



Academic Senate: Executive Committee

AGENDA

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2026

10:00 – 11:30 AM

Location: BPA Conference Room 134 and virtual.

Zoom: <https://csub.zoom.us/j/88091986667?pwd=GOSakqXvulfaZihtNxTsAFBYwWqAJs.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).

Guest: A. Hedge, Faculty Ombudsperson

1. Call to Order

2. Announcements and Information

A. Faculty Ombudsperson Report - A. Hegde (**Time Certain: 10:10 am**)

B. Spring 2026 Guests

i. Senate Guests

a. April 30 – Spring Reports (*written reports only*)

i. Received: FTL, GECCo

ii. Pending: UPRC, URC, Faculty Ombud Report, Calendar Committee

b. May 7 – Senate Organizational Meeting

i. Faculty Award recommendations from FHAC

ii. Remaining reports from April 30

c. Early Fall 2026

i. GRaSP, FAR (oral reports/presentations)

d. Unscheduled:

i. Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR)

ii. WSCUC Logistics – E. Adams (*provide updates to Senate*)

3. Approval of Agenda (**Time Certain: 10:05 am**)

4. Approval of Minutes

A. April 14, 2026 (handout)

5. Continued Items (**Time Certain: 10:40 am**)

- A. AS Referral Log (Refer to BOX folder)
 - i. AAC (T. Tsantsoulas)
 - ii. AS&SS (L. Kirstein)
 - iii. BPC (A. Grombly)
 - a. Memo – Recommendation on Referral #04 Time Blocks (handout)
 - iv. FAC (Z. Zenko)
 - a. Memo - Guidance on RTP Processes, WPAF Expectations, and Evaluation Practices (handout)
- B. Provost Report (D. Thien) (**Time Certain: 10:50 am**)
 - i. Instructional Budget Model Town Hall debrief
 - ii. Updates/ Status:
 - a. Academic Administrator Searches
 - b. Academic Administrator Reviews
- C. Proposed Title 5 Changes – EC (handout; draft in progress)
- D. Development of a Senate Recording Retention Policy for recordings that are intended to develop Minutes – EC (handout; draft in progress)
- E. Commendations for Spring 2026
- F. Calendar Committee – A. Grombly, BPC Chair (handouts in BOX)
- G. Faculty Legislative Liaison (handout)
- H. Deferred to Fall 2026
 - i. ASCSU Lecturer Electorate Representative term
- I. Policies on approval of Course Coding Changes (CS Numbers) (HOLD; pending data from AA)
- J. Faculty advising and CSUB Advising Council (HOLD; pending follow up w/ Provost and VP SASEM)
- K. ASI Resolution: SB 104 ASI and Shared Governance (HOLD; pending ASI’s revisions)

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

- A. Elections and Appointments- D. Solano
 - i. College Appointments Needed (**Time Certain: 11:00 am**) (handout)
 - ii. Open: Calls for Interest for Standing Committees and Standing Committee Chairs
 - iii. Upcoming: At-large Appointed positions
 - iv. Develop formal procedures for appointments for the CSU Fong and Fetterly Award (HOLD; pending FHAC discussion)
- B. Academic Tuition/ Scholarship Waiver (handout)
- C. State Legislation
 - i. ASCSU Legislative Positions – C. Lam
 - ii. [AB-2606](#) Oil and Gas Demonstration Zones
 - iii. [AB-2301](#) Community colleges: Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Pilot Program
 - iv. [AB-2236](#) Postsecondary education: articulation agreements.
- D. Staff Representative on Senate (handouts in BOX)
- E. Items from Advising Council (handout)

F. Summer Retreat agenda and logistics

- i. Date selected after the incoming subcommittee chairs are elected at the Organizational Meeting on May 7
- ii. Agenda Items:
 - a. Carry-over business
 - b. FHAC policies and procedures

7. Agenda Items for Senate (Time Certain: 11:15 am)

Academic Senate Meeting – Spring 2026

Thursday, April 30, 2026

Agenda

10:00 – 11:30 AM

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

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

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

Guest: President Harper

- I. Call to Order
 - a. Tejon Tribal Land Acknowledgement
 - b. [Robert's Rules of Order](#)
 - c. [Interruption Statement](#)
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - a. April 16, 2026 (handout)
- III. Announcements and Information
 - a. President's Report – V. Harper (**Time Certain: 10:10 am**)
 - b. Elections and Appointments – D. Solano (handout)
 - c. Upcoming Events:
 - i. May 7 – Senate Meeting

1. Session 1: Final Senate Meeting of 2025-2026
 - a. Time: 10 -11 am
2. Session 2: 2026-2027 Senate Organizational Meeting
 - a. Time: 11 – 11:30 am
 - b. 2026-2027 Senators Only
 - c. Picture of 2026-2027 Senate taken outside (Time TBA)
- ii. May 16 – Commencement, Dignity Health Arena
 1. csub.edu/commencement
 2. 8:30 am – AH, BPA, NSME
 3. 1:30 pm – SSE
- d. Informational Only: **Needs review; confirm report submissions**
 - i. Submitted Reports for 2025-2026:
 1. Faculty Teaching & Learning Center Activities – R. Weller (handout)
 2. GECCo Report – E. Montoya (handout)
 3. *UPRC Report – (?) Deferred to Senate, May 7*
 4. *URC Report – (?) Deferred to Senate, May 7*
 5. *Faculty Ombuds Report – A. Hegde*
 6. *Calendar Committee – A. Grombly (?) Deferred to Senate, May 7*
 - ii. *Forthcoming in Fall 2026:*
 1. *FAR Report*
 2. *GRaSP Updates*
 3. *Committee on Professional Responsibility (CPR) (?)*
 4. *WSCUC Logistics – E. Adams (?)*

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

V. Reports

- a. ASI Report – Senator Reed
- b. Provost’s Report – D. Thien (**Time Certain: 10:30 AM**) (handout)
- c. ASCSU Report – Senators Lam and Michieka (deferred)
- d. Staff Report – Senator Gonzalez
- e. Committee Reports:
 - i. Executive Committee – Vice-Chair Solano (handout)
 - ii. Standing Committees:
 1. Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) – Senator Tsantsoulas (handout)
 2. Academic Support and Student Services Committee (AS&SS) – Senator Kirstein (handout)
 3. Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) – Senator Grombly (handout)
 - a. Memo – Recommendation on Referral #04 Time Blocks (handout)
 4. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) – Senator Zenko (handout)

- a. Memo - Guidance on RTP Processes, WPAF Expectations, and Evaluation Practices (handout)
- f. CFA Report – T. Salisbury, CFA Bakersfield

VI. Resolutions **(Time Certain: 10:35 AM)**

- a. Consent Agenda
 - i. RES 252649 – Commencement, Spring 2026 – EC (handout)
- b. Old Business:
 - i. RES 252644 – Guidance on WPAF Contents and Timelines for Review – Handbook Change- FAC (handout)
 - ii. RES 252647 – Acting Appointments – Handbook Change – FAC (handout)
 - iii. RES 252648 – Teaching Modality – Handbook Changes – AAC, FAC (handout)
 - iv. RES 252624 – Expressions of the Senate- Bylaws Changes – EC (handout)
 - v. RES 252629 – Academic, Curricular, and Student Support Software Governance – AS&SS (handout) **Check status w/ AS&SS*
 - vi. RES 252641 – Readmission Requirements Following Academic Disqualification - AAC, AS&SS (handout)
 - vii. RES 252638 – New Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering – AAC, BPC (handout)
 - viii. RES 252639 – Program Name Change from a Bachelor of Arts in Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CAFS) to a Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) – AAC, BPC (handout)
 - ix. RES 252640 – Department Name Change from Human Development and Child, Adolescent, and Family Studies (HD-CAFS) to Human Development and Family Studies (HDFS) – AAC, BPC (handout)
 - x. RES 252628 – Inventory of Automated Decision-Making Software for the Classroom – AS&SS (HOLD) **Check status w/ AS&SS*
 - xi. RES 252622 – Academic Advising Structure Is an Academic Endeavor – AAC, AS&SS (TABLED)
- c. New Business:
 - i. RES 252643 – Policies & Procedures for Establishing New Schools – EC (handout)
 - ii. RES 252642 – Post-Enrollment Requirement Checking (PERC) Timing Alignment for Prerequisite Verification and Enrollment Stability – AAC, AS&SS (handout)

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

VIII. Adjournment

8. Adjournment



Memorandum

To: Academic Senate Executive Committee

From: Amanda Grombly, Chair, Budget and Planning Committee

CC: Budget and Planning Committee (BPC)

Date: April 22, 2026

Subject: Recommendation on Referral # 04 Time Blocks

Over the course of five years, the Budget and Planning Committee (BPC) has conducted extensive analysis of time blocks, space utilization, and scheduling practices, and has identified systemic challenges that require coordinated, institution-level action. Given the scope and impact of these issues, BPC recommends referring this work to a taskforce with appropriate administrative authority to address the broader enterprise of academic scheduling.

BPC recommends that the Executive Committee establish a taskforce including the AVP of Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs, Deans and/or Associate Deans from each college, a Department Chair from each college, and representatives from key units such as SASEM and ASI, with additional participation as deemed necessary by the Provost and the taskforce membership. Academic Senate will facilitate the call for faculty participants to the taskforce. The taskforce will convene under the direction of the Provost, report progress to the Academic Senate during the 2026–2027 academic year, and develop actionable recommendations for implementation beginning in the 2027–2028 academic year.



MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Deborah Boschini, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs

CC: Dr. Deborah Thien, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Executive Committee, Academic Senate
Academic Senate
College Deans
College Associate Deans

From: Faculty Affairs Committee

Date: April 23rd, 2026

Guidance on RTP Processes, WPAF Expectations, and Evaluation Practices

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) recognizes that recent revisions to the University Handbook governing periodic evaluation and retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) processes represent a significant and necessary modernization of existing policies. These revisions clarify expectations regarding the formation of Unit RTP Committees, revision of Unit RTP Criteria, and the scope, organization, and timelines of Working Personnel Action Files (WPAFs), and better align evaluation practices with the purpose of different types of review. At the same time, the FAC acknowledges that these changes introduce a level of complexity that may not be immediately intuitive, particularly as the University continues to transition toward fully electronic systems and updated organizational frameworks.

Although broad consultation has been undertaken in the development of these revisions, it is neither realistic nor expected that all faculty, committee members, and administrators will become fully versed in all aspects of RTP policy in a short period of time. The RTP process is inherently complex, and effective implementation requires time, communication, and shared understanding. Accordingly, the FAC emphasizes the importance of approaching these processes with professionalism, collegiality, and good faith. Faculty undergoing review should be understood as making earnest efforts to comply with evolving expectations, and minor inconsistencies or omissions in WPAF preparation may reflect variation in communication, training, or interpretation rather than deficiencies in performance.

At the same time, the FAC underscores the critical importance of RTP evaluation processes and the responsibility held those participating in them. Evaluation letters prepared by Unit RTP Committees, Department Chairs, and Deans play a central role not only in the current review cycle, but also in

ACADEMIC SENATE

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

establishing a cumulative record of performance that may influence future evaluations, including promotion and post-tenure review. As such, these evaluations should be thorough, clear, and carefully reasoned, providing meaningful feedback to faculty and transparent justification for recommendations.

To support consistent and equitable implementation of RTP processes, the Faculty Affairs Committee encourages ongoing communication and the development of regular training opportunities for all participants in the RTP process.

The FAC further recommends that the Office of Faculty Affairs (perhaps in partnership with the Academic Senate, the University Review Committee, the California Faculty Association, and the Committee on Professional Responsibility), give regular attention to the development and delivery of training and guidance for those involved in participating in and navigating these complex processes. Such efforts will help ensure that expectations are clearly understood, that evaluation practices are applied consistently across units, and that the process remains both rigorous and fair.

The FAC appreciates the continued commitment of faculty and administrators to maintaining high standards of evaluation while supporting the professional development and success of our colleagues.

To: CSU Board of Trustees

From: Executive Senate, California State University, Bakersfield

Date: [Insert Date]

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Title 5 Amendments on Undergraduate Degree Structure

Dear Members of the Board of Trustees,

On behalf of the Executive Senate at California State University, Bakersfield, we write to express our opposition to the proposed amendments to Title 5 concerning undergraduate degree structures.

Our primary concern is that the proposed changes fundamentally shift the CSU toward conferring degrees at a system level rather than through coherent, campus-based academic programs. The revisions to residency requirements allow units to be earned across any CSU campuses, and the proposed degree structures—particularly for the Bachelor of Professional Studies and Bachelor of Applied Studies—permit degrees to be completed through general education, a minimal major, and electives, while explicitly stating that “no additional campus requirements shall be enforced.”¹

Taken together, these changes create a model in which students may assemble degrees by taking courses across multiple campuses—particularly through online offerings—without meaningful integration into a single, faculty-designed program. While collaboration across campuses can be beneficial, this proposal risks producing degrees that lack curricular cohesion, sequencing, and shared intellectual experience. A CSU degree has historically reflected the academic vision and standards of the faculty at the degree-granting campus. If students increasingly “piece together” coursework across the system, that coherence—and the ability of faculty to ensure program-level learning outcomes—will be significantly weakened.

This shift also raises serious concerns regarding resource alignment and institutional sustainability. When instruction is distributed across campuses

but degrees are conferred by a single institution, the connection between teaching, funding, and program responsibility becomes unclear. Over time, this may erode the ability of campuses to sustain robust academic programs and maintain accountability for student learning.

We also hold concerns regarding general education curriculum. Campus-specific general education programs are intentionally designed to develop and reinforce foundational skills—writing, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning—while also engaging students in the study of civic institutions, diversity, and social systems. These requirements are essential to ensuring that CSU graduates meet the expectations of a baccalaureate degree. The proposed limitation on campus requirements, combined with new degree pathways requiring as few as 90 units, risks reducing general education to a minimal framework rather than a developmental process.

These concerns are heightened by national evidence of student preparation gaps. According to the 2024 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), only about 37% of 12th graders are proficient in reading and approximately 22% in mathematics.² Given these realities, CSU campuses must retain the ability to design curricula that ensure students develop and demonstrate essential competencies prior to graduation.

We support innovation and intercampus collaboration. However, such efforts must preserve program coherence, faculty oversight, and the integrity of the degree-granting campus. We respectfully urge the Board to reconsider the proposed Title 5 amendments and to ensure that campuses retain the authority to maintain requirements necessary to uphold academic quality and student success.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Title]

On behalf of the Executive Senate

California State University, Bakersfield

Footnotes

1. Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Division 5 – Board of Trustees of the California State Universities, §40503–40504 (Proposed Regulations, March 18, 2026), which state that no additional campus requirements shall be enforced.
2. National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2024 Grade 12 Results in Reading and Mathematics.

From: Deborah Thien <dthien@csub.edu>

Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2026 9:35 AM

To: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>; Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>; Senate Executive Committee Group <executivecommittee@CSUB.onmicrosoft.com>

Subject: Re: April 7 - EC Agenda

Hi, all,

Unfortunately, I was not able to attend this week's extra meeting due to other obligations. I have reviewed the notes, with thanks to Dani.

Regarding the [Proposed Title 5 changes](#) I am sharing a document provided by the CO re: WASC guidance (attached) as well as an LA Times article that reports on 3-year degrees in a national context.

Regarding concerns about the 3-year degree (e.g. about adequate preparation), only faculty can propose new degree programs and curriculum. In other words, faculty would have the ultimate say as to whether or not they build a 90-unit degree program or a 'less than 120-unit' degree program. These proposed changes to Title 5 allow for the possibility only. If no faculty on a campus want to build such a degree, then we would not have them.

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

California State University, Bakersfield

Academic Senate Recording Retention Policy

Purpose

Audio and video recordings of Academic Senate meetings are created solely to assist in the preparation and verification of official meeting minutes. These recordings are not the official record of Senate proceedings.

Scope

This policy applies to all audio and video recordings of Academic Senate meetings conducted via Zoom or similar platforms.

Use of Recordings

- Recordings are used exclusively by authorized personnel (e.g., Senate staff or designee) for the purpose of drafting and confirming meeting minutes.
- Recordings shall not be distributed, shared, or used for any other purpose, including publication or public dissemination.

Official Record

- The approved meeting minutes constitute the official and permanent record of Academic Senate proceedings.
- Recordings are considered transitory materials and do not serve as official records.

Access Restrictions

- Access to recordings is limited to individuals directly involved in preparing and reviewing the minutes.
- Recordings shall not be released in response to routine requests unless required by law and reviewed in consultation with appropriate campus authorities.

Retention and Deletion

- Recordings shall be retained only as long as necessary to complete and approve the official minutes.
- Recordings will be deleted according to the following schedule, whichever occurs first:
 - **Fourteen (14) days after approval of the meeting minutes, or**
 - **Sixty (60) days after the meeting date**

- Deletion shall be carried out in a secure manner to ensure recordings are not recoverable.

Compliance

This policy is intended to comply with:

- CSU systemwide records management guidelines
- California Public Records Act (CPRA)
- Applicable state records retention requirements
- Campus data governance and privacy policies

Review and Responsibility

- The Academic Senate Office is responsible for implementing and enforcing this policy.
- This policy shall be reviewed periodically and updated as needed to ensure compliance with evolving CSU and state requirements.

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 1:54 PM
To: Senate Executive Committee Group
Subject: Faculty legislative liaison
Attachments: AS-3609-23.pdf

Hi all,

The statewide chairs mailing list had a recent thread about faculty legislative liaisons in response to the attached ASCSU resolution encouraging campuses to create such positions.

CalPoly was gracious enough to pass along their resolution to create the position, which has further evidence from HEERA and AAUP: <https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1984&context=senateresolutions>

Something to consider. The Handbook has one line mentioning the Public Affairs Committee of the Senate, which has long been dormant. We can discuss if we want to revive that committee with this additional charge, or if we want to have a single Senator fill that role.

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/>

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-3609-23/FGA (Rev)
March 16-17, 2023

ENCOURAGING CAMPUS FACULTY LEGISLATIVE LIAISONS

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) suggests that campus Senates create a position of Campus Faculty Legislative Liaison; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recommends that this position be held by a Campus Senator who will meet with the campus Government and Local Relations legislative staff and report and communicate with the campus Senate Executive Committee and the campus Senate who may adopt other formal responsibilities for the position; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recommends that CSU Campus Senates and Presidents support faculty in lobbying efforts to strengthen individual and collective CSU efforts with a Campus Faculty Legislative Liaison, or Senate Chair/designee, who will meet twice annually (in a virtual format unless the CSU Chancellor's Office will fund a trip to a common location) with the ASCSU Legislative Specialists, the ASCSU Fiscal & Governmental Affairs (FGA) Committee Chair and other Campus Faculty Legislative Liaisons; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU requests the head of the CSU Chancellor's Office (CO) Advocacy and State Relations office, and campus Government and Community Relations staff join those meetings; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU requests the California Faculty Association (CFA) Legislative Director and/or the CFA Legislative Analyst, and CFA ASCSU Liaison join those meetings; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU advises CSU Presidents that they encourage cooperation between the ASCSU Faculty Legislative Specialists and the Campus Faculty Legislative Liaisons (see <https://www.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/government/Advocacy-and-State-Relations/Pages/campus-legislative-liaisons.aspx>); and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU recommend that CSU Senates request funding from their President for this essential faculty service work; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU Executive, Assistant and Associate Vice Chancellors, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU campus Senate Executive Committees, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, California Faculty Association (CFA), California State Student Association

(CSSA), and the CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty & Staff Association (CSU-ERFSA).

RATIONALE: *In order to coordinate efforts and communication, we offer this resolution to bring together existing advocacy to form a unified advocacy to the legislature. Advocacy efforts for the CSU are built on the work of The Office of Advocacy and State Relations (ASR) advocates for the interests of the California State University with the state's government. ASR does so with the help of the Chancellor's Office, the CSU's 23 campuses, alumni, and other supporters." Presently, the advocacy efforts by the ASCSU Fiscal and Government Affairs Committee, and more specifically the work of the ASCSU Legislative Specialists, are not coordinated with CSU Senates beyond ASCSU statewide senator reporting. Each year the ASCSU Senate votes on legislative advocacy priorities with some cross-consultation with California Faculty Association (CFA) leadership. While Campus Legislative Liaisons exist, there is no coordination with the campus Senates. The creation of parallel Campus Faculty Legislative Liaisons will strengthen overall CSU advocacy efforts and, especially the advocacy efforts of the ASCSU by mobilizing campus Senates and increasing individual and collective faculty to contact their representatives in support of ASCSU legislative advocacy priorities.*

Approved Unanimously – May 19-20, 2023

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Melissa Danforth
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 10:52 AM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: FW: senate resolution

Hi Katie,

Tony talked to me about this too last week. Probably too late for this year's Senate to tackle, but a good topic to put on the Summer Senate retreat agenda.

Melissa

From: Amber Stokes <astokes2@csb.edu>
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 at 10:49 AM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csb.edu>
Subject: Fwd: senate resolution

Hi, Melissa. I received a request for a resolution (see email below). Let me know if you need anything further from me.

Amber

AMBER N. STOKES, PhD
Professor of Biology
Graduate Program Director
Department of Biology
(661) 654-2886

California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Hwy, Mail Stop: 61 SCI
Bakersfield, CA 93311
USA

<https://sites.google.com/view/stokeslabcsb/home>

"Science and everyday life cannot and should not be separated." - Rosalind Franklin



Begin forwarded message:

From: Anthony Rathburn <arathburn@csub.edu>
Subject: senate resolution
Date: March 3, 2026 at 9:11:45 PM PST
To: Amber Stokes <astokes2@csub.edu>

Hi Amber:

I trust that your semester is going well.

I am writing because of an issue that is preventing us from offering grant funds to cover grad student tuition. According to Manuel in GRaSP, NSF rules indicate that unless the University offers at least one tuition scholarship/waiver, we cannot include tuition funds in any proposal. Other CSUs can wrtiet tuition funds into NSF proposals as can other universities in the country. This means that we cannot compete with these institutions for grad students. It also means that with scholarship/salary restrictions, we can't cover tuition and other expenses even though NSF is willing to provide the funds.

I have met with a number of people about this, including Jane Dong. It seems that the only solution is to have at least one academic tuition waiver scholarship for the university that is provided regularly. Of course, athletics gets all of the tuition waivers now. From what I understand, tuition waivers are at the discretion of the President. I have not talked with him about this, but as a senator, I would like to ask you to introduce a resolution to the Senate to ask the President to create an academic tuition waiver scholarship for the University. This waiver could be competitive or rotated between colleges, but would be a regular, yearly scholarship. In this way, we could write NSF proposals that include tuition funds for grad students and attract students from a wider circle.

I would be happy to chat with you about this, if you wish.

Cheers,
Tony

Anthony Rathburn
Professor and Chair
Co-Director of the California Well Sample Repository
Dept. of Geological Sciences, Sci Bldg II, mail stop 66 SCI
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, CA 93311-1022
arathburn@csub.edu

This email, and any attachments, thereto, is intended only for use by the addressee(s) named herein and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email, and any attachments thereto, is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

Katherine Van Grinsven

From: Danielle Solano
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 2:09 PM
To: Tiffany Tsantsoulas; Melissa Danforth; Katherine Van Grinsven
Subject: Re: Items for EC from Advising Council


The only thing I would add is that we still don't have an email list for faculty advisors.

--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: Tiffany Tsantsoulas <ttsantsoulas@csub.edu>
Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2026 2:07 PM
To: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>; Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>
Cc: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>
Subject: Re: Items for EC from Advising Council

Nothing to add!

--

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: Melissa Danforth <mdanforth@csub.edu>
Date: Wednesday, March 11, 2026 at 5:15 PM
To: Katherine Van Grinsven <kvan-grinsven@csub.edu>

Cc: Danielle Solano <dsolano@csub.edu>, Tiffany Tsantsoulas <ttsantsoulas@csub.edu>

Subject: Items for EC from Advising Council

Hi Katie,

Here are some items for EC from today's Advising Council meeting.

Handbook items:

- Student ombuds description: Request that we seek input from Dean of Students on the descriptive paragraph.
- Grievance appendix still references the Associate Dean of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies. This is causing issues with current grievances, since position no longer exists.

General items:

- Timeline of schedule build (chairs, associate deans), classroom assignments, course-based advising (Advising Weeks in calendar), and registration was discussed. Still some pressure points to talk through.
- Canvas shell being developed with resources and training videos for faculty advisors. Still working on how to distribute to faculty advisors. Request to place blank outlines there.

I'm CCing Dani and Tiffany, who were also at the meeting, to see if they have anything to add.

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/>



ACADEMIC SENATE
CSU BAKERSFIELD

Commencement – Spring 2026

RES 252649

EC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend to the President those appropriate degrees be conferred to students satisfying the requirements of their programs of study.

RATIONALE: Faculty are responsible for designing curriculum, establishing program and degree requirements, teaching classes, advising and mentoring students, and ensuring standards are met.

Let us join together as a university community in celebrating the accomplishments of these graduates and candidates for graduation.

Distribution List:

President
Provost and VP Academic Affairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Academic Senate

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



Guidance on WPAF Contents and Timelines for Review – Handbook Change

RES 252644

FAC

- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate recommends revising Sections 305.3.3., 305.5.2., 305.5.3., 305.4.2.10, and Appendix G of the University Handbook to replace outdated guidance regarding WPAF size and content (e.g., the “three-inch binder” limitation) with updated guidelines that reflect electronic file systems and emphasize clarity, organization, and representative evidence aligned with Unit RTP Criteria.
- RESOLVED:** That the revisions to the University Handbook establish clear expectations for the scope and organization of Working Personnel Action Files (WPAFs) that are aligned with the type of review being conducted, such that developmental reviews (e.g., retention and periodic evaluations) emphasize materials since the most recent WPAF submission, while cumulative reviews (e.g., lecturers seeking three-year appointments, tenure and promotion) appropriately consider a broader body of work over the relevant period.
- RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate affirms the importance of thorough, clear, and fair evaluation letters by Unit RTP Committees and Deans, as these are essential to providing meaningful feedback, ensuring transparency, and supporting equitable and well-informed personnel decisions.
- RESOLVED:** That any change to the platform used for WPAF submission and review shall be implemented in consultation with the Academic Senate, and that the Office of Faculty Affairs shall develop and communicate clear, consistent, and equitable procedures to support faculty and reviewers in the evaluation process.
- RESOLVED:** That such guidance shall ensure clarity, consistency, and alignment with University RTP policies while taking into account the organizational features of the platform.
- RESOLVED:** That Appendix G of the University Handbook shall be reviewed and updated as necessary to reflect these changes and to ensure that WPAF organization guidelines remain current, accessible, and appropriate for the platform in use.

RESOLVED:

The Academic Senate approves revisions to the University Handbook regarding the organization of the WPAF. Deletions are in ~~striketrough~~ and additions are in **bold and underlined**.

305.3.3 Promotion of Tenured Faculty

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

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

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

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

305.5.2 Contents and Organization of the RTP File

The Working Personnel Action File (WPAF, sometimes informally referred to as the RTP, PTR, or PEF file) shall be organized to provide a clear, structured, and representative record of the faculty member's accomplishments in relation to the applicable Unit RTP Criteria. Materials should be arranged to support a narrative explanation of performance in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service. The WPAF should be thorough yet concise, providing representative rather than exhaustive documentation sufficient for effective review. Faculty shall not be expected to include all artifacts or materials associated with their professional activities; rather, materials should be selected to demonstrate quality, impact, and alignment with Unit RTP Criteria.

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

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

- a. Log sheet – lists each document placed in the file **WPAF**, date of insertion, original source, person or authority responsible for inserting the document.
- b. Access sheet – lists each person having access to the file, reason for access, and date of access.
- c. Master index – lists each document in the file arranged chronologically within each area of review—teaching/performance, scholarly/creative activity/ professional growth, and professionally related service.
- d. Assignments – list all courses taught, semester-by-semester (faculty) and all major responsibilities and professional activities (librarians and counselors).
- e. Current ~~vita~~ **curriculum vitae**
- f. Applicable unit RTP criteria.
- g. Previous RTP evaluations and recommendations (all levels).
- h. Personal statement (optional) – ~~concisely describes personal perspective regarding performance in the three areas of review for the current RTP cycle.~~
 - a. **Provides a clear and organized narrative describing the faculty member's performance in each area of review for the current RTP cycle.**

addressing the applicable Unit RTP Criteria, highlighting accomplishments, and responding to prior evaluations where appropriate

- i. Documentation of Teaching or Performance
 - a. **All peer observations of teaching conducted during the period under review shall be included and clearly labeled for reviewers. For promotion reviews, faculty shall include all peer observations conducted during the period in rank.**
- j. Documentation of Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth
- k. Documentation of Professionally Related Services to the University and the Community
- l. Miscellaneous Section

305.5.3 Completeness of the WPAF for periodic and performance review

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

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

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

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

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

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

Once the relevant unit periodic or performance review committee has determined that the WPAF contains all required elements, any materials to be added to the WPAF must be approved by the University Review Committee (URC) and shall be limited to items that became available only after the date of completion of the file. Only evaluations and recommendations completed by each level of review, any minority reports, and any responses to the evaluations and recommendations may be added to the WPAF without prior approval by the URC. A copy of all added materials shall be provided to the faculty. ~~Reviewing authorities may disregard any added material that could have been included in the original file at the beginning of the review process.~~

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

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

305.4.2.10 The RTP File

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. Retention of Probationary Faculty

1. Materials shall represent the faculty member's work since the most recent WPAF submission, or since initial appointment if no prior review has been conducted, with emphasis on progress toward meeting the applicable Unit RTP Criteria in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and professionally related service.
 - i. For the second-year review, the WPAF shall include all materials since initial appointment, including materials from the first-year review, to ensure that all levels of review have access to a complete record of the faculty member's performance to date.

2. All SOCI's collected since the initial appointment shall be included in a separate folder.
3. For multi-year probationary reviews, materials from prior review cycles may be included, and additional materials spanning multiple years may be incorporated as appropriate to demonstrate the faculty member's professional development, progress, and growth, particularly for levels of review that did not participate in earlier evaluations.

c. Tenure and Promotion of Probationary Faculty

1. Materials may represent the faculty member's body of work during the probationary period at California State University, Bakersfield, with emphasis on accomplishments during the most recent years and demonstration of sustained development and achievement across all areas of review.
2. With the exception of SOCI's, materials included in the WPAF shall be representative rather than exhaustive. Faculty are expected to exercise professional judgment in selecting materials that best demonstrate their development, achievement, and readiness for tenure and promotion. The absence of individual documents shall not, in itself, be interpreted as a deficiency, provided that sufficient evidence is included to support a comprehensive and fair evaluation.
 - i. All SOCI's collected since the initial appointment shall be included in a separate folder.

d. Promotion of Tenured Faculty

1. Materials may represent the faculty member's overall body of work, with particular emphasis on accomplishments since the final WPAF submission as a probationary faculty member, demonstrating sustained achievement, impact, and continued professional growth.

2. With the exception of SOCI, materials included in the WPAF for promotion of tenured faculty shall be representative rather than exhaustive. Faculty are expected to exercise professional judgment in selecting materials that best demonstrate sustained achievement, impact, and continued professional growth. The absence of individual documents shall not, in itself, be interpreted as a deficiency, provided that sufficient evidence is included to support a comprehensive and fair evaluation.

i. All SOCI collected in current rank shall be included in a separate folder.

e. Post-Tenure Review without Promotion

1. Materials shall represent the faculty member's activities and achievements since the most recent WPAF submission, with emphasis on continued engagement in teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service, as well as plans for ongoing professional development.

2. With the exception of SOCI, materials included in the WPAF shall be representative rather than exhaustive. Faculty are expected to exercise professional judgment in selecting materials that best demonstrate continued engagement, effectiveness, and professional development. The absence of individual documents shall not, in itself, be interpreted as a deficiency, provided that sufficient evidence is included to support a comprehensive and fair evaluation.

i. All SOCI collected since the most recent review shall be included in a separate folder.

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

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

The WPAF is intended to provide a structured, organized, and representative record of faculty accomplishments in relation to the applicable Unit RTP Criteria. Materials should be selected and organized to support a clear narrative explaining the faculty member’s performance. The WPAF should be thorough yet concise and should include representative rather than exhaustive documentation. Faculty shall not be expected to include all artifacts or materials associated with their professional activities; rather, materials should be selected to demonstrate quality, impact, and alignment with Unit RTP Criteria.

Because Unit RTP Criteria vary across disciplines, the length and organization of WPAF materials may reasonably differ across units.

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

Standard Organization of the WPAF (Section-Based Structure)

To promote consistency, clarity, and ease of review across electronic platforms, WPAF materials shall be organized into clearly defined sections and, where appropriate, subsections, using the organizational features of the platform in use (e.g., sections, tabs, or folders). Because electronic review platforms vary in their organizational features and capabilities, the structure described below represents a conceptual framework rather than a rigid technical format.

The WPAF should generally be organized as follows:

- 1. Log Sheet¹**
- 2. Access Sheet**
- 3. Master Index²**
- 4. Assignments Sheet**
- 5. Current Curriculum Vitae**
- 6. Unit RTP Criteria**
- 7. Previous and Current RTP Evaluations and Recommendations**
- 8. Personal Statement**
- 9. Teaching (or Performance)**
- 10. Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth**
- 11. Service**
- 12. Miscellaneous (optional)**

Document Naming Conventions

¹ **In electronic review systems that provide automated tracking of file access, document history, and case materials, the Log Sheet and Access Sheet requirements may be satisfied by system-generated records and need not be maintained as separate documents.**

² **A Master Index may be included where helpful for clarity; however, in electronic systems that provide structured navigation and document labeling, a separate index is not required. The inclusion of a Master Index or Table of Contents is considered best practice to facilitate the review process.**

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

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

For example:

Teaching 2026 Fall SOCI CSUB1001

RSCA 2026 JournalArticle Einstein et al.

A. Log Sheet

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

A. Access Sheet

- 1) The names of all persons accessing the RTP file shall be recorded on the Access Sheet, with date(s) of access and reason for access.
- 2) Each person accessing the RTP file shall be responsible for recording the necessary information on the Access Sheet.
- 3) The Access Sheet shall be prepared and maintained by the custodian of the PAF, normally the office of the dean or director of the faculty.

B. Master Index

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

A. Assignments Sheet

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

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

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

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

G. Previous and Current RTP Evaluations and Recommendations

- 1) At each level of review, evaluations and recommendations pertaining to retention, the award of tenure, and promotion shall be placed in the RTP file, as well as entered into the Log Sheet.

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

H. Personal Statement (Optional)

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

I. Documentation of Teaching or Performance

- 1) Teaching
 - a. Careful documentation of teaching performance is essential. It is imperative to keep this section current, relevant, and orderly for faculty, teaching success is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion.
 - b. ~~Student evaluations of teaching (SOCI) for all courses taught during the probationary period must be included.~~ **Student Opinion of Curriculum and Instruction (SOCI) data shall be included in the WPAF in a dedicated folder and organized chronologically. The scope of SOCIs included shall align with the type of review being conducted (see section 305.4.2.10 of this Handbook).**
 - c. **Classroom observations, as required by the University Handbook (section 305.4.2.7) and the Unit RTP Criteria, shall be included. Teaching materials shall include a clearly labeled subfolder for Classroom Observations, which shall**

include all required peer observations conducted during the period under review (or period in rank for promotion reviews).

- d. Other evidence illustrating teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - i. representative syllabi, course materials and handouts, quizzes and exams;
 - ii. peer evaluations of teaching, including those conducted by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff;
 - iii. signed letters from current students or alumni;
 - iv. professional development activities for the improvement of teaching performance, including those conducted by the Faculty TLC;
 - v. curriculum development—new courses and/or new pedagogy; and/or
 - vi. significant advising of students in a major/program.
 - e. The use of information or other technologies and involvement in TLC and assessment activities, by themselves, will carry little, if any, weight in the judgment of teaching effectiveness. Reviewers should justify their evaluations regarding such activities and student learning.
 - f. Additional teaching through Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach, including SOCI, must be included in this section.
 - g. Except for the SOCI, no anonymous materials, including letters, notes, e-mails, etc., shall be included in the RTP file.
- 2) Performance (librarians and counselors)
- a. For librarians and counselors, performance is the principal requirement for retention, tenure, and promotion. Therefore, careful documentation of performance on all assignments during the probationary period is essential. It is imperative to keep this section current, relevant, and orderly.
 - b. Evidence illustrating high levels of performance may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - i. assignments requiring significant leadership skills, analytical and organizational skills, and/or problem solving skills
 - ii. peer evaluations of performance, including those conducted by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) staff;
 - iii. signed letters from faculty, staff, current students, or alumni; and
 - iv. program development.
 - c. The information should be in sufficient detail to substantiate the role of the faculty and his/her contributions.

3) Specific Suggestions for Organizing Teaching Materials

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

J. Documentation of Scholarly/Creative Activities or Professional Growth

- 1) This section must show how the faculty is growing and developing through scholarly/creative activities within the discipline (teaching faculty or librarians) or through professional growth activities within the field (counselors).
- 2) Faculty who are earlier in their career progression (e.g., probationary faculty), may emphasize ongoing scholarly or creative activities, without outputs, as an indication of their potential for future success and impact. However, peer-reviewed outputs (e.g., publications, presentations, exhibitions, creative outputs, as articulated in the Unit RTP Criteria), are expected for tenure and promotion of probationary faculty, and promotion of tenured faculty.**
- 3) Faculty should include evidence for scholarly/creative activities in accord with their unit RTP criteria, which may include, but is not limited to, published journal articles, monographs, books, papers presented at professional conferences, etc.

a. Faculty shall include all peer-reviewed outputs that are relevant to their current review type (e.g., retention of probationary faculty, promotion of probationary faculty, post-tenure review).

- 4) Faculty are responsible for obtaining outside reviews of unpublished scholarly manuscripts in a timely manner so that they can be included in the RTP file before the RTP review cycle begins.
- 5) ~~Scholarly/creative materials that have been neither published nor reviewed by peers in the discipline will carry little, if any, weight in the review process.~~
- 6) When listing papers presented at a scholarly conference, the faculty must provide information as to whether the paper was selected through a refereed process. **When listing papers presented at a scholarly conference, faculty shall provide information regarding the nature of the review process (e.g., refereed, invited, or other selection process), as this provides important context for evaluating the work.**
- 7) When listing co-authored books, articles, research projects, and grant proposals, the faculty must clearly indicate the extent of his/her contribution to the joint effort. **When listing co-authored books, articles, research projects, creative projects, and grant proposals, faculty shall provide a clear description of the nature and extent of their contributions to the collaborative work.**
- 8) In general, grant/contract proposals that have been funded carry more weight than those that have not been funded. Grant/contract proposals that have been submitted for review but have not yet been evaluated carry little weight in the review process. **Grant and contract activity should be evaluated in terms of both engagement in the scholarly process and resulting outcomes. Funded proposals provide evidence of successful external validation and support, while submitted proposals and those under review may demonstrate ongoing scholarly engagement, development of research agendas, and efforts to secure external funding.**
- 9) Consulting work (paid or unpaid) in of itself carries little, if any, weight in the review process. Consultant reports, if they have received outside peer review, may carry some weight. **Consulting work (paid or unpaid) may provide evidence of professional engagement, applied expertise, and contributions to practice. Consultant reports or products that have undergone external review or dissemination may also provide evidence of scholarly or professional impact.**
- 10) ~~Reviews of book manuscripts, journal articles, papers being considered for presentation at professional meetings, etc., may carry some weight if there is documentation of the faculty's contributions.~~ **Service to the profession, such as reviewing book manuscripts,**

journal articles, or conference submissions, may provide evidence of scholarly engagement and recognition within the discipline, particularly when accompanied by documentation of the faculty member's contributions and role.

- 11) Under ordinary circumstances, work on accreditation applications and reports should be considered under the category of service to the department and university rather than as scholarly activity. However, in those instances where the products of the accreditation process can be worked into a larger research strategy or design that can lead to or result in the production of an article or monograph published in a peer-reviewed journal, such activities can be considered scholarship.
- 12) Activities currently "in process" or being "planned for the future" may be listed, but such activities carry some weight only in the early stages of the faculty's probationary period. If these activities are listed in this section, then the faculty is obligated to inform all reviewers regarding the outcome of these "in process" or "planned" activities in subsequent review cycles.
- 13) Specific suggestions for organizing materials in this section
 - a. Materials must be organized in chronological order, preferably "reverse chronology," with the most recent materials (current RTP review cycle) in front; and
 - b. ~~Versions or revisions of published papers or articles must be carefully cross-referenced in the RTP file (including Log Sheet and Master Index). Earlier versions should be purged from the file to keep physical size manageable.~~ **When multiple versions or stages of a scholarly work are included (e.g., draft, submitted, accepted, published), these should be clearly labeled and, where appropriate, cross-referenced to illustrate the progression of the work.**

K. Documentation of Professionally Related Services to the University and to the Community

- 1) This section must show the type and extent of professionally related services the faculty provides to the **profession, university, college, department, students, and/or community** campus and/or to the community.
- 2) Faculty should include evidence for professionally related services to the university and to the community in accord with their unit RTP criteria, including, but not limited to, membership/leadership of university committees and task forces, professional associations and societies, and/or community organizations, presentations to community groups, involvement in community projects, etc. Supporting documentation from others knowledgeable about the faculty's level of performance should be included in this section.

- 3) The professionally related services listed in this section should be related to the faculty's teaching area, field of scholarship/creative activities, or professional assignments.
- 4) Teaching for additional pay through Division of Extended Education and Global Outreach (and other similar academic arrangements) shall not be listed in this section.
- 5) Consulting activities for which the faculty was paid shall not be listed in this section.
- 6) Activities for which special assigned time arrangements have been made shall be counted in this section only to the extent that the faculty's performance was exemplary, or his/her **their** efforts significantly exceeded the amount of assigned time. In either case, supporting documentation from others knowledgeable about the assigned time arrangements should be included in this section.

L. Miscellaneous Section (optional)

- 1) An additional section may be appended to the RTP file to include such materials as:
 - a. large, bulky items, e.g., audio or video tapes, CDs, award plaques, photographs, paintings, and creative "artifacts;"
 - b. unpublished or unreviewed manuscripts;
 - c. unreviewed grant/contract proposals;
 - d. letters/articles published by the local media;
 - e. information on professional conferences, meetings, workshops attended (as opposed to those where a paper was presented); and
 - f. signed thank you notes and cards from other faculty, staff, students, alumni, or individuals from the community.
- 2) Since these materials are usually not considered as significant evidence of the faculty's performance, good judgment must be exercised in creating this additional section.

RATIONALE:

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

The proposed revisions establish a more coherent and equitable framework by aligning WPAF expectations with the purpose and scope of each type of review. Developmental reviews (e.g., retention and periodic evaluations) emphasize work since the most recent WPAF submission, while cumulative reviews (e.g., tenure and promotion) appropriately consider the broader body of work over a defined period, such as the probationary period or time in rank. Importantly, the revisions clarify the timeline and

scope of materials included in the WPAF, explicitly indicating that materials should generally reflect accomplishments since the most recent WPAF submission. This resolves a common source of confusion in which activities occurring after the most recent WPAF submission—but prior to a change in rank or effective date of promotion—may otherwise be omitted. By clarifying that such activities shall be included, the policy ensures that faculty work is fully represented and that no period of professional activity is inadvertently excluded from evaluation.

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

The revisions further strengthen the policy by clarifying that WPAF materials are intended to be representative rather than exhaustive, reinforcing the expectation that faculty exercise professional judgment in selecting evidence that best demonstrates the quality, impact, and significance of their work. This approach recognizes that, particularly in multi-year and cumulative reviews, it is neither necessary nor desirable to include every possible document. Instead, the focus is on providing sufficient, well-organized evidence to support a fair and comprehensive evaluation. By explicitly indicating that minor omissions of individual documents should not be interpreted as deficiencies, the revisions promote a more holistic and equitable approach to evaluating completeness. In some cases, such omissions may reflect inconsistencies in communication, training, or clarity of expectations rather than deficiencies in performance, and the policy is intended to mitigate overly rigid or punitive interpretations.

In addition, the revisions provide greater clarity regarding the evaluation of scholarly, creative, and professional growth activities by distinguishing between engagement in scholarly processes and the production of scholarly outputs. This is consistent with the principles of Resolutions 252632 and, to a greater extent, 252633. This distinction is particularly important in developmental and post-tenure review contexts, where sustained engagement, trajectory, and professional growth are central considerations alongside traditional measures of dissemination and impact. By framing a broader range of activities as meaningful evidence of engagement, the policy supports a more nuanced and context-sensitive evaluation of faculty work while still recognizing and prioritizing the importance of peer-reviewed and publicly disseminated outputs. These distinctions should be discussed and articulated as units revise their

Unit RTP criteria. Collectively, these refinements further align WPAF expectations with the varied purposes of faculty review and promote a fair, developmental, and forward-looking evaluation process.

Distribution List:

President

Provost and VP for Academic Affairs

AVP for Faculty Affairs

College Deans

Dean of the Library

College Associate Deans

General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Acting Appointments – Handbook Changes

RES 252647

FAC

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

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

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

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

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

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

309.9 Appointment of other Interim University-Wide Academic Administrators

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

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

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

309.10 Appointment of Interim College or School Deans

- a. **Acting appointments may be made when an administrator is temporarily unavailable due to short-term circumstances (e.g., leave, illness, or temporary reassignment), and continuity of operations is required. Acting appointments shall only be made when there is insufficient time to engage in the full consultative process required for interim appointments.** Acting appointments are intended to be brief in duration and shall not

exceed 90 calendar days. Acting appointments do not require the full consultation process required for interim appointments; however, the appointing authority shall consult with the Chair of the Academic Senate and notify the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. If the need for administrative coverage extends beyond 90 calendar days, the appointment shall transition to an interim appointment and follow the procedures outlined in this section.

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

309.11 Appointment of Interim College or School Associate Deans

- a. **Acting appointments may be made when an administrator is temporarily unavailable due to short-term circumstances (e.g., leave, illness, or temporary reassignment), and continuity of operations is required. Acting appointments shall only be made when there is insufficient time to engage in the full consultative process required for interim appointments. Acting appointments are intended to be brief in duration and shall not exceed 90 calendar days. Acting appointments do not require the full consultation process required for interim appointments; however, the appointing authority shall consult with the Chair of the Academic Senate and notify the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. If the need for administrative coverage extends beyond 90 calendar days, the appointment shall transition to an interim appointment and follow the procedures outlined in this section.**

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

Rationale:

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

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

Distribution List:

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



Teaching Modality - Handbook Changes

RES 252648

AAC, FAC

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

203.11 **Distributed Learning Committee**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

303.1.1 Teaching Assigned Courses

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

The assignment of courses includes responsibility for the mode of instruction (e.g., face-to-face, flex, or online). The determination of course modality is primarily a departmental or program-level decision, made through established curricular and

scheduling processes and grounded in pedagogical appropriateness, disciplinary standards, and student learning outcomes. [Departments and programs shall ensure that a sufficient proportion of courses are offered in face-to-face format, recognizing that face-to-face instruction is the primary and expected mode of instruction at CSUB.](#)

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

College Deans retain a [managing](#) role to ensure that instructional offerings within the college are consistent with the University mission, student access needs, and resource constraints. Any decision that departs from the department's or program's recommendation shall be documented in writing and grounded in academic, operational, or resource-based considerations. Changes to course modality after registration begins shall require approval of the College Dean or designee.

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

This resolution affirms that teaching modality is fundamentally a pedagogical matter best determined by departments and programs, while also recognizing the responsibility of College Deans to ensure that instructional offerings align with institutional mission and student expectations, including the University's emphasis on face-to-face instruction as its primary mode of delivery.

The resolution further responds to the prolonged inactivity of the Distributed Learning Committee by reinforcing expectations for its operation and oversight role. The Distributed Learning Committee (DLC) policy has not been updated in more than a decade, and the Faculty Coordinator of Online Instruction position has been discontinued. During this period, instructional modalities have evolved substantially. Online and flex teaching are now

integral components of many faculty members' regular teaching assignments, and CSUB no longer requires certification for online instruction. These handbook revisions redefine the role and scope of the DLC to reflect current institutional practices. Maintaining clear, functional, and faculty-driven policies for online and flex instruction is essential to instructional quality, shared governance, and institutional coherence.

Distribution List:

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:



Expressions of the Senate – Bylaws Changes

RES 252624

EC

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

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

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

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

Attachments: Senate Bylaws

Distribution List:

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

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

Sections

I. Governance of Meetings

II. Meeting Times and Dates

III. Order of Business for Meetings

IV. Standing Committees

V. Expressions of the Senate

VI. Amendments

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

SECTION I: GOVERNANCE OF ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

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

Senate Bylaws

Approved/Revised XXXX_XX

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

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

SECTION II: ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING TIMES AND DATES

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

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

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

SECTION III: ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

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

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

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

SECTION IV: STANDING COMMITTEES

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section V: Expressions of the Senate

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

A. Statements of the Senate

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

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

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

Statements of the Senate:

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

B. Votes of No Confidence

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

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

iii. Ratification by the General Faculty.

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

SECTION VI: AMENDMENTS

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



Academic, Curricular, and Student Support Software Governance

RES 252629

AS&SS

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

RATIONALE:

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

Distribution List:

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



**Readmission Requirements Following Academic Disqualification
RES 252641**

AS&SS, AAC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. One-semester Readmission Pathway:

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

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

2. Two-Semester Readmission Pathway:

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

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

RATIONALE:

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

Distribution List:

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

Department Chairs
General Faculty

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Other units for consideration for distribution list:

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

Vice-President for University Advancement

Vice-President for People and Culture

Chief of Staff to the President

AVP for Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment

AVP for Grants, Research and Sponsored Programs

AVP for Information Technology Services and Chief Information Officer

AVP for Student Affairs and Dean of Students

AVP for Enrollment Management

Director of Enrollment Management Systems (formerly Academic Operations)

Director of Undergraduate Advising

Executive Director of Associated Students, Inc.

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

Director of Athletics



New Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering

RES 252638

AAC, BPC

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

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

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

Distribution List:

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:


Academic Senate

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



2025-2026 REFERRAL #37

New Degree Proposal for Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering

From: Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair 

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

Date: January 20, 2026

cc: Katherine Van Grinsven, Academic Senate Administrative Analyst

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

During your discussion, please consider:

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

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

Thank you.

Attachments:

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

DR. MELISSA DANFORTH, CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE

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



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

RES 252639

AAC, BPC

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

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

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

Distribution List:

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



2025-2026 REFERRAL #38

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

From: Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair

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

Date: January 22, 2026

cc: Katherine Van Grinsven, Academic Senate Administrative Analyst

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

During your discussion, please consider:

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

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

Thank you.

Attachments:

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

DR. MELISSA DANFORTH, CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE

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

Additional Questions

Is this program an accredited educator preparation program?

No

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

Yes

Supporting Documentation

Placeholder.docx

Key: 49



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

RES 252640

AAC, BPC

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

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

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

Distribution List:

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



2025-2026 REFERRAL #40

Department Name Change Request for HD-CAFS

From: Melissa Danforth, Academic Senate Chair

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

Date: January 20, 2026

cc: Katherine Van Grinsven, Academic Senate Administrative Analyst

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

During your discussion, please consider:

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

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

Thank you.

Attachments:

- (1) Department of HD_CAFS name change.doc

DR. MELISSA DANFORTH, CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE

California State University, Bakersfield

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



Policies & Procedures for Establishing New Schools

RES 252643

EC

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Bakersfield, adopt the document entitled “Policies & Procedures for Establishing New Schools,” as submitted by the Criteria for Proposing New Schools Task Force.

RATIONALE: Currently, there are no formal policies governing the establishment of new schools at CSUB. The proposed guidelines address this gap by providing a comprehensive framework for the formation of new schools, modifications to existing schools, and the procedures required to establish such entities.

The Criteria for Proposing New Schools Task Force, composed of representatives from the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC), Budget & Planning Committee (BPC), Academic Support & Student Services Committee (AS&SS), and Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), conducted an extensive review of policies and procedures from other California State University (CSU) campuses to inform its work. The resulting document reflects consensus-based recommendations and establishes a formal policy to guide future decisions regarding the creation and modification of academic schools.

Attachment: Final Report_Policies and Procedures for Establishing New Schools.pdf

Distribution List:

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved:

Academic Senate

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

Academic Senate Task Force

School Formation Criteria

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

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

Composition of Criteria for Proposing New Schools Task Force:

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

CSU Bakersfield
Policies and Procedures for Establishing New Schools

- I. Policy Purpose
 - A. The process for creating new schools within the colleges should be uniform and transparent.
 - B. A uniform system of school creation shall allow for fair and efficient mechanisms to be in place for interested parties to create schools.
- II. Policy
 - A. Definitions and Operative Terms
 - i. Principal academic sub-units are colleges at California State University, Bakersfield, whose chief primary academic/administrative officers are deans. Departments, schools, and programs are standard terms for units within colleges.
 - ii. Departments and schools are each part of a college, reporting to a college dean. Schools may, but need not necessarily, include more than one department, division, or program, as well as centers and institutes.
 - iii. Academic departments or schools serve as administrative units within the university's respective colleges and are organized around specific fields of academic inquiry and pedagogical outcomes.
 - iv. Departments offer a major, minor, and/or credential, and may offer a certificate. Schools, and any subordinate departments located within the school, will offer majors, minors, and/or credentials, and may offer a certificate.
 - v. Departments are led by department chairs, and schools by directors. In a school with multiple departments, department chairs will report to the school director. Both department chairs and school directors will be selected according to the University Handbook, and report to the dean of a college. The director of a school which has multiple departments from different colleges will report to the dean of the college in which the school is located.
 - vi. Considerations that will normally apply in designation of one or more units as a school include professional accreditation, licensing, or certification requirements for graduates, size of the unit(s) and common practice in higher education of administratively referring to the discipline as a school.
 - B. Purpose of an Academic School
 - i. The purpose of a school is to support the mission of the university by offering academic programs in the disciplines it houses, promoting academic inquiry and critical thinking within and across disciplines, and engaging in disciplinary and interdisciplinary research, scholarship, and creative activities.
 - ii. To qualify as a school, the proposed entity must:
 - 1. Offer a set of academic programs, approved through the appropriate curricular review process (department, college, university, and CSU system levels), that lead to undergraduate or graduate degrees.
 - 2. Ensure to its faculty the rights and responsibilities of Academic Freedom, as defined by the American Association of University Professors, to engage in free inquiry and dissent in both scholarship and instruction. This includes the rights of the school and units within to initiate curricular proposals, to make autonomous decisions on instructional materials, pedagogy, delivery mode, and grading systems/practices. The faculty unit is free to offer its own views and interpretations that may dissent from the received views of either the discipline or in any other arena of society.

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

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

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

IV. Procedures for Establishing a New School

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

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

ii. Faculty Composition

Include the following information:

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

C. Budgetary, Financial, and other Resource Considerations

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

D. Planned Implementation and Timeline

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


V. New School Proposal: Procedure for Review

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

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

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

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

Signature: 
Email: yko@csub.edu


Signature: 
Email: lbishop@csub.edu

Signature: 
Deborah Cours (Dec 9, 2025 16:23:22 PST)
Email: dcours@csub.edu

Signature: 
Email: rdugan2@csub.edu

Signature: 
Email: hhe@csub.edu

Signature: *Amber Stokes*
Email: astokes2@csub.edu

Signature: 
Debbie Wilson (Dec 9, 2025 15:15:27 PST)
Email: dwilson4@csub.edu



Post-Enrollment Requirement Checking (PERC) Timing Alignment for Prerequisite Verification and Enrollment Stability
RES 252642

AS&SS, AAC

- RESOLVED:** That Post-Enrollment Requirement Checking (PERC) report generation be scheduled following the semester grade submission deadline and no later than nine business days after the semester grade submission deadline, to allow sufficient time for departments to review prerequisite fulfillment and notify affected students; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the initial PERC process apply only to students identified through the initial report run, and that additional late grade postings or updates be managed through regular departmental advising practices rather than repeated PERC cycles; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That, while PERC reports shall be generated no later than nine business days after grades are due, departments and advisors shall receive PERC results no later than six business days after the PERC report is generated to support proactive advising and schedule adjustments; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That students identified through PERC as not having met prerequisite requirements be provided with a minimum notification period of five business days before any administrative drops are processed, and that no student be dropped without an opportunity to meet with an academic advisor, to support appropriate advising intervention, (except for extreme circumstances) and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That the Office of Academic Programs publish the PERC processing timeline each semester and communicate it to department chairs, faculty, advisors, and students, including (1) confirmation of grade submission completion, and (2) expected dates for PERC distribution and follow-up; and be it further
- RESOLVED:** That this timeline and process be included in Academic Affairs procedural guidance and referenced in department chair onboarding and semester-start communications.
- RATIONALE:** Aligning the timing of Post-Enrollment Requirement Checking (PERC) with the period immediately following the Registrar's confirmation of grade submission allows departments adequate time to verify prerequisite completion and support students in adjusting their schedules. Establishing a nine-business day PERC deadline provides



ACADEMIC SENATE
CSU BAKERSFIELD

departments with practical flexibility while helping to minimize last-minute schedule disruptions.

Requiring that students receive at least five business days of notice before administrative drops and ensuring that no student is dropped without the opportunity to

meet with an advisor, promotes equitable access to academic guidance. These changes enhance clarity, predictability, and consistency in the prerequisite verification process and support student enrollment stability.

Distribution List:

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

Approved by the Academic Senate:

Sent to the President:

President Approved: