the General Faculty and not expected to be signed by the President and adopted into campus policy.

Statements of the Senate may be initiated by the Executive Committee and shall be placed on the Academic Senate agenda for deliberation and action. Adoption of the Statement of the Senate shall require an affirmative vote of a majority of the Academic Senate members present and voting.

Section 7 Votes of No Confidence

A Vote of No Confidence represents one of the most serious actions available to the faculty within the shared governance framework and shall be reserved for exceptional and grievous circumstances. Such votes are not intended to address routine disagreements, policy disputes, or differences in leadership style. A Vote of No Confidence shall be based upon credible, substantive, and documented concerns, including but not limited to: negligence, dereliction of duty, persistent failure to effectively carry out the responsibilities of the position, abuse or misuse of authority, malice, or actions that substantially compromise the academic mission, governance processes, or institutional wellbeing of the University.

Votes of No Confidence serve to formally communicate the collective judgment of the faculty regarding an administrator's ability to fulfill their role and to provide a mechanism for escalating serious institutional concerns to appropriate authorities.

A resolution for a Vote of No Confidence in a campus or system-level administrator may be brought forward for consideration by the Academic Senate in one of the following ways:

1. By majority vote of the Executive Committee, or
2. By the General Faculty, through submission of a written petition to the Executive Committee containing the signatures of at least 15% of the members of the General Faculty, subject to verification by the Academic Senate.

If one of the above conditions is met, a resolution for a Vote of No Confidence shall be placed before the Academic Senate as a formal agenda item, subject to consideration and debate. The Academic Senate shall be given a minimum notice of ten (10) days prior to any vote.

Adoption of a Vote of No Confidence shall require an affirmative vote of two-thirds (2/3) of the Academic Senate members present and voting. Votes of No Confidence shall be conducted by secret ballot, using a method that ensures accuracy, confidentiality, and integrity of the vote.

If a Vote of No Confidence is adopted by the Academic Senate, the matter shall be submitted to the General Faculty for a vote. Adoption and ratification by the General Faculty shall require an affirmative vote of a majority of the General Faculty members voting, conducted by secret ballot.

Upon adoption and ratification, a Vote of No Confidence shall be transmitted by the Academic Senate Chair to the appropriate university administrator(s) and, when

applicable, to system-level leadership.

Rationale: These procedures are intended to clarify and formalize how Statements of the Senate and Votes of No Confidence may be brought forward, deliberated, and acted upon within the Academic Senate, consistent with principles of shared governance, transparency, due process, and meaningful faculty voice. In the absence of explicit procedures, practices for no confidence actions have varied widely across CSU sister campuses and across higher education more broadly. Some campuses rely on ad hoc resolutions, others on general faculty meetings, and others on union-led processes, sometimes with or without clear thresholds, notice requirements, opportunities for deliberation, or protections for faculty participation. This lack of standardization can lead to uncertainty, inconsistency, and perceptions of procedural unfairness, particularly when matters of significant institutional consequence are under consideration.

Votes of No Confidence represent an extraordinary and consequential expression of faculty concern and are intended to be reserved for only the most serious and grievous circumstances. They are not designed to address routine disagreements, policy disputes, or differences in leadership style, but rather to respond to credible and substantive concerns regarding negligence, dereliction of duty, abuse of authority, sustained failure to fulfill the responsibilities of the position, or conduct that materially undermines the academic mission or institutional integrity of the University.

Accordingly, these procedures establish a rigorous, multi-stage process that emphasizes deliberation, legitimacy, and collective judgment. Requiring that a Vote of No Confidence first be proposed to and debated by the Academic Senate and subsequently ratified by a majority of the General Faculty, ensures both representative and direct faculty participation. The requirement that such resolutions be initiated either by the Executive Committee or by a petition signed by at least fifteen percent (15%) of the General Faculty further ensures that no confidence actions reflect a meaningful level of collective concern rather than the actions of a small number of individuals. This threshold mirrors existing Handbook provisions governing other faculty-initiated actions, including petitions for review of Senate actions and proposals for constitutional amendments, thereby reinforcing internal consistency.

Together with heightened voting thresholds, advance notice requirements, opportunities for debate, and secret balloting, these procedures balance accessibility with gravity, protect the integrity of the process, and provide the Academic Senate and the General Faculty with a clear, fair, and defensible framework for addressing matters of profound institutional importance.

Distribution List:

President
President's Cabinet
Campus Faculty
Campus Staff
Campus Students

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Tiffany Tsantsoulas
Sent: Monday, February 9, 2026 11:01 AM
To: Senate Executive Committee Group
Subject: Comments on SOS and Votes of No Confidence

Hi EC,

Here are my comments on Zack's proposed language for the SOS and Votes of No Confidence policies:

I have no edits to the SOS policy (Section 6).

Section 7 - I like the preamble language (great job Zack!). I do think that we should outline more clearly the conditions that must be met prior to initiating the vote of no confidence process. Specifically, I think we could supplement this part of the policy with further conditions: "**A Vote of No Confidence shall be based upon credible, substantive, and documented concerns, including but not limited to: negligence, dereliction of duty, persistent failure to effectively carry out the responsibilities of the position, abuse or misuse of authority, malice, or actions that substantially compromise the academic mission, governance processes, or institutional wellbeing of the University.**"

Here are my questions and suggestions:

1. How will we establish that the concerns are credible, substantive, and documented? Could we be more specific especially about the latter condition?
2. Relatedly, perhaps we could establish a procedure whereby credible and substantive concerns are documented, supplied to EC, and then communicated via EC to the administrator. The administrator could then be given some time to respond and adequately address the concerning behaviors. If this is not done, only then could we consider that this constitutes "exceptional and grievous circumstances". Thoughts? I think it is important for us to avoid faculty using this process as a way to publicly complain or evaluate administrators.
3. I think we need to be more specific about what should constitute the petition for option #2 "By the General Faculty". Do we want to provide a template? Or at least a checklist of items that need to be covered? I favor the template option as it would help us control the communication and avoid issues like we saw where the document circulated looked like it originated with EC. We could also insist that they document their concerns and provide proof that these concerns were previously communicated to the administrator in question and EC without an adequate response.

Again, I'm sorry that I can't be at the EC discussion tomorrow morning. I appreciate you all!

Sincerely,
Tiffany

--

DR. TIFFANY TSANTSOULAS

She/Her/Hers

Director of Interdisciplinary Studies

Assistant Professor of Philosophy

Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies

661-654-2408

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy

Bakersfield, CA 93311



SB 104
ASI and Shared Governance

WHEREAS: The Associated Students, Incorporated (ASI) of California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) is the official representative body, and the voice of CSUB's approximately 11,000 students and is entrusted to represent the best interests of their constituencies; AND

WHEREAS: The Chancellor's Office passed Coded Memorandum AA-2009-02, the university is responsible for student participants; AND

WHEREAS: The coded memorandum requires "that associated student body organizations are involved in campus policy development as full participants"¹; AND

WHEREAS: The coded memorandum also encourages that the "[university] presidents will provide these officially recognized associated student body organizations an opportunity to offer opinions and make recommendations about campus policy and procedures that have or will have an effect upon students"¹; AND

WHEREAS: The coded memorandum states that there must be "accommodations [made] of the participating students' academic schedules when setting campus committee meetings"¹; AND

WHEREAS: The CSU Board of Trustees passed the Student Participation in Policy Development resolution² that reaffirms the coded memorandum AA-2009-02; AND

WHEREAS: The CSU Board of Trustees resolution states that the university "presidents will provide these officially recognized associated student body organizations an opportunity to offer opinions and make recommendations about campus policy and procedures that have or will have an effect upon students"³; AND

WHEREAS: The California State Student Association (CSSA) Shared Governance Resolution defines shared governance as "the expectation of consistent collaboration among students, faculty, staff, and administration in making decisions that impact the campus and its community"⁴; AND

WHEREAS: The CSSA also notes that "students are key stakeholders on any university campus and as such are subject to direct and indirect impacts made by university policies, procedures, and decisions"⁴; AND

(cont.)

¹ <https://calstate.policystat.com/policy/9823399/latest/>

² <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/resolutions/bot-resolutions-jul2001.pdf>

³ <https://www.calstate.edu/bot/agendas/jul01/edpol.pdf>

⁴ <https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/board-of-trustees/resolutions/bot-resolutions-jul2001.pdf>

WHEREAS: The CSUB Core Values emphasize “promoting active and informed engagement in shared governance of students, faculty, and staff”⁵; AND

WHEREAS: The CSUB Budget Book defines shared governance as “the collaborative process used to inform and affect decisions related to the university strategic planning and budget advisory committee process and recommendations to the president on the prioritization of available budget resources”⁶; AND

WHEREAS: The CSUB University Handbook states “the basic concepts of shared governance are crucial to the development of trust and communication among staff, faculty, administration, and students”⁷; AND

WHEREAS: ASI, and other student leaders, have perceived that their voices during meetings are not appreciated and they are there to “check the box” that a student was present;
THEREFORE, LET IT BE

RESOLVED: That ASI stresses the importance of shared governance and calls for active inclusion of students as equal partners in university policies, procedures, and decisions; AND LET IT BE FURTHER

RESOLVED: That all campus committees must include a section on shared governance in their governing documents and must clearly outline how students, faculty, and staff participate in the decision-making process; AND LET IT BE FURTHER

RESOLVED: That a student representative shall sit on every campus committee, and that such student representatives must be appointed by ASI to sit on the committee; AND LET IT BE FURTHER

RESOLVED: That if the appointed student cannot attend a committee meeting due to an academic schedule conflict, the committee chair shall defer to ASI before the committee meeting takes place so that an appropriate student can be found to ensure that the student voice is captured; AND LET IT BE FURTHER

RESOLVED: That all campus departments shall include verbiage on their official website highlighting CSUB’s Core Value of shared governance, emphasizing the role of students in policies, procedures, and decision-making; AND LET IT BE FURTHER

RESOLVED: That CSUB administration, faculty, and staff honor the principles of shared governance by accommodating students’ academic schedules when scheduling meetings and by ensuring full transparent communication regarding decisions that directly or indirectly affects students; AND LET IT BE FINALLY

(cont.)

⁵ <https://www.csub.edu/about/mission.shtml>

⁶ https://www.csub.edu/budget/_files/budgetbook/2018-19/2018-19-UBB-Chapter-9-Glossary.pdf

⁷ https://www.csub.edu/senate/_files/University_Handbook_2024.pdf

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be distributed to the following: University President – Dr. Vernon B. Harper Jr., Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs – Deborah Thien, Vice President for Student Affairs and Strategic Enrollment Management – Dr. Dwayne Cantrell, Vice President for Business and Administrative Services – Dr. Kristen Watson, Vice President for University Advancement – Heath Niemeyer, Vice President of People and Culture – Lori Blodorn, Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach and Special Assistant to the President for External Affair – James Rodriguez, Interim Director of Athletics – Dr. Sarah Tuohy, and Academic Senate Chair – Dr. Melissa Danforth.

Creation Date: 08.23.25

Approved by the ASI Board of Directors: 8.29.25

Approved by:

Marcos Ramirez

Marcos Ramirez (Sep 12, 2025 20:24:37 PDT)

Marcos Ramirez, Vice President of University Affairs

Anthonio Reyes

Anthonio Reyes (Sep 13, 2025 20:30:41 PDT)

Anthonio Reyes, ASI President

Acknowledgement:

In the spirit of shared governance, and to show that you have read through this resolution and will commit to its contents, please sign below.

Dr. Vernon B. Harper Jr., University President

Dr. Deborah Thien, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dr. Dwayne Cantrell, Vice President for Student Affairs and Strategic Enrollment Management

Dr. Kristen Watson, Vice President for Business and Administrative Services

Heath Niemeyer, Vice President for University Advancement

Lori Blodorn, Vice President of People and Culture

James Rodriguez, Dean of Extended Education and Global Outreach and Special Assistant to the President for External Affair

Dr. Sarah Tuohy, Interim Director of Athletics

Dr. Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair

Academic Senate Task Force

School Formation Criteria

During Fall 2024, the California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) Academic Senate Executive Committee requested that the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), Budget and Planning Committee (BPC), Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS), and Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) address the issue of school formation criteria. The standing committees elected representatives to an ad hoc task force to create new school formation policies and procedures, with representatives from the AAC, BPC, AS&SS, and FAC.

Since there are no existing policies on new school formation, the task force completed an extensive review of example policies from other California State University (CSU) campuses. The current document represents a consensus recommendation from the task force for a new policy document. We share this document with the standing committees and invite comments and suggestions, if any.

Composition of Criteria for Proposing New Schools Task Force:

Yangsuk Ko (Chair), Amber Stokes (FAC), Debbie Wilson (AS&SS), Heidi He (AAC), Rhonda Dugan (BPC), Deborah Cours (dean representative), and Laura Ann Bishop (staff).

CSU Bakersfield
Policies and Procedures for Establishing New Schools

I. Policy Purpose

- A. The process for creating new schools within the colleges should be uniform and transparent.
- B. A uniform system of school creation shall allow for fair and efficient mechanisms to be in place for interested parties to create schools.

II. Policy

A. Definitions and Operative Terms

- i. Principal academic sub-units are colleges at California State University, Bakersfield, whose chief primary academic/administrative officers are deans. Departments, schools, and programs are standard terms for units within colleges.
- ii. Departments and schools are each part of a college, reporting to a college dean. Schools may, but need not necessarily, include more than one department, division, or program, as well as centers and institutes.
- iii. Academic departments or schools serve as administrative units within the university's respective colleges and are organized around specific fields of academic inquiry and pedagogical outcomes.
- iv. Departments offer a major, minor, and/or credential, and may offer a certificate. Schools, and any subordinate departments located within the school, will offer majors, minors, and/or credentials, and may offer a certificate.
- v. Departments are led by department chairs, and schools by directors. In a school with multiple departments, department chairs will report to the school director. Both department chairs and school directors will be selected according to the University Handbook, and report to the dean of a college. The director of a school which has multiple departments from different colleges will report to the dean of the college in which the school is located.
- vi. Considerations that will normally apply in designation of one or more units as a school include professional accreditation, licensing, or certification requirements for graduates, size of the unit(s) and common practice in higher education of administratively referring to the discipline as a school.

B. Purpose of an Academic School

- i. The purpose of a school is to support the mission of the university by offering academic programs in the disciplines it houses, promoting academic inquiry and critical thinking within and across disciplines, and engaging in disciplinary and interdisciplinary research, scholarship, and creative activities.
- ii. To qualify as a school, the proposed entity must:
 - 1. Offer a set of academic programs, approved through the appropriate curricular review process (department, college, university, and CSU system levels), that lead to undergraduate or graduate degrees.
 - 2. Ensure to its faculty the rights and responsibilities of Academic Freedom, as defined by the American Association of University Professors, to engage in free inquiry and dissent in both scholarship and instruction. This includes the rights of the school and units within to initiate curricular proposals, to make autonomous decisions on instructional materials, pedagogy, delivery mode, and grading systems/practices. The faculty unit is free to offer its own views and interpretations that may dissent from the received views of either the discipline or in any other arena of society.

3. Be mainly comprised of Unit 3 faculty, who are subject to the rights and responsibilities of the CFA-CSU collective bargaining agreement, the CSUB University Handbook, and other relevant university policies.

III. Formation of New Schools, or Modifications to Existing Schools

- A. A new school may be formed as (1) an entirely new entity, (2) a result of dividing an existing school, (3) a result of combining two or more existing schools, or (4) a result of combining two or more departments from one college or from different colleges into a single school.
- B. Requests to change the structure of an already existing school should usually emerge from the concerns of the faculty, the school director and/or the dean directly involved. However, other individuals of the university may suggest that the faculty examine the effectiveness of the present school structure, especially as part of the Program Review process.
- C. If the change affects more than one college, then more than one dean will be involved, so any references to a dean in this policy statement implies more than one dean if the situation is so indicated.
- D. Collegiality is the fundamental principle upon which the governance of the university rests. At any point in this process, any of the parties involved may consult informally with anyone in the campus community whose contribution seems desirable.

IV. Procedures for Establishing a New School

- A. **Initiation of Proposal**
 - i. Faculty members, departments, schools, colleges or administrative officers of the university may initiate discussion and consultation processes to consider the establishment of a new academic school.
 - ii. When considering a change in school structure, the relevant faculty, the appropriate college dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (P&VPAA) should engage in considerable informal discussion. These people should solicit advice from other potentially interested parties, possibly including faculty in other departments, schools, or colleges as well as the Academic Senate.
 - iii. When informal discussions appear to have elicited all relevant issues and concerns, the faculty who wish to form the new school should write a proposal that addresses all areas set forth below in New School Proposal: Contents.
 - iv. The initial request should be submitted in writing to the appropriate dean(s). Due to the potential impact on departments/schools/colleges/programs, faculty, staff, and students, the proposal must follow the guidelines and review process set forth below in New School Proposal: Procedure for Review.
- B. **New School Proposal: Contents**
 - i. **Background and Introduction**
 1. The exact name of the proposed school and name(s) of individual(s) preparing the proposal;
 2. Description of the consultation process and informal discussions that occurred prior to the submission of the proposal (Initiation of Proposal);
 3. Description of possible consequences for not forming the new school;
 4. Statement of how the proposed school may advance the campus' vision, mission, and goals;
 5. Statement of how the proposed school will better serve the needs of institution, students, faculty and staff; and contribute to the recruitment and retention of a high quality and diverse faculty;

6. Statement of how the proposed school will provide added value or benefits to CSUB, enhance the relationships of the college(s) where the school is housed, including its faculty, students, and the greater community;

- ii. Faculty Composition

Include the following information:

- a. Regardless of whether the proposed school has one or multiple departments, include the name of each department, the name of the department chair, number of faculty in each department including the ranks (lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor), and current college or school affiliation. In the case of school restructuring, also include whether the listed departments will be moved to the new school or jointly appointed between their prior academic units and the new school.
 - b. If the new school is breaking away or drawing members from existing schools/ colleges, list all foreseeable effects that this change would have on other department(s), school(s), or college(s) in terms of name change, number of faculty, support staff, curriculum, operating budget, or space, etc.
 - c. Results of a vote from each college directly affected, including written comments from affected academic program chair(s)/director(s) and faculty. Anonymity, if requested, should be accommodated and respected throughout the process.

- iii. In the case of impacts on schools, colleges or programs with external accreditation, provide the rationale and justification for creating the school that aligns with accreditation requirements.

- C. Budgetary, Financial, and other Resource Considerations

In general, creating the school should be completed in a budget-neutral manner. Release time for the director and staff time for the school office should be covered by reallocation from existing resources within the colleges, departments, and programs involved. The director should be a faculty member on course release, not an administrator.

- D. Planned Implementation and Timeline

- i. The proposed date of implementation and the appropriate timeline for the process of implementation.
 - ii. Include important milestones and dates for the development of the school.

V. New School Proposal: Procedure for Review

The proposal must pass through the following levels of review in the order indicated. The individual(s) at each level review the proposal, consult with others as appropriate, and then either forward it to the next level with a positive recommendation or provide a written explanation of the reasons for withholding approval. If the proposal fails to receive approval at any level, the proposal shall not proceed to the next level of review. The proposers may choose to revise and resubmit to that specific level of review. Any revisions of a proposal shall be communicated with previous levels of review. All levels of review must be documented clearly for subsequent review levels:

- i. The initial proposal must be submitted to the appropriate dean(s) for consultation

and signature(s). The dean(s) shall provide written comments/recommendations to the originator(s) of the proposal.

- ii. The proposal, including responses and revisions based on feedback from the dean(s), shall then be submitted to the P&VPAA, who shall consult with the Council of Deans and provide written comments/recommendations reflecting their own review and feedback from the council.
- iii. The revised proposal, including responses and revisions based on feedback from the dean(s), P&VPAA, and Dean's Council, shall then be submitted to the Academic Senate, through the Executive Committee. If all prior levels of review are deemed to have been satisfied, the proposal shall be forwarded to the Standing Committees for review. Each Standing Committee will review the proposal and provide their comments/recommendations.
- iv. If the revised proposal receives approvals from all prior levels of review, the proposal will then be sent to the full Academic Senate for review and final approval.
- v. The approved proposal shall then be forwarded to the President for their final decision regarding the proposal.

Signature: 

Email: yko@csub.edu

Signature: 

Email: lbishop@csub.edu

Signature: 

Deborah_Cours (Dec 9, 2025 16:23:22 PST)

Email: dcours@csub.edu

Signature: 

Email: rdugan2@csub.edu

Signature: 

Email: hhe@csub.edu

Signature: 

Email: astokes2@csub.edu

Signature: 

Debbie_Wilson (Dec 9, 2025 15:15:27 PST)

Email: dwilson4@csub.edu

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

Approved by the Task Force on May 12th, 2025

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

Task Force Members

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

Dr. Maryann Parada, Associate Professor from Arts and Humanities

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

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

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

Ms. Kristine Holloway, Librarian

Dr. Tracey Salisbury, CFA President

Dr. Deborah Boschini, AVP for Faculty Affairs

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Executive Summary and Recommendations

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

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

Faculty Workload and Presidential Authority

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

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

Collective Bargaining Agreement, University Handbook, and RSCA

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

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

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

Major Findings of this Task Force

Faculty Workload

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

RSCA and Workload Misalignment

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

Service and Advising Loads

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

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

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

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Increased Teaching Demands

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

Faculty Well-Being and RSCA

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

Areas for Support

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

Key Disparities Identified

URM Faculty

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

College and Disciplinary Differences

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

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

Gender Differences

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

Advising Differences

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

Overall Conclusion

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

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

Recommendations

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

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Table R1. Recommendations

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

Note: RSCA – Research, scholarship, and creative activities

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations

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

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

- 2.1. We recommend departments and academic affairs leadership adopt flexible, budget-neutral strategies to rearrange teaching workloads in ways that prioritize and protect time for RSCA. Strategies may include:
 - 2.1.1. Strategic Scheduling: Allow faculty to work with Department Chairs to schedule classes and meetings in ways that protect uninterrupted time (e.g., reserving Fridays for RSCA work with no teaching or standing meetings).
 - 2.1.2. Asymmetrical Semester Loads: Permit faculty, with department approval and faculty agreement, to teach a heavier load in one semester (e.g., 18 WTUs in Fall, with 15 WTUs for direct instructional activity and 3 WTUs for indirect instructional activity) and a lighter load in another (e.g., 12 WTUs in Spring, with 9 WTUs for direct instructional activity and 3 WTUs for indirect instructional activity) to create focused RSCA time.
 - 2.1.3. Prioritize course scheduling for RSCA-active faculty: In consultation with the faculty and pedagogical best practices, provide more predictable, consolidated, or asynchronous teaching schedules to create blocks of uninterrupted time for research.
- 2.2. Faculty-Driven Flexibility: Ensure these options are implemented collaboratively and voluntarily, recognizing the diverse needs across disciplines and career stages.

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

- 3.1. Create a formal mentorship program to make RSCA expectations feel more manageable, especially for early-career faculty and faculty who intend to become more RSCA-active. Appropriate mentorship may also help address some of the problematic gaps identified in this report (e.g., URM-faculty perceiving the requirements for RSCA to be more unmanageable compared to non-URM faculty) by offering additional, and perhaps essential support.
 - 3.1.1. Pairing and Selection: Appoint experienced, highly research-active faculty as mentors, recommended by Deans, and pair them with early-career or less research-active faculty. Mentors should receive reassigned time (e.g., 3 WTUs) to support meaningful engagement and successful outcomes.
 - 3.1.2. Structure and Expectations: Mentors and mentees should meet regularly to discuss goal setting, time management, collaboration within and between units, funding strategies, publishing, and balancing RSCA with teaching and service. Mentorship should offer both practical advice and emotional support.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

6. Establish and ensure equitable and accountable service distributions.

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

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

7.1. We recommend that unit- and university-level criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion include both quantitative and qualitative impact measures for demonstrating scholarly achievement. Faculty should be able to meet expectations by:

- 7.1.1. Quantitative Threshold: e.g., a pre-determined number of peer-reviewed publications and professional conference presentations over six years, or
- 7.1.2. Qualitative Impact: e.g., one highly impactful work (such as a monograph, major creative work, or community-engaged research project), supported by evidence such as external reviews, citation metrics, policy influence, or student mentorship.

7.2. This dual-pathway model recognizes that meaningful RSCA takes many forms and allows faculty to pursue excellence in ways that align with their discipline, methodology, and professional identity. For example, a faculty member might publish a single book cited in national scholarship and used in graduate curricula or lead a community-based research project resulting in one publication and demonstrable societal impact.

7.3. Clear expectations and flexible evaluation criteria will promote equity across departments and disciplines while upholding rigorous standards for scholarly contributions. This is meant to allow faculty to achieve a minimum standard for assurance of achieving criteria for acceptable RSCA (for tenure and/or promotion), while also allowing flexibility for faculty to achieve tenure and/or promotion based on a smaller number of more impactful works.

7.4. Current University policy indicates that “Unit RTP criteria shall be formally reviewed at least once every five (5) years” (Section 305.4.2.4 of the University Handbook). We recommend that this policy is followed and that the Deans, in collaboration with the Office of the Provost, ensure that this policy is followed.

7.5. Departments and units without clear post-tenure review criteria should establish clear post-tenure review criteria to ensure continued growth, professional development, and continuous contributions and engagement with the University.

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

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

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.2. To strengthen faculty well-being, productivity, and retention, and to reinforce the university's scholarly mission, administrators and faculty leadership should:
 - 8.2.1. Regularly assess workload realities (teaching, service, and RSCA) through surveys and listening sessions.
 - 8.2.2. Implement systemic workload planning that reflects the diversity of faculty roles, disciplines, and labor demands.
 - 8.2.3. Invest in infrastructure and culture that fosters deep work, collaboration, and scholarly engagement across all ranks and appointment types.
- 9. Establish RSCA dashboards to track RSCA outputs, reassigned time use, and funding distributions (with both internal and external supports) across units.**
 - 9.1. To promote transparency, accountability, and data-informed decision-making, the university should develop RSCA dashboards that track research, scholarship, and creative activity (RSCA) outputs, reassigned time utilization, and internal and external funding distributions across departments and colleges.
 - 9.2. These dashboards would serve as important tools for faculty, department chairs, deans, and campus leadership to better understand patterns of scholarly engagement and support allocation. This information should be used to recognize and reward highly RSCA-active faculty, and support faculty who wish to become more engaged with RSCA.
 - 9.3. Specifically, the dashboards should include metrics such as the number of publications, presentations, performances, exhibitions, or equivalent scholarly outputs per unit; the amount and source of reassigned time granted for RSCA activities; and internal and external funding awarded to support faculty research and creative endeavors. Where appropriate, data should be disaggregated by college and department, while recognizing and accounting for disciplinary differences in publication norms, creative output timelines, and funding opportunities.
 - 9.4. By making these data visible and accessible, the university can foster a culture of transparency and continuous improvement, allowing units to celebrate successes, identify gaps in support, and advocate for necessary resources. Importantly, the dashboards should be used as a tool for self-assessment and equity, rather than as punitive or overly simplistic comparisons across disciplines.
 - 9.5. Care must be taken to contextualize RSCA metrics within the realities of different academic fields and to ensure that the dashboards inform constructive, rather than competitive, dialogue about faculty workload and scholarly productivity.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TASK FORCE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 4:27 PM
To: Bilin Zeng; Sean Wempe; Ji Li; Yvonne Ortiz-Bush; Gitika Commuri
Cc: Danielle Solano; Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: Request from HR to review staff award applications
Attachments: Trustee Wenda Fong & Mr. Daniel Fetterly Staff Award - Deadline to Submit Nominations TODAY[74].eml

Hi all,

Senate has received a request from HR to appoint two faculty members to join a larger committee that will be reviewing staff applications for the new CSU Fong and Fetterly Award. I've attached the copy of the call for nominations email for this award, if you want to learn more about it.

They asked too late for Senate to create a formal procedure for appointment this year (we'll work on one for next year). However, in discussions with Senate Executive Committee, we noted that this is similar to how the FHDC reviews honorary doctorate applications, and makes recommendations to the President, so we thought we'd reach out to you to see if there is any interest in serving.

HR is planning to review the applications next week so they can forward names to the Chancellor's Office.

We realize this is very short notice, but if you are interested in serving on the application review committee, please let me, Dani, and Katie know.

Thanks,
Melissa

--
Dr. Melissa Danforth (she/they)
Chair, CSUB Academic Senate
PI, CSUB's S-STEM Scholarship Program
Professor of Computer Science
Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering/Computer Science
California State University, Bakersfield
Website: <https://www.cs.csub.edu/~melissa/>

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 8:27 PM
To: Lori Blodorn
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven; Yvonne Ortiz-Bush; Gitika Commuri
Subject: RE: Fong and Fetterly Award committee

Hi Lori,

Senate Executive Committee reached out to the members of FHDC to see if anyone would be willing to help.

Yvonne Ortiz-Bush and Gitika Commuri have volunteered to help review the applications. I've CCed them on this message.

Thanks,
Melissa

From: Lori Blodorn <lblodorn@csub.edu>
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2026 4:04 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: RE: Fong and Fetterly Award committee

2 faculty would be great.

Lori A. Blodorn, J.D., SPHR, SHRM-SCP

(she | her)

Vice President, People and Culture

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 37 ADM

Bakersfield, CA 93311

Main: (661) 654-2266

Direct: (661) 654-3206

**Human Resources | Employee and Labor Relations | Organizational Excellence | Safety and Risk
Management | Civil Rights and Compliance | Culture and Belonging | Payroll**
[CSUB Careers](#)



LGBTQ Safe Zone Ally



**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
BAKERSFIELD**

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Monday, December 1, 2025 9:07 PM
To: Mike Kwon; Leslie Kirstein
Cc: ORG-ASIExecutiveVice-President; Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: RE: Agenda Items - Considerations for AS&SS

Hi Mike,

We can put these concerns on the Senate Exec agenda. However, we only have two meetings left, and we'll lose some time from tomorrow's meeting if the president's open forum runs long. I don't see us getting to this item until Spring term given our current backlog of business.

Melissa

From: Mike Kwon <mkwon@csub.edu>
Sent: Saturday, November 29, 2025 12:04 PM
To: Leslie Kirstein <lkirstein@csub.edu>; Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Cc: ORG-ASIExecutiveVice-President <asi-vicepresident@csub.edu>
Subject: Agenda Items - Considerations for AS&SS

Hi, Leslie and Dr. Danforth—

I hope you both had a wonderful holiday break.

At last Friday's ASI Board meeting, students recommended to the Provost that she ask the Deans on the following considerations:

- (1) Office Hours: Is there a way to make sure that faculty are hosting office hours. It is stated in the Academic Handbook that faculty are required to do so, but students have reported that some faculty are not available during their posted office hours. Does each department track when faculty are doing office hours or is it based on a trust system?
- (2) Reporting Grades: Students are concerned that their grades are not being reported in a timely manner during the semester. Students would like to see how they are doing in the class but some faculty are not inputting grades until the very end. Is there information or a requirement on this?

Thank you so much,

MIKE KWON, J.D., M.L.S., M.S.

Pronouns: He/Him/His

Executive Director | Associated Students, Inc.

Office: (661) 654-2741 | Email: mkwon@csub.edu

California State University, Bakersfield

Student Affairs & Strategic Enrollment Management

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 56 SU

Bakersfield, CA 93311

<https://www.csub.edu/asi>



Topic: Handbook and Bylaws Project – EC (See Box folder for handouts)

- A. Updating Schools to Colleges
- B. Updating all references to quarters
- C. Standing Committees Composition:
 - 1. Clarify Handbook language about staff positions being non-MPP staff
 - 2. AS&SS Composition: Associate Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies is not actually listed in the bylaws as an ex-officio member of AS&SS.
 - 3. Update language for administrator positions to allow for designee
 - 4. Review and update the Standing Committees ex-officio positions due to the re-organization of university
 - 5. AAC Composition: Clarify the catalog and PeopleSoft positions with the SASEM re-organization.
- D. Director of Assessment: Review position (Handbook 105.2 and 305.6.)
- E. Council of Academic Deans: Review Composition and name (Handbook 105.2)
- F. Public Affairs Committee: Committee in handbook but not bylaws (Handbook 107.1. Standing Committees of the Academic Senate). Discussion on if we want to create the committee or not.
- G. Review committees listed (Handbook 107)
- H. Update TEAC Description: Currently lists old college names (H&SS, SOE, and NSM) (Handbook 201.5)
- I. Update reference to Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs- association with Academic Advising and review other duties (Handbook 104.2.1)
- J. Update position titles in 309.9 (Handbook 309.9)
- K. Update all references to the AVP of Enrollment Management- distinguish the VP of Strategic Enrollment Management from the new AVP of Enrollment Management
- L. Bylaws Section IV.A.4 Annual reports from committees- limit to specific committees?
- M. Changes to bylaws that were approved by previous resolution but never posted (clarifying the edition of Robert's Rules of Order).
- N. Q2S Lingering Issues:
 - 1. Deadline issue for stating one's intent to seek promotion to full professor
 - 2. Discussions about whether we should change the Handbook to require classroom observations for tenured faculty.
- O. Section 103.1 Statewide Organization Structure still states 23 CSU campuses- remove number?
- P. Update the Committee on Academic Requirements and Standards (CARS) to the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) - referenced in various places in Handbook
- Q. Updated all references to "Services for Students with Disabilities" to the new name, "Center for Accessibility and Essential Needs." Review 303.1.5 Course Syllabi, Appendix K - Instructional Materials, etc.

APPENDIX B: CONSTITUTION OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

Article 1 Name and Purpose

Section 1 The name of this organization shall be the General Faculty of California State University, Bakersfield, herein referred to as the General Faculty.

Section 2 The purpose of the General Faculty organization is to provide that the collective knowledge, experience, and judgment possessed by members be utilized to develop University policies and procedures which ensure the full realization of the University's mission and to foster a spirit of unity and cooperation among its members.

Article 2 Membership and Voting

Section 1 The membership of the General Faculty shall be professors, associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers in full-time teaching positions, part-time faculty teaching a minimum of 15 WTUs in each of three preceding years, full-time librarians, and student services professionals-academic related (SSP- AR employees in Unit Three) who are not included in the Management Personnel Plan.

Section 2 Those named in Section 1 shall have the power to vote in meetings of the General Faculty, in faculty referenda, and in elections for representatives to the Statewide Academic Senate and to the University Academic Senate, but with the following exceptions: Only tenured and tenure-track faculty having full-time teaching responsibilities (including full-time librarians and all Department Chairs regardless of teaching load) may vote on policy matters relating to retention, promotion, and tenure or on the awarding of degrees.

Section 3 All members of the General Faculty on leave retain all powers to vote.

Commented [MD1]: Do SSP-AR employees get hired in Unit 3 anymore or are they in other units now?

Article 3 Powers and Structure

Section 1 The General Faculty shall have the power to formulate, adopt, review, and revise recommendations relating to the policies and operation of the University. The General Faculty may consider matters subject to the provisions of the Higher Education Employee Relations Act (Chapter 744, Government Code) and in conformance with the policies of the Board of

Trustees of the California State University, and in accordance with such other State laws as may be applicable.

Section 2 The General Faculty shall exercise its powers through the Academic Senate of the University elected by and representative of the General Faculty and subject to its review, except as noted in Section 3, below.

Section 3 The General Faculty shall consider such policy matters as are brought before it by the Academic Senate and may initiate discussion of policy matters of concern to the faculty.

The General Faculty shall, in accordance with Article II, Section 2, Subsection (2) of this Constitution, approve the list of degree candidates. In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the Academic Senate, the General Faculty may require that the Academic Senate reconsider its action(s).

Commented [MD2]: Subsection 2 does not exist in Article 2, Section 2. Highlighted in blue what might have been the subsection in the past.

Article 4 Officers of the General Faculty

Section 1 The officers of the General Faculty shall be a Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.

Commented [MD3]: We now have the Senate Analyst instead of a faculty member elected as Secretary

Section 2 The officers shall constitute the Executive Board of the General Faculty and shall perform its administrative functions.

Section 3 Only members of the General Faculty who have full-time teaching responsibilities (including all Department Chairs) may be officers of the General Faculty.

Section 4

- A. The General Faculty Chair and Vice Chair shall be elected by majority vote before the end of the academic year and shall hold office for the next academic year.
- B. The Secretary of the General Faculty shall be one and the same as the Academic Senate Secretary and elected according to the procedures established for the Academic Senate.

Commented [MD4]: Inconsistent with Appendix C which establishes the term of service as two years, instead of one year. Prior practice has been two-year terms.

Section 5 The Chair and Vice Chair of the General Faculty shall serve concurrently as the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Senate.

Article 5 Duties of the General Faculty Officers

Section 1 The Chair of the General Faculty shall (1) preside over all meetings of the General Faculty; (2) carry out the directions of the General Faculty; (3) be the

spokesperson for the General Faculty and its representative at formal functions of the University.

Section 2 The Vice Chair of the General Faculty shall exercise the powers and duties of the Chair in the absence of or at the request of the Chair.

Section 3 The Secretary of the General Faculty shall perform the usual duties of office, including keeping the minutes of the meetings of the General Faculty and distributing such minutes as soon as practicable following each meeting.

Section 4 No elected officer of the General Faculty shall be eligible to serve more than two consecutive full terms in the same position.

Section 5 The Chair of the General Faculty may appoint a parliamentarian to serve concurrently.

Article 6 Meetings

Section 1 All meetings of the General Faculty shall be open to all members.

Section 2 The General Faculty shall meet as often as necessary to transact its business.

Section 3 The General Faculty shall meet each year during the week prior to the beginning of classes in the fall semester and shall at that time invite a State-of-the-University report by the President of the University.

Section 4 The General Faculty Chair shall have the power to call a meeting of the General Faculty on personal initiative, when requested to do so by a majority vote of the Academic Senate, or upon petition by 15 percent of the General Faculty, provided that each member in residence be notified of the meeting and the business to be transacted.

Section 5 One third of the total membership of the General Faculty in residence on the first day of classes of the current term shall constitute a quorum.

Article 7 Amendments to this Constitution

Section 1 Proposal of Amendments

Commented [MD5]: Inconsistent with Appendix C which establishes a six year max. Prior practice has been 2 two-year terms (4 years max)

- A. The Academic Senate, whenever a majority of its membership present deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to the Constitution. Proposed amendments shall receive a first and second reading.
- B. Amendments to this Constitution may also be proposed by a petition of twenty (20) percent of the General Faculty.

Section 2 Approval of Amendments

Amendments to this Constitution shall be by affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Faculty voting. A copy of proposed amendments shall be sent to every faculty member at least two weeks before voting takes place.

Amendments are subject to approval by the campus President.

APPENDIX C: CONSTITUTION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Constitution of the Academic Senate

Preamble

The Academic Senate is a body by which the General Faculty exercises its powers as described in Article III, Section 2 of its Constitution. The Academic Senate shall perform all duties consistent with the formulation, adoption, review and revision of recommendations relating to the policies and operations of the University, within the limits prescribed by the constitutions of the General Faculty and the Academic Senate, the policies of the Board of Trustees, and the laws of the State of California.

Article 1 Membership

Section 1 The Academic Senate shall be composed of the following members:

- A. the General Faculty Chair and Vice Chair elected by the General Faculty;
- B. two representatives to the CSU (statewide) Academic Senate elected by the General Faculty;
- C. one lecturer representative to the CSU (statewide) Academic Senate Lecturer Senate Electorate elected by the lecturer faculty;
 - a. The Lecturer representative may be full-time or part-time with a time base entitlement of at least 0.6 (e.g., 18 WTUs for the academic year)
 - b. The lecturer representative may be elected to the CSU (statewide) Academic Senate
 - c. If the Lecturer representative is elected to the CSU (statewide) Academic Senate, then they will serve on the Executive Committee as a representative to the Academic Senate CSU (see Section 2)
- D. two representatives from each College,
- E. one representative from the CSU Bakersfield Antelope Valley campus, elected by the respective faculty members of the Antelope Valley Campus
- F. six at-large representatives elected from and by the General Faculty;
- G. the ASI President or designee;
- H. one representative of the Council of Academic Deans selected by the council;
- I. a staff member elected by Staff Forum;

Commented [MD6]: Could be more than two, should we ever become one of the larger campuses (unlikely, but possible)

Commented [MD7]: We are inconsistent with referencing ASCSU in this appendix. Some use this phrase, some use variations on the current name, like "Academic Senate CSU"

- J. the immediate previous Senate Chair, will serve for a period of one term, *ex officio*, and
- K. the Provost (and Vice-President for Academic Affairs) serves *ex officio* and nonvoting.

Section 2 The Executive Committee shall consist of:

- A. the current Chair;
- B. the Vice Chair;
- C. the Standing Committee Chairs;
- D. the representatives to the Academic Senate CSU
- E. the immediate previous Senate Chair, will serve for a period of one year, *ex officio*; and
- F. the Provost (and Vice President for Academic Affairs) serves *ex officio* and non-voting.

Article 2 Functions and Responsibilities

Section 1 The Academic Senate shall have the following functions and responsibilities relating to university matters not subject to collective bargaining:

- A. The Academic Senate shall carry out those responsibilities vested in the faculty by Trustee policy and State law for developing policies and making recommendations to the University President on the following matters:
 - 1) criteria and standards for the appointment, retention, awarding of tenure, promotion and evaluation of academic employees including preservation of the principle of peer evaluation and provision for the direct involvement of appropriate faculty in these decisions;
 - 2) curricular policies, such as admission and degree requirements, approval of new courses and programs, discontinuance of academic programs, and academic standards;
 - 3) fiscal policies and budgetary priorities;
 - 4) the awarding of grades;
 - 5) faculty appointments to institutional task forces, advisory committees, and auxiliary organizations;
 - 6) academic standards and academic policies governing athletics.
- B. The Academic Senate shall be the primary source of policy recommendations to the University President on decisions related to the following matters:

Commented [MD8]: Ambiguous language. Term as in academic term or term as in term of service? Prior practice has been one academic year and the next section also says one year on EC.

Commented [MD9]: Also non-voting? Ex-officio technically means "by the office", and there can be *ex officio*, voting positions (like the ASI President or designee)

- 1) establishment of campus-wide committees on academic or professional matters;
- 2) the academic role of the library;
- 3) academic awards, prizes, and scholarships;
- 4) the academic conduct of students and means for handling infractions;
- 5) development of institutional missions and goals.

C. The Academic Senate shall be a source of policy recommendations to the University President on decisions related to the following:

- 1) the academic calendar and policies governing the scheduling of classes;
- 2) policies governing the appointment and review of academic administrators.

D. The Academic Senate shall organize itself, adopt procedures, and appoint Chairs and members of its standing committees in accordance with its Bylaws.

E. This outline of functions and responsibilities is intended to provide the essentials for a satisfactory system of shared governance but should not necessarily be viewed as a comprehensive enumeration of those functions and responsibilities.

Section 2 The Academic Senate shall act for the General Faculty to formulate and to recommend policies to the University President or to other appropriate agents. The Academic Senate shall also consider and respond to policy recommendations submitted by individual members, by the General Faculty, or by the University President. The Academic Senate may refer the matter to an appropriate committee for study and recommendation, or it may refer it to the General Faculty. If any matter is referred from any source to the General Faculty and the referred matter is not acted on by the General Faculty due to lack of a quorum, then such matters will be referred to the Academic Senate for final disposition.

Section 3 All members of the General Faculty have the right to attend Academic Senate meetings and may address the Senate with the consent of the Chair, but they shall not vote. **Other persons may attend at the discretion of the Academic Senate.**

The Academic Senate, upon a two-thirds vote of its members present, may declare a closed session.

Section 4 Any action taken by the Academic Senate is subject to review by General Faculty. Any member of the General Faculty may require such review by (a) filing a notice of Intent to Seek Review with the Academic Senate office no later than five (5) calendar days after a report of the Academic Senate action has been distributed to the faculty and (b) filing a Petition Requesting Review, containing signatures of at least 15 percent of the members of the General Faculty, with the Academic Senate office no later than ten (10) calendar days after a report of the Academic Senate action has been distributed to the faculty. Execution of the Intent and Petition documents as specified shall result in the conduct of a referendum in which the General Faculty by vote of a majority of those voting may return the action to the Academic Senate for its reconsideration. Reconsideration may also occur if so moved by any of the Senators who voted in favor of approving the resolution(s) subject to review.

Section 5 Actions in the form of recommendations to the University President are forwarded to the President when any one of the following has occurred:

- A. No notice of Intent to Seek Review is received at the Academic Senate office by the fifth calendar day following distribution to the faculty of a report of that action; or
- B. No valid Petition Requesting Review is received at the Academic Senate office by the tenth calendar day following distribution to the faculty of a report of that action; or
- C. A referendum fails to achieve a majority in favor of reconsideration of that action by the Academic Senate. In order to provide for a timely review, actions taken by the Academic Senate shall be reported promptly to the General Faculty.

Article 3 Procedures

Section 1 The Academic Senate shall create committees necessary to the performance of its duties and shall establish rules and procedures for these committees.

Section 2 The Academic Senate, by vote of a majority of its total membership, shall adopt all bylaws necessary to the performance of its duties and amend them when necessary. **Changes in the bylaws shall not be proposed and voted upon at the same meeting.**

Section 3 The Academic Senate shall keep a record of its proceedings and shall distribute copies of minutes to the General Faculty and appropriate administrative officers of the University.

Article 4 Officers

Section 1 The Officers of the Academic Senate shall consist of the Chair, the Vice Chair, and the Senate Standing Committee Chairs. **The Chair and Vice Chair shall be elected to serve for two years or until their successors are elected. No member shall hold more than one office at a time, and no member shall be eligible to serve more than six consecutive years in the same office.**

Section 2 Chair

- A. The General Faculty Chair, by virtue of election to that office, shall serve as the Academic Senate Chair.
- B. **The Chair may receive assigned time commensurate with the responsibilities of the office.**
- C. The duties of the Chair shall be as follows:
 - 1) the Chair shall preside at the Academic Senate meetings;
 - 2) the Chair shall also be the Academic Senate Executive Committee Chair;
 - 3) the Chair shall be the liaison between the University President and the Academic Senate.

Section 3 Vice Chair

- A. The General Faculty Vice Chair, by virtue of election to that office, shall serve as the Academic Senate Vice Chair.
- B. The Vice Chair will receive assigned time commensurate with the responsibilities of the office.
- C. The duties of the Vice Chair shall be as follows:
 - 1) in the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair shall preside at the Academic Senate meetings;
 - 2) the Vice Chair shall be a member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee;
 - 3) in the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair shall be the liaison between the University President and the Academic Senate.
 - 4) the Vice Chair shall ensure that comprehensive minutes of the Academic Senate proceedings and actions are prepared.

Commented [MD10]: Inconsistent with Appendix B

Commented [MD11]: Inconsistent with Appendix B. This may have arisen because committee chairs could theoretically serve up to 6 years, if they were the chair of the same committee for the entire time they were a Senator (which also has a max of 6 years of service)

Commented [MD12]: Inconsistent with rest of section, where the verb "will" is used, instead of "may", for the other officers

- 5) as soon as possible after each Academic Senate meeting, the Vice Chair shall ensure that the draft minutes are circulated to all members, alternates, and others as requested.
- 6) After the Senate has approved the minutes, the Vice Chair will be responsible for making them available to all members of the University, and keeping them on file in the Academic Senate Office;
- 7) the Vice Chair shall ensure that minutes contain the names of those present and absent at Academic Senate meetings;
- 8) the Vice Chair shall maintain a list of official committees for which the Senate has responsibility for recommending membership.

Section 4 Standing Committee Chairs

- A. The Academic Senate Standing Committee Chairs shall be elected by the Academic Senate from its membership after the Senate Chair and Vice Chair have been elected.
- B. Standing Committee Chairs will receive assigned time commensurate with the responsibilities of their offices.

Article 5 Term of Service and Recall

Section 1 Term of Service

- A. **Senators shall serve for a term of two years (with the exception of the representatives to the Academic Senate CSU who are elected for three-year terms), with terms so arranged that one-half of the Academic Senate shall be elected each year.**
- B. Each Academic Senate member, other than the officers, shall identify an alternate in the event the elected member cannot attend a Senate meeting. Standing Committee Chairs will have a representative of their Standing Committee identified as an alternate.
- C. **With the exception of the representatives to the CSU Academic Senate, no Senator shall serve consecutively for more than six academic years.**

Section 2 Recall

- D. Any Academic Senator or representative to the Academic Senate CSU shall be subject to a recall election by submission of a petition signed by 25 percent of his or her electorate. Alternatively, after an investigation

Commented [MD13]: Needs to be updated for the following: ASCSU Lecturer Electorate representative (one year), ASI President or designee (one year, or term length specified by ASI), and Dean's Council representative (one year)

Commented [MD14]: Not all members are elected, but they're still expected to designate an alternate

Commented [MD15]: Inconsistent with practice with respects to the Chair and Vice Chair role. Practice has allowed up to 6 years as Senator, up to 4 years as Vice Chair, up to 4 years as Chair, and 1 year of immediate past chair (up to 15 years total)

requested by a majority vote of the Senate, the Senate may initiate a recall election by two-thirds vote.

E. A member of the Academic Senate or representatives to the Academic Senate CSU may be recalled by a two-thirds vote of the electorate.

Section 3 Absences

A Senate member who does not attend or have an alternate attend, without excuse or notification, three consecutive Academic Senate meetings will be replaced by an election by the appropriate constituency.

Commented [MD16]: Not all members are elected, so this needs a little wordsmithing on how the replacement is selected

Section 4 Replacement

Should the Academic Senate Executive Committee determine that an Academic Senator should be replaced because of recall or resignation, or two semesters leave, a replacement shall be elected by the same constituency that elected the Senator, to serve out the remainder of the term. *(Revised 2023–2024)*

Commented [MD17]: See previous comment with respects to “elected” and “election”

Article 6 Agenda

The agenda shall be circulated among the General Faculty at least two days prior to the Academic Senate meeting. Any General Faculty member may transmit topics or proposals to the Senate if the topics are within the Senate's jurisdiction.

Article 7 Meetings

The Academic Senate shall hold regularly scheduled meetings at least twice a month during the academic year while classes are in session except when the Executive Committee determines that the flow of Senate business does not warrant a meeting. Whenever deemed necessary, the Executive Committee may also call special Academic Senate meetings.

Article 8 Academic Senate Committees

Section 1 Standing Committees

- A. Standing committees shall make recommendations to the Academic Senate regarding matters of policy, within the limits prescribed for them by the Academic Senate, and by this Constitution and its bylaws.
- B. The Executive Committee and the Elections Committee shall be sole standing committees established by this Constitution. Other standing committees shall be established in the Bylaws of this Constitution.
- C. All standing committees shall report regularly to the Academic Senate concerning committee activities.

Section 2 Executive Committee

- A. **Membership:** The Executive Committee shall consist of:
 - 1) the current Chair;
 - 2) the Vice Chair;
 - 3) the Standing Committee Chairs;
 - 4) the two representatives to the Academic Senate CSU
 - 5) the immediate previous Senate Chair, will serve for a period of one year, ex officio; and
 - 6) the Provost (and Vice President for Academic Affairs) serves ex officio and non-voting.

Commented [MD18]: Repetitive from earlier Article 1, Section 2

- B. Duties:
 - 1) in addition to its other duties, the Executive Committee shall prepare the agenda for the Academic Senate meetings;
 - 2) the Executive Committee shall interpret the meaning and intent of all articles of the Constitution and Bylaws, subject to approval by the University President;
 - 3) the Executive Committee shall recommend the appointment of Standing Committee members to the Senate for approval;
 - 4) during the Fall, and Spring Semesters, whenever classes are not in session, a majority of the Executive Committee members shall act as an Interim Academic Senate. All policy decisions made by this body shall be reported to the next regular Academic Senate meeting for approval.

During the Summer Semester the Interim Academic Senate shall consist of the outgoing and incoming Executive Committee members.

Commented [MD19]: In fact, we missed updating the wording here with last year's resolution about the ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Representative

Section 3 Elections Committee

- A. Membership: The Academic Senate Vice Chair shall serve as the Elections Committee Chair. The Chair of each School Elections Committee shall serve as a member of the Academic Senate Elections Committee.

Commented [MD20]: This committee is also defined earlier in the Handbook in Section 202.6

Commented [MD21]: Missed a School to College update here

B. Duties: The Elections Committee shall administer all Academic Senate and General Faculty elections using the “single-transferable-vote system,” based on preferential voting as described in Robert’s Rules of Order.

Section 4 Ad Hoc Committees

A. Academic Senate Ad hoc committees may be established by the Academic Senate or by the Executive Committee with Academic Senate approval.

B. The University President may, upon a request from the Academic Senate, select one representative to membership on an ad hoc committee.

Article 9 Amendments to this Constitution

Section 1 Proposal of Amendments

A. The Academic Senate, whenever a majority of its membership present deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to the Constitution. Proposed amendments shall receive a first and second reading.

B. Amendments to this Constitution may also be proposed by a petition of 20 percent of the General Faculty.

Section 2 Approval of Amendments

A. Amendments to this Constitution shall be confirmed by an affirmative vote by two-thirds of the members of the General Faculty voting.

B. A copy of proposed amendments shall be sent to every faculty member at least two weeks before voting takes place.

C. Amendments are subject to approval by the University President.

Approved by the Academic Senate May 29, 2008

Amendments Voted on and Passed by General Faculty October 30, 2008

Commented [MD22]: Dates were not updated for the ratification of the ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Representative changes last year

From: Danielle Solano
Sent: Thursday, December 4, 2025 3:56 PM
To: ORG-AcademicSenateChair; Melissa Danforth
Cc: ORG-AcademicSenateOffice; Katherine Van Grinsven; Rebecca Weller
Subject: Updates to the Distributed Learning Community (DLC) Membership & Description
Attachments: RES 2526XX_Distributed Learning Community.docx

Dear Chair Danforth,

I am forwarding the attached draft resolution on the behalf of the Distributed Learning Community (DLC) which updates the membership and the description of the DLC in the handbook.

The DLC has also discussed developing recommendations for classroom observations of online courses to ensure the quality of online teaching, but decided that this will be a separate resolution (that we intend to hopefully send along with an updated distributed learning policy).

Thank you,

--Dani

Danielle Solano, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
California State University, Bakersfield

Office: SCI II 268
Phone: (661) 654-2785
Email: dsolano@csub.edu

***Schedule an appointment with me on [Runner Connect](#) or [Acuity Scheduling](#)

 [Book time to meet with me](#)



Updates to the Distributed Learning Community (DLC) Membership & Description

RES 2526XX

AAC, AS&SS, and/or FAC

RESOLVED: That the Handbook section in this resolution replace section 203.11.

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

203.11 Distributed Learning Committee

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

The DLC consists of (1) one faculty member from each of the academic **colleges** ~~schools~~; (2) **one faculty member at-large** ~~the Faculty Coordinator of Online Instruction from the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (FTLC)~~; (3) the Faculty Director of the FTLC; (4) a student representative from ASI; and (5) one staff member with direct responsibilities related to CSUB's learning management system (ex-officio). Additional members may be appointed as ex-officio members by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, at the recommendation of the current DLC members. **The Faculty Director of the FTLC convenes the first meeting of the year, during which the committee elects a chair.** Faculty members on the committee are expected to have experience with the designing and teaching of online/**flex**~~hybrid~~ courses and **should have received training in** ~~be certified by~~ CSUB for online/**flex**~~hybrid~~ instruction. Faculty members are elected in accordance with the election procedures in Sections 202.6 and 202.7 and serve on staggered two-year terms. The student representative will be selected by ASI on an annual

basis. The staff member will be appointed by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs on an annual basis.

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

RATIONALE: The Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) policy has not been updated in more than a decade, and the Faculty Coordinator of Online Instruction position has been discontinued. During this period, instructional modalities have evolved substantially. Online and flex teaching are now integral components of many faculty members' regular teaching assignments, and CSUB no longer requires certification for online instruction. These handbook revisions redefine the role and scope of the DLC to reflect current institutional practices.

Distribution List: (update as needed)

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2025 4:36 PM
To: Deborah Thien; John Tarjan
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: RE: Potential Resolution on Inclusion of Emeriti Individuals in Social Events

This might also be an ITS issue, in terms of how they build mailing lists from the HR records. They may only pull active faculty into the Faculty and Announcements4Faculty mailing lists.

Melissa

From: Deborah Thien <dthien@csub.edu>
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2025 3:30 PM
To: John Tarjan <jtarjan@csub.edu>; Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Subject: Re: Potential Resolution on Inclusion of Emeriti Individuals in Social Events

Thanks, John.

I will discuss with the deans.

Best,
Deb

--
DEBORAH THIEN, Ph.D.

she / her / hers
Provost and Vice President
Academic Affairs

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 59 ADM
Bakersfield, CA 93311



From: John Tarjan <jtarjan@csub.edu>
Date: Friday, December 12, 2025 at 8:01 AM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>

Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>, Deborah Thien <dthien@csub.edu>

Subject: Potential Resolution on Inclusion of Emeriti Individuals in Social Events

I was wondering if a resolution based on the below and attached could be considered by the Senate. I would be more than happy to bring it from the floor if that would be more appropriate.

In the meantime, perhaps the Provost could consider encouraging the academic deans to make this a practice. Thanks. JT

308.2.4 Emeriti Privileges and Public Announcement

Public announcement of any Emeriti awards shall take place during an event suitable to the announcement. The award of Emeriti status shall entitle recipients to the following:

- a. A certificate of award of Emeriti status at an event suitable to the announcement;
- b. Listing within faculty roster published in the catalog and appropriate University or CSU system bulletins or announcements;
- c. A faculty membership card for purposes of appropriate identification;
- d. Library privileges and services ordinarily accorded to faculty;
- e. Free parking privileges (issued annually);
- f. Continuous access to a University email account.

f1. Invitation to social events to which other members of the unit from which they retired are invited.

The award of Emeriti status may also entitle recipients to the following institutional courtesies or benefits when they are appropriate and available:

- g. Timely notice of all General Faculty meetings and events of the University and such other notices as desired;
- h. Mail services, including the mailing of appropriate faculty notices;
- i. Space for scholarly or other professional pursuits, as available;
- j. Access to and appropriate use of campus buildings, including spaces for conference and laboratory facilities;
- k. Use of campus recreational facilities with payment of membership fee; l. Discounts for specified commercial events or programs sponsored by CSUB;
- m. Free passes or discounts to University athletics events; n. Limited use of telephone and Reprographics services;

Rationale: “Awards are to be regarded as an honor and a continuing commitment of the University to designated faculty members.” (308.2.3) The continued involvement of CSUB emeriti community members in CSUB social activities can bring benefits to both the campus and those individuals.

John Tarjan
Management/Marketing
CSU, Bakersfield
BDC A 209
661-654-2321 (Office)

308.2.4 Emeriti Privileges and Public Announcement

Public announcement of any Emeriti awards shall take place during an event suitable to the announcement. The award of Emeriti status shall entitle recipients to the following:

- a. A certificate of award of Emeriti status at an event suitable to the announcement;
- b. Listing within faculty roster published in the catalog and appropriate University or CSU system bulletins or announcements;
- c. A faculty membership card for purposes of appropriate identification;
- d. Library privileges and services ordinarily accorded to faculty;
- e. Free parking privileges (issued annually);
- f. Continuous access to a University email account.

f1. Invitation to social events to which other members of the unit from which they retired are invited.

The award of Emeriti status may also entitle recipients to the following institutional courtesies or benefits when they are appropriate and available:

- g. Timely notice of all General Faculty meetings and events of the University and such other notices as desired;
- h. Mail services, including the mailing of appropriate faculty notices;
- i. Space for scholarly or other professional pursuits, as available;
- j. Access to and appropriate use of campus buildings, including spaces for conference and laboratory facilities;
- k. Use of campus recreational facilities with payment of membership fee; l. Discounts for specified commercial events or programs sponsored by CSUB;
- m. Free passes or discounts to University athletics events; n. Limited use of telephone and Reprographics services;

Rationale: “Awards are to be regarded as an honor and a continuing commitment of the University to designated faculty members.” (308.2.3) The continued involvement of CSUB emeriti community members in CSUB social activities can bring benefits to both the campus and those individuals.

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 5:15 PM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: Fw: Dean's List

Another item for the EC agenda.

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Elizabeth Adams <eadams6@csu.edu>
Sent: Monday, January 26, 2026 3:53:00 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csu.edu>
Subject: FW: Dean's List

Hi Melissa,

We discovered that there's some ambiguity in the way the Dean's List Policy is written (and is being applied). Could EC consider a reference to AAC on this?

The policy in the current catalog reads:

"A full-time, undergraduate student, carrying at least six (6) units of letter-graded work during the semester, who earns a GPA of 3.25 or above in that semester will be placed on the Dean's List."

For a number of years, Dean's list has been awarded to any student with 6 units at 3.25 or above, even if they're not full-time. At minimum, I think the policy needs to be revised to indicate that full-time is 12 units, but I wonder if the 6 units of letter-graded work might be revisited. In addition, most campuses require a 3.5 for Dean's List. Don't know if there's any appetite to change that either.

The endless policy revision must continue (or not).

Elizabeth

From: Jennifer Mabry <jmabry2@csu.edu>
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 at 3:04 PM
To: Karlo Lopez <klopez@csu.edu>, Sonya Gaitan <sgaitan@csu.edu>
Cc: Jane Dong <jdong2@csu.edu>, Elizabeth Adams <eadams6@csu.edu>
Subject: RE: Dean's List

Hi Karlo,

In review of previous semesters, at end of term processing, the system is looking for 6 units of letter graded coursework.

I have Dr. Adams in my office – as we reviewed the catalog language, we believe that there needs to be a review of this policy so that the language can be written more clearly. Dr. Adams will send it to Academic Senate for review. In a quick review of other CSU's, it appears they list their requirement as 12 units of graded classes, and many require a higher threshold of 3.5.

Good catch.

Jennifer

From: Karlo Lopez <klopez@csub.edu>
Sent: Thursday, January 8, 2026 2:50 PM
To: Sonya Gaitan <sgaitan@csub.edu>
Cc: Jennifer Mabry <jmabry2@csub.edu>; Jane Dong <jdong2@csub.edu>
Subject: Dean's List

Hi Sonya,

The Registrar's Office page on the catalog states the following:

Dean's List

A full-time, undergraduate student, carrying at least six (6) units of letter-graded work during the semester, who earns a GPA of 3.25 or above in that semester will be placed on the Dean's List.

Can you please clarify which students qualify for the dean's list; a full-time student (12+ units) or a part time student (6 units)?

Best,

KARLO M. LOPEZ, Ph.D.

Associate Dean

Professor of Chemistry and Biochemistry

College of Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering

Office: (661) 654-3450

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 13SCI

Bakersfield, CA 93311

klopez@csub.edu

This message, and any attachments it may contain, is for the named person's use only. It may contain confidential, proprietary, or legally privileged information. No confidentiality or privilege is waived or lost by any mis transmission. If you receive this message and you are not the intended recipient, please delete it and all copies of it from your system, destroy any hard copies of it, and notify the sender. You must not, directly or indirectly, use, disclose, print, or copy any part of this message if you are not the intended recipient.

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Danielle Solano
Sent: Monday, February 16, 2026 12:48 PM
To: Pierre Igoa; Alex Slabey; Melissa Danforth
Cc: Katherine Van Grinsven; ORG-AcademicSenateOffice
Subject: Re: ATI - Academic Senate approved process

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Pierre,

I'm adding Katie to this email so she can add this item to the EC agenda for Senate. The process is that EC will refer to one or more subcommittees to discuss, and that will result in a memo or resolution with guidance.

From what I understand, Alex would have to create a special role for the student workers in Canvas so they can access UDOIT, files, and pages only. Hopefully Alex can speak more about this. The Senate would then make recommendations for this process (how faculty would request help for course remediation, how student workers would be granted permission, how students would report concerns, etc.).

Hope that helps,

--Dani

Danielle Solano, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry
California State University, Bakersfield

Office: SCI II 268
Phone: (661) 654-2785
Email: dsolano@csub.edu

***Schedule an appointment with me on [Runner Connect](#) or [Acuity Scheduling](#)

 [Book time to meet with me](#)

From: Pierre Igoa <pigoa2@csub.edu>
Sent: Monday, February 16, 2026 11:40 AM
To: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>; Alex Slabey <aslabey@csub.edu>; Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Subject: Re: ATI - Academic Senate approved process

In addition, we will address the following:

- Faculty checkbox, faculty concern
- ATI student workers, what access permissions and restrictions

PIERRE IGOA

From: Pierre Igoa <pigoa2@csub.edu>
Date: Monday, February 16, 2026 at 10:56 AM
To: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>, Alex Slabey <aslabey@csub.edu>
Cc: Christopher Diniz <cdiniz@csub.edu>, Ydalia Lucio <ylucio2@csub.edu>
Subject: ATI - Academic Senate approved process

Hello,

I'm reaching out in connection to our ATI Working Group Meeting today.

How would we move forward on getting Academic Senate approval?
What specific concerns should we address with the ATI Digital Accessibility Students?
What do you need from me to facilitate?
What other items do you want to address in connection to our meeting?

Thank you,

PIERRE IGOA
Web Services & Communications Manager
Information Technology Services

California State University Bakersfield

<https://www.csub.edu/its/>
<https://twitter.com/itscsub>
(661) 654-6228
pigoa2@csub.edu

<https://www.csub.edu>

[Request Web Services](#)



From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Monday, February 9, 2026 10:59 AM
To: Tiffany Tsantsoulas; Zachary Zenko; Senate Executive Committee Group
Subject: RE: Lecturer Title Change

Hi all,

To add to this, there is also the difference between lecturers with entitlement and lecturers with 3-year contracts.

According to the CBA, lecturers gain entitlement after being employed for two semesters in an academic year (Sections 12.3 through 12.5), while a three-year contract requires six consecutive academic years of employment (Section 12.12). Section 12.12 also discusses entitlement, in terms of the three-year contract.

So, I'd want clarification from Senator Horn on if he meant Section 12.12 entitled lecturers with three-year contracts, or any lecturer with entitlement under Sections 12.3 through 12.5.

Thanks,
Melissa

From: Tiffany Tsantsoulas <ttsantsoulas@csub.edu>
Sent: Monday, February 9, 2026 10:37 AM
To: Zachary Zenko <zzenko@csub.edu>; Senate Executive Committee Group
<executivecommittee@CSUB.onmicrosoft.com>
Subject: Re: Lecturer Title Change

Hi EC,

Thanks for sharing this, Zack. I am in favor of this idea. I do have a few questions that I want to share here as I am unable to attend EC tomorrow:

1. Has Senator Horn looked at other CSU campuses to see if there are similar measures in place?
2. Has Senator Horn polled the lecturers to see if the adoption of this preferred title is a popular choice? I am just wondering how the non-entitled lecturers may feel about this policy.
3. I appreciate the language specifying that this does not have bearing on the CBA. Still, I wonder if Senator Horn has spoken with administration about this idea to see if they have any objections. Not that we necessarily need to abide their objections, but I wonder if the conversation has happened.

Sincerely,
Tiffany

--
DR. TIFFANY TSANTSOULAS
She/Her/Hers

Director of Interdisciplinary Studies
Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies
661-654-2408

California State University, Bakersfield

9001 Stockdale Hwy
Bakersfield, CA 93311

From: Zachary Zenko <zzenko@csub.edu>

Date: Friday, February 6, 2026 at 8:23 AM

To: Senate Executive Committee Group <executivecommittee@CSUB.onmicrosoft.com>

Subject: Fw: Lecturer Title Change

Good morning Melissa and EC Colleagues,

Please see below and the attached draft resolution from Senator Horn.

He is proposing a title change for entitled lecturers to "Senior Lecturers", as a non-contractual academic title.

I am requesting that we consider this, and I am requesting that FAC receives a referral for consideration.

Thank you,
Zack

ZACHARY ZENKO, PH.D., FACSM, PAPHS

He/Him/His
Associate Professor
Graduate Program Director, [MS in Kinesiology](#)
Department of Kinesiology
(661) 654-2799
Office: EDUC 149
[Zoom Link](#)

Spring 2026 Office Hours

Mondays: 8:30 am to 11:30 am
Tuesdays from 11:45 am to 12:45 pm
Thursdays from 11:45 am to 12:45 pm
or by appointment

California State University, Bakersfield

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

Essentials of Exercise and Sport Psychology: An Open Access Textbook



CALIFORNIA STATE BAKERSFIELD

I am a proud member of the California Faculty Association; if you are not already a proud member of CFA, [join here](#).

From: Dirk Horn <dhorn3@csub.edu>
Sent: Thursday, February 5, 2026 11:04 AM
To: Zachary Zenko <zzenko@csub.edu>
Subject: Lecturer Title Change

Hi Zack,

Attached is what I have come up with. I decided to go with senior lecturer even though that is different than what CSU CI did because I believe this is the path of least resistance.

I recently found out my senate term is up after this year because lecturer electorate reps only serve one year instead of the two originally thought, so I am not sure how that works if this doesn't get taken up until next AY and I am no longer on Senate.

Let me know your thoughts and what you think my next steps should be. Thank you!

Best,
Dirk

Dr. Dirk Michael Horn, Ph.D.
Model United Nations Program Director
CSUB Academic Senator 25-27
CFA CSUB Lecturer Representative

Department of Political Science
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy
Bakersfield, CA 93311
(661) 654-2149

Office: BDC 242 A

Academic Senate Resolution and Policy Packet

California State University, Bakersfield

SECTION 1. RESOLUTION XXXX

Resolution to Adopt a Preferred Non-Contractual Academic Title “Senior Lecturer” for Entitled Lecturers

WHEREAS, California State University, Bakersfield relies on lecturers who provide sustained, high-quality instruction and long-term service to the institution; and

WHEREAS, many lecturers at CSU Bakersfield hold entitlement under the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), reflecting continuity of service and institutional commitment; and

WHEREAS, the contractual title “Lecturer” does not distinguish between newly appointed temporary faculty and long-serving entitled lecturers; and

WHEREAS, peer institutions have adopted preferred, non-contractual titles to recognize experienced non-tenure track faculty while remaining compliant with CBAs;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Academic Senate of CSU Bakersfield approves the adoption of “Senior Lecturer” as a preferred, non-contractual academic title for entitled lecturers.

SECTION 2. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS POLICY

Purpose:

This policy establishes a preferred, non-contractual academic title for entitled lecturers at California State University, Bakersfield. The policy recognizes sustained instructional contributions while maintaining full compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the California Faculty Association and the California State University.

Definitions:

Lecturer: The contractual Unit 3 faculty title is defined in Article 12 of the CBA.

Entitled Lecturer: A lecturer who has earned entitlement status under the CBA.

Preferred Non-Contractual Title: A designation recognizing experience and service without modifying employment status, classification, or contractual rights.

Policy:

This policy creates a preferred title that recognizes long-serving entitled lecturers, preserves all contractual classifications and rights, and creates no change to workload, evaluation, salary, or benefits.

Eligibility:

Eligibility is limited to lecturers who hold entitlement under the CBA and maintain an active appointment at CSU Bakersfield. Use of the preferred title is voluntary. The preferred title may be used in syllabi, websites, directories, and correspondence.

Preferred Title:

Eligible faculty may use the preferred, non-contractual academic title “Senior Lecturer.”

Limitations:

The preferred title creates no additional rights or entitlements, does not affect salary, benefits, evaluation, or workload, does not modify the CBA, is campus-specific and non-transferable, and shall cease to apply if entitlement status is lost.

Savings Clause:

This policy shall be rendered null and void if future amendments to the CBA establish a conflicting contractual title structure.

SECTION 3. RATIONALE AND FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Why is this policy being proposed?

This policy addresses a long-standing gap between instructional reality and faculty titles. Lecturers who have earned entitlement provide continuity, institutional knowledge, and long-term service, yet are indistinguishable in title from newly appointed temporary faculty. The preferred title improves clarity and recognition without altering contractual status.

Does this create a new faculty rank or promotion system?

No. This policy does not create ranks, tiers, or promotions. Eligibility is binary and based solely on entitlement status already defined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Does this affect tenure-track or tenured faculty?

No. The title “Senior Lecturer” is explicitly non-contractual and does not use professoriate ranks. It does not impact tenure density, tenure-track hiring, or faculty governance roles.

Does this change pay, workload, or evaluation?

No. The policy creates no changes to salary, benefits, workload, evaluation standards, or appointment terms.

Does this require collective bargaining?

No. The policy preserves the contractual title “Lecturer” for all official employment purposes and does not modify any provision of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Why use the title “Senior Lecturer”?

The term is widely used nationally, is easily understood by students and external audiences, and signals experience without implying promotion, rank, or permanence beyond entitlement.

Why limit eligibility to entitled lecturers?

Entitlement already reflects sustained service and institutional commitment. Using entitlement as the eligibility threshold avoids subjective criteria and additional review processes.

Is use of the title mandatory?

No. Use of the preferred title is voluntary.

Does this create future obligations or costs?

No. The policy is cost-neutral and administrative in nature.

What problem does this solve?

It improves transparency for students, external partners, and accrediting bodies, while offering long-overdue recognition to long-serving lecturers.