ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

Wednesday, November 6, 2013
1 – 2:50 p.m. (approx.)
Commons 206

I. Approval of agenda

II. Approval of minutes of 10/02/2013 meeting *emailed on 11/04/2013*

III. Chair's report: Vivienne Bennett Referrals to committees *attached*

IV. Vice chair's report: Laurie Stowell

V. President's report: Karen Haynes *unable to attend*

VI. Provost's report: Graham Oberem

VII. ASCSU report: Brodowsky

VIII. CFA report

IX. ASI report: Matthew Walsh

X. Standing Cmte oral reports (5 mins each, max): APC, FAC, GEC, LATAC, UCC *written reports attached*

XI. Consent Calendar

NEAC Recommendations *attached*
UCC Course & program change proposals *attached*

XII. Action items *These are items scheduled for a vote, including second reading items.*

FAC Lecturer evaluation policy revision *attached*

XIII. Discussion items *These are items scheduled for discussion, including first reading items.*

A. EC Resolution re LAMP report *attached*
B. FAC University RTP policy: joint hires *(pending EC action)* *attached*
C. UCC MILS courses *(pending EC action)* *attached*
D. GEC GE program mission statement *attached*
E. GEC Syllabus guidelines: adding learning outcomes *attached*
F. SAC Field Trips policy, new *attached*
G. EC Resolution on presidential search process *attached*
H. BLP Resolution on restructuring *attached*
I. LATAC Resolution in support of CALM *attached*

XIV. Presentations

Integrated co-curricular program, Dilcie Perez ***Time certain 2:15 pm***

XV. Senators' concerns and announcements

Next meeting: December 4, 2013

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

Committee	Description
FAC	CHABSS lecturer faculty evaluation policy
NEAC	Conflict of interest in standing committees
NEAC/PAC	PAC membership: IDS seat
APC	Reconcile Credit Certificates policy to reflect how our campus now awards stackable certificates and Master's degrees (consult with Eisenbach/Gonzalez and possibly Schroder)
GEC	CLEP exams for GE credit
LATAC	Develop definitions of online, distance, and distributed learning
NEAC	Consider letting unfilled seats (following spring election) become "at large" seats, and then revert back to original representation at term end
APC	Convene Arts & Lectures task force
FAC	CEHHS RTP document
APC	Grad. Student Probation, Disqualification, and Reinstatement policy re immediate disqualification for egregious conduct
FAC	Sabbatical & DIP Leave policies re changes to sabbatical project after approval
FAC/NEAC	Form a joint task force re lecturer seats on Senate

CONSENT CALENDAR

NEAC Recommendations

Committee	Seat & Term	Name(s)
Academic Senate	CoBA 13-15	Qi Sun
Budget & Long-range Planning Cmte (BLP)	CHABSS 13/14	Robert Yamashita
Student Grievance Committee (tenure req'd)	CoBA 13-15	Ted Shore
California Indian Culture & Sovereignty Center review cmte	At large 13/14	Liliana Rossmann (CHABSS)
California Indian Culture & Sovereignty Center review cmte	At large 13/14	Tom Spady (CSM)

UCC Course & Program Change Proposals

SUBJ	No.	Course/Program Title	Form	Originator	To UCC	UCC Approved
VSAR	460	Art & Social Change	C	Kristin Moss	3/12/13	9/26/13
PHIL	342	Philosophy of Technology	C	Jessica Mayock	3/22/13	10/3/13
EDUC	P-2	M.A. in Educ: Option in Communicative Sciences & Disorders	P-2	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	632	Augmentative and Alternative Communication	C	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	645	Supervised Clinical Experience: Clinical Internship	C	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	653	Professional Seminar III	C	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	654	Grand Rounds in SLP	C	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	644	Supervised Clinical Experience: Student Teaching	D	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	652	Professional Seminar	C-2	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	665	SLP Services for Cleft Palate and Craniofacial Anomalies	C	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	681	Audiology	C-2	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	693	Seminar in Counseling in CSD	C-2	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	694	Seminar in Autism Spectrum Disorders	C-2	Sue Moineau	3/11/13	10/3/13
EDSL	673a	Language Disorders in Adults	C	Sue Moineau	10/1/13	10/3/13
EDSL	673b	Cognitive-Linguistic Disorders in Adults	C	Sue Moineau	10/1/13	10/3/13
WMST	351	Black Feminist Thought & Activism (formerly WMST 300-2)	C	Sheryl Lutjens	3/22/13	10/17/13
PSYC	P-2	Minor in Psychology	P-2	Sharon Hamill	4/5/13	10/24/13
GEOG	330	Geographic Info Systems Explorations across the curriculum	C	K Knowles-Yanez	8/30/12	10/24/13
GEOG	491	Geospatial Analysis Internship	C	K Knowles-Yanez	8/30/12	10/31/13
OM	442	Procurement and Supplier Management	C-2	R Aboolian	10/17/13	10/31/13
MIS	388	Java Programming for Business Applications	C	Yi Sun	9/19/13	10/31/13
MIS	488	Mobile Project Development and Agile Management	C	Yi Sun	9/19/13	10/31/13

Rationale: *The following changes have been approved by FAC. Some minor changes have been made for accuracy and/or clarity.*

Definition: A policy governing the evaluation of lecturer faculty at CSUSM.

Authority: The collective bargaining agreement between The California State University and the California Faculty Association.

Scope: Lecturer Unit 3 faculty at CSUSM.

I.   PURPOSE

This document establishes a university-wide procedure for CSUSM for the periodic evaluation of Lecturer Faculty, including librarians and counselors (SSP-ARs), taking into account the need to:

A.   Comply with Board of Trustees policies, Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, the California Education Code; the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and other applicable State and Federal laws pertaining to the employment of Lecturer Faculty.

B.   Be consistent with the terms outlined in the appointment letters issued to Lecturer Faculty.

C.   Provide Lecturer Faculty with feedback to improve teaching and student learning.

D.   Provide evaluators with materials for the periodic evaluation of Lecturer Faculty.

E.   Provide appropriate administrators with documentation to base reappointment and other personnel actions relating to Lecturer Faculty.

II.   DEFINITIONS

A.   A *Lecturer Faculty* member (or *Lecturer*) is a full-time or part-time Unit 3 employee appointed for one or more semesters off the tenure track. *Full-time* refers to an appointment totaling fifteen units in a semester, within one department, program or equivalent. *Part-time* refers to an appointment totaling fewer than fifteen units in a semester.

B.   A *semester or equivalent* means an academic semester or a four-month appointment period.

C.   The *evaluation cycle* is the period of service being evaluated as specified in this procedure; e.g. one semester, one academic year, three years, or six years.

D.   The *appropriate administrator* for each college and the library is the Dean or Associate Dean. The *appropriate administrator* for counselors is Director of Student Health and Counseling or the Associate Vice President of Student Development Services.

E.   Composition of the Peer Review Committee (PRC)

The Department or appropriate academic unit is responsible for determining the size and election conditions of the PRC. The Department Chair shall ensure that there is an election of a PRC. Where no Department Chair exists, the department or appropriate faculty governance unit will ensure that there is an election of a PRC.
The PRC shall be composed of at least three full-time tenured faculty nominated and elected by the tenure-track and Lecturer Faculty in the department (or equivalent)faculty in the Lecturer's department (or equivalent), with the chair elected by the committee. If there are

not enough eligible faculty members in a department or program, the department or program shall elect Peer Review Committee members from eligible university faculty in related academic disciplines.

Each College or equivalent unit shall adopt procedures for electing a Peer Review Committee from the eligible faculty. These procedures must follow the CBA Article 15 provisions for Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty Unit Employees~~guidelines of the CBA~~.

F. The Working *Personnel Action File* (WPAF) shall be defined as that file specifically generated for use in a given evaluation cycle. That file shall include all required forms and documents, all information specifically provided by the Lecturer being evaluated, and information provided by faculty, students and academic administrators. It shall also include all faculty and administrative level evaluation recommendations from the current evaluation cycle, and all rebuttal statements and responses submitted (CBA 15.8). The WPAF may be submitted in electronic format. Guidelines for electronic submission may be obtained from the college / division.

The materials in the WPAF shall be incorporated by reference into the PAF. At the beginning of the evaluation cycle, the Lecturer being evaluated shall prepare an index of these materials and submit it with the WPAF. Lecturer faculty shall appropriately update the index to reflect any material added to the WPAF during the course of the evaluation. This index and the CV shall be permanently placed in the PAF by the Dean's office (or appropriate administrator). At the end of the evaluation cycle, the WPAF shall be returned to the Lecturer (CBA 15.9).

G. The *Personal Action File* (PAF) shall be defined as "the one (1) official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee." Only the official PAF shall be used as the basis of personnel actions (CBA 11.1).

H. Colleges/divisions and/or departments/programs may also provide additional evaluation criteria, which may be termed *Standards*. Such *Standards* must be approved in accordance with campus policy, such as the policy on *Temporary Faculty Unit 3 Employees-Department Level Standards and Additional Material for Evaluations*.

I. Throughout this document, the word "*shall*" indicates mandatory action; the word "*may*" indicates voluntary action.

III. GENERAL PROCEDURE

A. No later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term, the Office of Faculty Affairs shall provide each Lecturer a copy of the *Procedure for Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty*. During that time frame, the college/division and/or department/program shall provide its specific evaluation standards and/or criteria (if any). Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the ~~evaluation~~ peer review committees and the academic administrators prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun, there shall be no changes in evaluation criteria and procedures (CBA 15.3).

B. Each academic year, the Office of Faculty Affairs shall publish *Timetables for the Periodic Evaluation of Lecturer Faculty*. The timelines shall include deadlines for submission of the WPAF as well as for each stage of the evaluation. All Lecturer evaluations must be completed in accordance with the established deadlines. Each spring, the Dean's Office or appropriate administrator shall give to department chairs and their equivalents a list of Lecturers appointed in their program areas, including the terms of their appointments and entitlements (if any).

C. Prior to the beginning of the evaluation process, the Lecturer shall be responsible for the identification of materials they wish to be considered and for the submission of such materials. (CBA 15.12a)

D. Review for Completeness: evaluating committees and administrators shall be responsible for identifying materials relating to the evaluation *not* provided by Lecturers (CBA 15.12 a.). For Lecturer appointments specified in Sections IV.A and IV.C, below, department chairs shall review the file for completeness and contribute such information to the appropriate administrator.

E. Once a WPAF is declared complete, additional material may only be inserted with the approval of the ~~evaluation~~ peer review committee, as applicable, and the appropriate administrator and shall be limited to items that became accessible after this declaration. Material inserted in this fashion shall be returned to the initial level ~~evaluation~~ peer review committee, as applicable, for review, evaluation and comment before consideration at subsequent levels of review (if any). If, during the evaluation process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the WPAF shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner (CBA 15.12 b).

F. The WPAF shall be forwarded in a timely manner to the next level of review, as applicable (CBA 15.4). At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to the next level, the Lecturer shall be given a copy of the recommendation and the written reasons thereof. The Lecturer may submit a written rebuttal or response within ten (10) days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and also be sent to ~~all~~ the previous level~~s~~ of review, as applicable (CBA 15.5).

G. Faculty, students, academic administrators and the President may contribute information to the evaluation of Lecturer Faculty. Information submitted by the Lecturer and by academic administrators may include statements and opinions about the qualifications and work of the Lecturer provided by other persons identified by name. (CBA 15.2)

H. Only tenured faculty and academic administrators may engage in deliberations and make recommendations on the evaluation of Lecturers (CBA 15.2). Only tenured faculty can serve on peer review committees (PRC).

I. Probationary and Lecturer Faculty may provide peer input, if so requested by the Lecturer being evaluated, but they may not engage in deliberations or make recommendations.

J. Written or electronic Student Evaluations of Instruction shall be required for all Lecturers who teach, in accordance with the CBA. The results of these evaluations shall be placed in the Lecturer's PAF or may be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the PAF. Individuals involved in evaluations and personnel recommendations and decisions shall be provided secure access for these purposes (15.15).

K. Lecturers with appointments in more than one department, program or equivalent shall be evaluated separately by each department, program or equivalent based on their appointment in that department, program or equivalent.

L. A request for an external review of materials submitted by a Lecturer may be initiated at any level of review and by any party to the review. Such a request shall specify the special circumstances that necessitate an outside reviewer and the nature of the materials needing external review. The request must be approved by the President or President's designee with the concurrence of the Lecturer (CBA 15.12 d).

M. When classroom visits are utilized as part of the evaluation, the Lecturer shall be provided at least five (5) days notice that a peer visit is to take place. There shall be consultation between the Lecturer and the individual who visits their classes (CBA 15.14).

N. The Lecturer shall be provided an electronic copy of the evaluation, which must be signed and returned by the Lecturer (electronically or in hard copy). The signed evaluation shall be placed in the Lecturer's PAF (CBA 15.27). If the signed evaluation is not returned in 10 days, an unsigned copy shall be placed in the Lecturer's PAF.

O. All reappointment decisions and other personnel actions shall be based only upon evidence in the Lecturer's PAF (CBA 11.1).

IV. EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS BY TYPE OF APPOINTMENT

A. **Lecturer Hired for One Semester or Less:** A Lecturer hired for one semester or less shall be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair, the appropriate administrator, or the department or equivalent. The Lecturer may request that an evaluation be performed (CBA 15.25).

B. **Full-Time Lecturer Not Eligible for a Three-Year Appointment:** A full-time Lecturer appointed for an academic year but not eligible for a three-year appointment shall be evaluated on a yearly basis. This evaluation shall include Student Evaluations of Instruction, if applicable, evaluation by a PRC of the department or equivalent, evaluation by the appropriate administrator, and an opportunity for peer input, if requested by the Lecturer (CBA 15.23).

C. **Part-Time Lecturer Not Eligible for a Three-Year Appointment:** A part-time Lecturer appointed for an academic year but not eligible for a three-year appointment shall be evaluated on a yearly basis. This evaluation shall include Student Evaluations of Instruction, if applicable, evaluation by the department chair or the appropriate administrator, and an opportunity for peer input, if requested by the Lecturer (CBA 15.24).

D. **Full- or Part-Time Lecturer Eligible for an initial Three-Year Appointment:** A full- or part-time Lecturer eligible for a three-year appointment shall be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of a three-year appointment. This evaluation shall include Student Evaluations of Instruction, if applicable, evaluation by a PRC of the department or equivalent, evaluation by the appropriate administrator, and an opportunity for peer input, if requested by the Lecturer.

The evaluation shall consider the Lecturer's cumulative work performance during the entire qualifying period for a three-year appointment and shall rate the Lecturer as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" (CBA 15.28).[1]

E. **Full- and Part-Time Lecturer Holding a Three-Year Appointment:** A full- or part-time Lecturer holding a three-year appointment shall be evaluated in the third year of the appointment. The Lecturer may be evaluated more frequently upon their request or at the request of the President or designee (CBA 15.26). This evaluation shall include Student Evaluations of Instruction, if applicable, evaluation by a PRC of the department, evaluation

---

[1] "A three-year appointment shall be issued if the temporary faculty unit employee is determined by the appropriate administrator to have performed in a satisfactory manner in carrying out the duties of his/her position. The determination of the appropriate administrator shall be based on the contents of the Personnel Action File and any materials generated for use in any given evaluation cycle pursuant to 15.8. Where the appropriate administrator determines that a Temporary Faculty Unit Employee has not performed his/her duties in a satisfactory manner, then the reasons for his/her determination shall be reduced to writing and placed in the Personnel Action File" (CBA 15.28).

by the appropriate administrator, and an opportunity for peer input, if requested by the Lecturer.

The evaluation shall consider the Lecturer's cumulative work performance during the entire three-year appointment and shall rate the Lecturer as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" (CBA 15.29).[2]

V.   WORKING PERSONNEL ACTION FILE (WPAF)

A.   A WPAF is required for all Lecturer Faculty being evaluated.

B.   For the purposes of the periodic evaluation, the WPAF for Lecturers with teaching duties shall include:

1.   WPAF Checklist, completed and signed by the Lecturer (Appendix A)
2.   Index of Materials
3.   Current curriculum vitae
4.   A list of all courses taught in the department or equivalent
5.   One representative syllabus for each course taught during the evaluation cycle
6.   The complete university-prepared report of the Student Evaluations of Instruction for all courses evaluated in accordance with the CBA during the evaluation cycle (CBA 15.15)[3]
7.   Course materials such as sample lesson plans, assessments of student learning outcomes, assignments, and examples of student work, pertaining to the evaluation cycle
8.   Materials required in accordance with approved college/division and/or department/program or equivalent criteria
9.   Copies of all prior periodic evaluations with responses/rebuttals (if any)
10.   A copy of the relevant university procedure, and all college /division, and department/program Lecturer evaluation criteria
11.   Mailing address to which a copy of the Lecturer's evaluation may be sent

C.   For the purposes of the periodic evaluation, the WPAF for Lecturers, Librarians and Counselors whose primary duties are not teaching shall include:

1.   WPAF Checklist, completed and signed by the Lecturer (Appendix B)
2.   Index of Materials
3.   Job Description or Assignment of Responsibility
4.   Current curriculum vitae
5.   Materials required in accordance with approved college/division and/or department/program or equivalent criteria
6.   Copies of all prior periodic evaluations with responses/rebuttals (if any)
7.   A copy of the relevant university procedure, and all college /division, and department /program Lecturer evaluation criteria
8.   Mailing address to which a copy of the Lecturer's evaluation may be sent

---

[2] "A subsequent three-year appointment shall be issued if the temporary faculty unit employee is determined by the appropriate administrator to have performed in a satisfactory manner in carrying out the duties of his/her position. The determination of the appropriate administrator shall be based on the contents of the Personnel Action File and any materials generated for use in any given evaluation cycle pursuant to 15.8. Where the appropriate administrator determines that a Temporary Faculty Unit Employee has not performed his/her duties in a satisfactory manner, then the reasons for his/her determination shall be reduced to writing and placed in the Personnel Action File" (CBA 15.29).

[3] "All classes taught by each faculty unit employee shall have such student evaluations unless the President has approved a requirement to evaluate fewer classes after consideration of the recommendation of appropriate faculty committee(s)."

D.   For the purposes of the periodic evaluation, the WPAF may also include:

   1.   Any other evidence relevant to the duties of the appointment
   2.   Evidence of scholarship, professional development, creative activities, and/or service to the campus, the community and/or the profession, whether or not these are required by the appointment. (If these activities are not required by the appointment but are performed voluntarily, they may be recognized as an additional positive factor in the evaluation. However, a lack thereof shall not be considered a negative factor in the evaluation.)
   3.   Optional peer input from the period being evaluated
   4.   A self-assessment or reflection with respect to the duties of the appointment for the evaluation cycle

VI.   CONSIDERATIONS

A.   Lecturers shall be evaluated in compliance with the Unit 3 CBA, in accordance with this procedure, and following the criteria approved by their colleges/divisions and by departments /programs (if any). In case of conflict between college/division criteria or department/ program criteria and this University-wide procedure, the University-wide procedure shall prevail.   This procedure is subject to Board of Trustees policies, Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, the California Education Code, the Unit 3 CBA, and other applicable State and Federal laws.

B.   Lecturer Faculty shall present the relevant evidence in each category (or area) of performance of their appointment. Each level of review is responsible for evaluating the quality and significance of all evidence presented.

C.   Every evaluator, at all levels of review, shall read the Lecturer's WPAF.

D.   In the evaluation of teaching performance, Student Evaluations of Instruction shall not constitute the sole evidence of teaching quality.

E.   The Lecturer shall have access to their WPAF at all reasonable times except when the WPAF is undergoing review.

F.   Maintaining confidentiality is an extremely serious obligation on the part of reviewers. Lecturers who believe that confidentiality has been broken may pursue relief under the CBA (CBA 10).

G.   The issuance of a three-year appointment shall be determined by the appropriate administrator based on the contents of the Lecturer's PAF and any materials generated for use in any given evaluation cycle. Where the appropriate administrator determines that a Lecturer has not performed their duties in a satisfactory manner, then the reasons for their determination shall be reduced to writing and placed in the PAF (CBA 15).

WPAF Required Items Checklist for Lecturers with Teaching Duties

Faculty initials	Item
	Completed Checklist (initialed, signed, and dated by review candidate)
	Index of materials
	Current Curriculum Vitae
	A list of all courses taught in the department or equivalent
	One representative syllabus for each course taught during the evaluation cycle
	The complete university-prepared report of the Student Evaluations of Instruction for all courses evaluated in accordance with the CBA during the evaluation cycle
	Course materials such as sample lesson plans, assessments of student learning outcomes, assignments, and examples of student work, pertaining to the evaluation cycle
	Materials required in accordance with approved college/division and/or department / program or equivalent criteria
	Copies of all prior periodic evaluations with responses/rebuttals (if any)
	A copy of the relevant university procedure, and all college / division, and department / program Lecturer evaluation criteria
	Optional: Any other evidence relevant to the duties of the appointment
	Optional: Evidence of scholarship, professional development, creative activities, and/or service to the campus, the community and/or the profession, whether or not these are required by the appointment.
	Optional: Peer input from the period being evaluated.
	Optional: A self-assessment or reflection with respect to the duties of the appointment for the evaluation cycle.

I verify that all items are included in the file: _____

                                                   Signature   **Date**

**WPAF Required Items Checklist for Librarians, Counselors
and Lecturers whose Primary Duties are not Teaching**

Faculty initials	Item
	Completed Checklist (initialed, signed, and dated by review candidate)
	Index of materials
	Job Description or Assignment of Responsibility
	Current Curriculum Vitae
	Materials required in accordance with approved college/division and/or department / program or equivalent criteria
	Copies of all prior periodic evaluations with responses/rebuttals (if any)
	A copy of the relevant university procedure, and all college / division, and department / program Lecturer evaluation criteria
	Optional: Any other evidence relevant to the duties of the appointment
	Optional: Evidence of scholarship, professional development, creative activities, and/or service to the campus, the community and/or the profession, whether or not these are required by the appointment.
	Optional: Peer input from the period being evaluated.
	Optional: A self-assessment or reflection with respect to the duties of the appointment for the evaluation cycle.

I verify that all items are included in the file: _____

  Signature   **Date**

EC: Resolution Regarding the Long-range Academic Master Plan (LAMP)

RATIONALE: Pursuant to an Academic Senate resolution passed in Spring 2012, CSUSM launched a Long-Range
Academic Master Plan (LAMP) process in AY 2012-2013. The AY 2012-2013 LAMP task force solicited from the
Colleges proposals for new majors, minors, certificates, and master's-level programs in order to project programmatic
planning into the next 10 years. Considering local regional needs as well as internal assessments, this task force
proposed criteria against which such proposals should be assessed and prioritized. The tasks of assessing and
prioritizing these proposals are now at hand. This resolution asks the Senate to endorse the continuation of the LAMP
process, asking this year's new task force to utilize the criteria developed in AY 2012-2013 as their starting point.

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of California State University San Marcos (Senate) acknowledge the hard work of the Long-range Academic Master Plan (LAMP) task force of Academic Year 2012-2013, as evidenced by the report submitted by that task force (appended hereto); and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Senate approve the continuation of the Long-Range Academic Master Planning process, according to the attached proposal, which builds on the AY 2012-13 task force's work; and be it further

RESOLVED, That, to achieve the goals set forth in the proposal, the Senate endorse compensation in the form of a 3 unit release each year for the task force's co-chair; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Senate endorse the LAMP task force's AY 2012-2013 report,[4] including the criteria for vetting and prioritizing curriculum proposals for majors, minors, graduate-level degrees, and certificate programs to guide the work of the task force in AY 2013-14; and be it further

RESOLVED, That, in the spirit of shared governance, the Senate invite the administration to adopt the principles set forth in the proposal to ensure the successful collaboration needed to achieve the goals of the long-range planning efforts.

PROPOSAL re: Process for Developing CSUSM's Long-range Academic Master Plan (LAMP):

<u>Part 1:</u> **Membership of Task Force to Develop CSUSM'S LONG-RANGE ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN:**

BLP Chair or Designee	Co-Chair[5]
Provost's Designee	Co-Chair
AVP for Academic Programs	
One faculty member from each College & Library (nominated by NEAC; confirmed by Academic Senate)[6]	
One representative from IITS	
One representative from Student Affairs	
Chair of Academic Senate or Designee	
Dean of Graduate Studies or Designee	
Dean of Extended Learning or Designee	
ASI President or Designee	

Staff support to the task force has been assured by the Provost's Office and is critical to the success of the task force's work. We also anticipate resource support from will be needed from Institutional Planning & Analysis (IPA), Instructional & Information Technology Services (IITS), Enrollment Management Services (EMS), Office of Community Engagement, and Extended Learning.

---

[4] EC's review revealed that some programs were listed twice in Appendix A. These duplicate listings should be deleted.

[5] While it would be preferable if the LAMP Co-Chair were always a BLP member, this may not always be possible. If the Co-Chair is not a BLP member, a BLP member shall serve either as one of the College's representatives or as a non-voting liaison from BLP to the task force.

[6] These faculty members should be experienced with College-level long-range planning.

51 <u>Part 2:</u> **PROPOSED CHARGE OF TASK FORCE:** This body will be responsible for drafting a Long-range
52 Academic Master Plan (LAMP) to guide CSUSM's curricular development both into the near future (i.e., the next
53 3-5 years) as well as over the long term (potentially as far as 10 years out).   This group will vet and prioritize
54 proposals for new degree programs as put forward by faculty within and across all of CSUSM's Colleges. In
55 vetting and prioritizing proposals, this task force will also make recommendations regarding future funding
56 priorities as well as recommendations about the timeline for implementing such programs. However, the LAMP
57 must be understood as a flexible plan that can be adjusted over time as unforeseen circumstances arise.
58
59 **UPCOMING TASKS & PROPOSED TIMELINE:**
60 **Fall 2013:** The Senate is asked to endorse the LAMP AY 2012-2013 report, including its criteria for evaluating and
61 prioritizing proposals. We anticipate that the Colleges will spend Fall 2013 reviewing, updating, and prioritizing
62 their own curricular priorities. These priorities will be developed collaboratively among current faculty and
63 administrators and in conjunction with community partners. In preparing a proposal to submit for the University-
64 wide LAMP, each College will need to develop a coherent plan that address the Senate-approved LAMP criteria.
65 This will most logically be carried out in conjunction with the development of the Colleges' "3-year rolling plans,"
66 which include outlines of anticipated funding needs during the planning period.
67
68 The proposals submitted by the Colleges to the University LAMP for review in Spring 2014 will be new programs
69 (majors, minors, certificates, credentials, and graduate degrees). However, care should be taken that new
70 program development does not come at the expense of existing programs.
71
72 **Spring 2014:** The LAMP task force will vet and prioritize proposals for new degree programs (including new
73 majors, minors, certificates, credentials, and graduate degrees), which will result in a draft Long-Range Academic
74 Master Plan. This draft LAMP shall be submitted for comment to the Academic Senate and AALC simultaneously.
75 At the annual EC retreat in August, the LAMP will be discussed with the objective of sending it to the Senate as an
76 agenda item at the first Academic Senate meeting of the new Academic Year, subject to approval, revision, or
77 rejection by the Academic Senate.
78
79 **After Approval by the Academic Senate:**
80   • Pursuant to LAMP 2012-2013 task force's recommendations, the LAMP should be reviewed and updated
81   each year by the LAMP task force, consistent with the submission of each college's prioritized proposals.
82
83 **TASK FORCE'S RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING PLANNING MECHANISMS, INCLUDING BLP & ACADEMIC**
84 **SENATE:**
85   • Once adopted, the Long-Range Academic Master Plan (LAMP) will inform our traditional planning
86   reviews, particularly those of BLP, into the next decade. However, this task force will not supplant
87   traditional shared governance at CSUSM, including the roles played by BLP, UCC, and the Academic
88   Senate.
89   • As it reviews proposals and data, the task force must stay in close and continuing contact with BLP, the
90   Academic Senate, and AALC regarding their proposed procedures, schedules, and work products.

FAC: University RTP policy – Joint Appointments

Rationale: Two joint appointment faculty searches approved in CHABSS prompted a review of the University RTP policy regarding joint appointments. FAC was asked to prioritize this matter so that a working policy might be in place by the end of the academic year, in time for the joint appointments to be made starting with fall semester. Although searches in CHABSS were the immediate catalyst, FAC has engaged the issues and written policy to address joint appointments in any academic unit in the university.

 FAC has worked intensively on this task over the last two months, considering the CHABSS "Interdisciplinary and Emerging Programs Task Force Recommendations" and also informal feedback from faculty and administrators on other CSU campuses. In light of the CBA, and our understanding of best practices, FAC recommends the Academic Senate create a new section on joint appointment in the University RTP document and also create a new document of guidelines on the Joint Appointment Memorandum of Understanding.

[New section to be added to University RTP policy: Joint Appointments]

Appointment

A "Joint Appointment" is an appointment made jointly in more than one academic department or equivalent unit. [CBA 12.1] Criteria for individual Joint Appointments shall be set forth in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), according to the "Instructions—Memorandum of Understanding for Joint Appointment**."**

Evaluation

For faculty with a Joint Appointment, reviews shall be conducted by a committee with representation from each department in which the individual holds an appointment. [CBA]

Election of Joint Appointment Peer Review Committee (PRC):
The Joint Appointment PRC shall consist of three eligible faculty. The election of the Joint Appointment PRC members shall adhere to established Department(s)/Unit(s) PRC election processes as much as possible.

The Joint Appointment PRC requires one eligible faculty member be selected by the tenure-track faculty in each of the Department(s)/Unit(s) party to the joint appointment, plus one eligible faculty member nominated by the Candidate.

Each Department/Unit shall run an election to select its member for the Joint Appointment PRC. [Membership eligibility shall adhere to the University RTP Policy and the CBA]

In the case of insufficient eligible members, the Department/Unit shall elect its Joint Appointment PRC member from a related academic discipline [CBA 15.40]

The third member shall be nominated by the Candidate from the Candidate's "majority Department/Unit" (the Joint Appointment establishes one Department/Unit has a greater weight).   In the case of a 50/50 Joint Appointment, the Candidate may nominate from either Department/Unit. In the case of insufficient eligible members, the Candidate shall nominate a member from a related academic discipline. [CBA 15.40] The Candidate's nominee must receive endorsement of a simple majority of the faculty in both Departments/Units in order to be elected to the Joint Appointment PRC.

Responsibilities of Joint Appointment PRC:
Conduct a review of the Candidate's WPAF according to:
 1. Departmental/Unit standards, college and the university policies
 2. The Collective Bargaining Agreement
 3. Memorandum of Understanding

56 <u>Memorandum of Understanding</u>
57 Criteria for individual Joint Appointments shall be set forth in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
58 that establishes the distribution of work expected in the three areas (teaching, research and service). The
59 MOU shall set forth how Department/Unit RTP standards apply. [See MOU Instructions]
60
61 The MOU shall be placed in the Personnel Action File (PAF). The MOU is a required element in the
62 Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). If the MOU is changed, it will be placed in the PAF, and it, as
63 well as all previous version of the MOU, shall be placed in the WPAF).
64
65 [Also proposed: Delete section iv.c.3.]
66 ~~In the case of a faculty member with a joint appointment, the peer review committee shall include when~~
67 ~~possible representatives from both areas with a majority of members on the committee elected from the~~
68 ~~department or program holding the majority of the faculty member's appointment. If a faculty member~~
69 ~~holds a 50/50 joint appointment, the committee will have representatives from both departments.~~
70
71 *Also proposed: Add definition of "joint appointment" and modify RTP checklist to specify that, for*
72 *faculty with a joint appointment, the MOU is a required element. These items are less time sensitive and*
73 *will be presented separately.*
74

INSTRUCTIONS—MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR JOINT APPOINTMENT

The initial Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) must be attached to the offer of employment for a joint appointment. The MOU shall be signed after the offer of employment is made and accepted. Signatures required: Dean, Department chairs/Unit directors; faculty member accepting joint appointment.

The MOU shall be placed in the Personnel Action File (PAF). The MOU is a required element in the Working Personnel Action File. If the MOU is changed, it will be placed in the PAF, and it, as well as all previous versions of the MOU, shall be placed in the WPAF).

The following are required elements of a MOU, and shall be addressed specifically for each appointment.
1. Participating Units in the Joint Appointment and their respective weight (50/50 or other)
2. Title and Rank of Joint Appointment Faculty
3. The MOU shall set forth how Department/Unit RTP standards apply
4. Workload Distribution in Department(s)/unit(s)
    a. The workload distribution for the Joint Appointment shall not be excessive or unreasonable. [CBA 20] Expectations for workload shall be consistent with workload expectations in a single Department/Unit appointment.
    b. Teaching (percent in each department/unit and corresponding WTUs[7]):
    c. Service
        i. Minimum service expectations shall be detailed in the MOU.
    d. Research
        i. Shall not be defined by percentage;
        ii. May be disciplinary (Department(s)/Unit(s)), interdisciplinary, or both
        iii. Shall serve the university mission
5. Office location/instructional support resources/administrative support/research support
6. Role and responsibilities of Department(s)/Unit(s) chair(s)/director(s)
    a. In evaluation process
    b. Other
7. Statement about Changing the MOU:
    a. The MOU may be changed according to the needs of the department/unit and students following consultation with the faculty member.
8. Recommended Option: Include in MOU a plan for mentoring (e.g. committee consisting of representatives from each unit).

---

[7] Ensure the percentage assigned to each Department/Unit correlates to whole, not fractional, WTUs that correlate numerically to courses that could be assigned in the Department(s)/Unit(s).

Military Science 101, 102, 103, and 104 are a series of 3-unit Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) courses focused on leadership, communication skills, and the structure and organization of the U.S. Army. The courses are "sponsored" by the College of Business Administration, since there is no official ROTC program at CSUSM. Currently CSUSM ROTC students must commute to San Diego State University to take these required courses.

MILS 101, 102, 201, and 202 were first examined by UCC on 4/22/13 and have been substantially revised during three rounds of review involving both the 12/13 UCC and the 13/14 UCC. Even in their current revised form, the courses differ substantially from most college-level curriculum in that they are highly repetitive and lack a typical prerequisite structure. However, their content and structure are largely standardized by the U.S. Army, with virtually identical courses taught at many CSU and UC campuses. The courses will not count toward any major, though the units may be applied toward a degree which contains free elective units. This is also true of the ROTC courses that CSUSM students currently take at San Diego State.

On 10/31/13 UCC voted to recommend the courses for Senate Approval, with a vote tally of 4 Yes, 2 No, and 1 Abstention. UCC members casting dissenting votes expressed concern at the repetitive/redundant structure of the curriculum. These courses are being brought to the Senate as Discussion Items (rather than the typical inclusion of C-forms on the Consent Calendar) based on the recommendations of the Senate ROTC Task Force (2008).

For Senate review, all C-forms, Course Syllabi, email acknowledgement/support of the courses from First Year Programs, and an email chain summarizing UCC's review comments and the responses of the course originators are all included at this link:

http://www.csusm.edu/senate/meetings/meetingdocs/1314/MILS_Cforms-syllabi-emails_AS-Nov2013.pdf

2
3   **Mission Statement**
4
5   The GE Program has been developed in the context of the University's Mission, Vision and
6   Values, and American Association of Colleges and Universities' Essential Learning Outcomes
7   from the LEAP initiative, as per Executive Order 1065.
8
9   The General Education curriculum supports the development of CSUSM students as effective
10 communicators, critical thinkers and life-long learners. It also promotes their development into
11 responsible adults and informed citizens capable of functioning in, and contributing to, a rapidly
12 changing world. The University encourages students to examine moral and ethical issues; the
13 historical past and its relationship to the present; human behavior, culture and language, values
14 and institutions; modern sciences and technology; human diversity and issues that are both
15 global and local.   To this end, the GE program has been designed to facilitate students'
16 interactions with these fundamental values.
17
18 The General Education program at CSUSM has four foundational goals. First, students will
19 develop competency in the basic skills characteristic of an educated person: critical thinking,
20 quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and communication, with an emphasis on
21 developing clear, coherent, and effective writing skills. Second, students will cultivate their
22 knowledge of human cultures and the natural and physical world. To this end, students will be
23 exposed to and think critically about diversity; the interrelatedness of peoples in local, national
24 and global contexts; the interaction of science, technology and society; and how organisms
25 interact with their environments. Third, the GE program will foster students' growth in personal
26 and social responsibility. Fourth, students will integrate this knowledge through their exposure
27 to both disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to academic fields of study.
28
29 The aim of CSU San Marcos is to instill in its students the enthusiasm and curiosity, the healthy
30 skepticism, and the habit of continuing inquiry that are central to all truly educated men and
31 women. The goal is to enable them to realize their potential as enlightened individuals and
32 productive members of society in a world of change.

2

3   ***Rationale****: The WASC 2013 Handbook of Accreditation Criterion for Review 2.3 states the*
4   *following:*

5

6   The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated
7   at the **course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional** level. These outcomes and
8   standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and are aligned with
9   advisement, library, and information and technology resources, and the wider learning
10   environment. (Emphasis added.)

11

12   *Criterion for Review 2.4 states the following:*

13

14   The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by
15   faculty and **widely shared among faculty, students**, staff, and (where appropriate) external
16   stakeholders. The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for establishing
17   appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement
18   of these standards.

19

20   **GUIDELINE: Student learning outcomes are reflected in course syllabi.**
21   (Emphasis added.)

22

23   *The stratification of learning objectives at the course and program level is a matter with*
24 *which our campus has been busy for several years. Most faculty have been closely involved with*
25 *development of learning objectives/outcomes in the programs of their own departments. The GE*
26 *program is also a 'program' with learning objectives and outcomes which the GEC has been*
27 *composing. In GE, learning outcomes at the Area level (e.g., Area A2, B2, C3, D, E) were*
28 *completed and approved by Academic Senate in 2012 and 2013. GE learning outcomes at the*
29 *program level are partially developed.*

30

31   *In order for these learning outcomes to meet the criteria for review of WASC, the GEC sees it*
32 *as necessary to make it a guideline that these learning outcomes be posted in syllabi of all GE*
33 *courses.*

34

35 ## **Guideline:**

36

37 The syllabus or first-day handout of a general education course at CSUSM must include the
38 following:
39   1. A web link to the online location of the GE Program learning outcomes (when available);
40   2. A web link to the online location of the GE learning outcomes for which the course is
41   certified;
42 The campus syllabus guidelines shall be updated to include this directive.

43

44 The GE learning outcomes at area and program levels shall be posted in a public place on the
45 campus web server in a format which is easily copied and pasted for use in individual syllabi.

46

Rationale: Per Executive Order 1062, campuses are required to establish policy and procedures designed to maximize the educational experience, mitigate risk to participants and minimize the university's liability exposure.

DEFINITION: A policy governing any university course-related, off-campus activity led by a faculty or staff member and designed to serve educational purposes.

AUTHORITY: Executive Order 1062

SCOPE: This policy applies to all employees involved with field trips, as such term is defined herein.

I.   DEFINITION

A field trip is a university course-related, off-campus activity organized by a faculty member, and designed to serve educational purposes. The travel must occur concurrently with enrollment in the course and the faculty must provide an alternative assignment for students unable and/or unwilling to participate. A field trip may include a museum visit, participation in a conference or competition, or visits to an event or place of interest. The duration of a field trip may be a class period or longer, and could extend over multiple days. This definition does not apply to activities or placements in the context of a teacher preparation program, intercollegiate sports, internships, student activities or service-learning placements, all of which are governed under separate policy.

II.   REQUIREMENTS

The appropriate CSUSM administrator(s), faculty and/or staff shall:

1. Identify all courses that involve off-campus field trips.
2. Require the use of the approved liability waiver. See Executive Order 1051.
3. Ensure student emergency contact information is obtained prior to the field trip. The campus must have emergency contact information readily available. Emergency contact information will be kept by the sponsoring faculty member and provided to a designated department contact and the University Police Department.
4. Provide students with an instructional agenda, health and safety information, emergency procedures, and the student code of conduct prior to the field trip.
5. Require a pre-trip evaluation that might include a site visit, review of online materials, and research on travel logistics to and from the site that demonstrate and document sufficient knowledge of the field trip site.
6. Include a plan to accommodate students with special needs.
7. Provide training for any equipment that may be used on the activity.
8. Provide for an alternative assignment for students unwilling to accept the risk of participation.
9. Comply with the California State University Use of University and Private Vehicles Policy Guidelines and the California State University student travel policy, where applicable. See Executive Order 1041.
10. Retain documents related to the field trip consistent with system-wide and campus document retention guidelines. See Executive Order 1031.
11. Administer regular reviews to monitor and document compliance with the field trip policy and update requirements as necessary at regular intervals.

EC: Resolution Endorsing the California State University, Long Beach, Academic Senate's
'Resolution on Presidential Search' (adopted 9/19/13)

WHEREAS, On September 19, 2013, the Academic Senate at California State University, Long Beach, adopted a 'Resolution on Presidential Search,' now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of California State University San Marcos endorse the CSULB 'Resolution on Presidential Search' as well as the Rationale; and be it further

RESOLVED, That this resolution be sent to Governor Brown, the CSU Board of Trustees, Chancellor White, the ASCSU, all CSU campus Academic Senates, and to the CSUSM campus community.

CSULB: RESOLUTION ON PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH
(Adopted September 19, 2013)

WHEREAS, the CSU Board of Trustees will be conducting a search for a new president of California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) in the academic year 2013/14;

WHEREAS, the Academic Senate of the California State University, Long Beach (ASCSULB) recognizes that the CSU Board of Trustees' Policy for the Selection of Presidents of September 20-21, 2011 states that "the Chancellor and the Chair of the TCSP [Trustees Committee for the Selection of the President] determine whether to schedule campus visits, which are optional, or to schedule campus visits on a modified basis, depending on the circumstances of the search";

WHEREAS, that same Policy affirms a "deep commitment throughout the process to the principles of consultation with campus and community representatives";

WHEREAS, the omission of the official campus visits would mean less transparency in the search and hence possibly less trust from the University and the public in the outcome of said search;

WHEREAS, the presidential candidates' official campus visits give the CSU Board of Trustees and the TCSP as well as the University and the public important insight into the candidates' knowledge of, and ability to lead, the students, faculty, staff, and administration of CSULB; and

WHEREAS, the ASCSULB wishes to affirm that the incoming president of CSULB will of course ultimately be judged *not* on the procedures by which he or she was selected *but* on his or her performance as president;

be it therefore

RESOLVED, that the ASCSULB strongly encourages the Chancellor and the TCSP to schedule official campus visits for the finalists in the search for a new president of CSULB in the academic year 2013/14; and

RESOLVED, that the ASCSULB strongly encourages the CSU Board of Trustees to revisit their Policy for the Selection of Presidents of September 20-21, 2011 and once again make official campus visits for finalists in presidential searches mandatory.

BLP: Resolution on restructuring

WHEREAS, An institution's relevance to its constituencies sometimes dictates that its structure must adapt to meet changing needs; and

WHEREAS, The goal of any such structural change must be to enhance the institution's ability to fulfill its mission, vision, and values and to meet the needs of its constituents, now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate expresses its commitment to the principles and guidelines provided below.

I. Principles

The goal of Academic Affairs' organizational structure is to facilitate employees' performance of their duties and responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner in achieving the overall mission of Academic Affairs. These principles were originally presented to the campus in the Final Report of the Academic Affairs Structure Task Force (January, 2009). We continue to view these as the criteria against which any restructuring proposals should be evaluated.

1. Any change in the organizational structure needs to be consistent with the mission, vision, core values, and goals of Academic Affairs.

2. The organizational change needs to be consistent with the Division's human, fiscal and physical resources. There must be sufficient resources to sustain the new unit(s), and the change should produce a net positive benefit for the entire division.

3. The organizational change should result in more effective and efficient decision-making and operation in terms of effective communications, coordination and integration of efforts across and within units.

4. The organizational change should provide for clear authority, responsibility, and control/accountability.

II. Recommended Process

We urge a collaborative consultation process to ensure that any restructuring is carried out in a manner consistent with the principles of shared governance. We would anticipate that any proposals for reorganization or new structures would include consultation with the relevant Departments, Schools, and Colleges as well as with the Academic Senate, including the Senate's Budget & Long Range Planning committee.

We include the following flow charts simply as examples of consultative processes. These flow charts were also first put forward by the Final Report of the Academic Affairs Structure Task Force (January, 2009), which was endorsed by the Senate in Spring, 2010.

Academic Affairs Structure: Recommended Process for Structuring Academic Units

46 _____

47 *Create*[8]

48 The appropriate administrator may hire an outside consultant to prepare the proposal when sufficient expertise in the subject matter is deficient internally.

49   ↗ To AALC   ↘

50   Initiator   To Provost

51   ↘ To Senate BLP → To Academic Senate ↗

52 _____

53 *Merge*

54   ↗ To AALC   ↘

55 Initiator → To Schools or Colleges affected → Faculty Vote → To Deans affected   To Provost

56   ↘ To Senate BLP → To Academic Senate ↗

57 _____

58 *Split*

59   ↗ To AALC   ↘

60 Initiator → Faculty in splitting units vote → aggregate School or College vote recorded →To Dean   To

61 Provost

62   ↘ To Senate BLP →To Academic Senate ↗

63 _____

64 *Transfer*

65

66 Initiator → To Schools or Colleges affected → Faculty Vote → To Deans affected → To Provost

67 _____

68 *Abolish*

69   ↗ To AALC   ↘

70 Initiator[9] → Faculty in affected units vote → School or College faculty vote →To Dean   To Provost

71   ↘ To Senate BLP →To Academic Senate ↗

72 _____

73

---

[8] If the process requires a curriculum change, the proposal is sent to the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) concurrent with Budget and Long-Range Planning (BLP) review.

[9] The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) of the Academic Senate may initiate the formation of an Ad Hoc Program Review Committee (AHPRC) when "the PAC finds that the Program Review report fails to document satisfactory program viability." Thus the PAC may be the initiator, and the process outlined in Appendix C of the PAC policy on Program Review will be followed.

LATAC: Resolution in Support of the CSUSM Affordable Learning Solutions Initiative

WHEREAS, CSU San Marcos students face economic challenges in completing their degrees, and the 2008 California Bureau of State Audits Report indicates that the average CSU student pays an estimated $812 per year for textbooks; and many studies have shown book prices have risen at least 6% a year yielding a 2013 cost estimate of over $1000; and

WHEREAS, The growing availability of low or no cost, high-quality online or open access instructional content, as well as lower-cost commercially published content, has provided a possible alternative to traditional textbooks in many disciplines; and

WHEREAS, New technologies are becoming available that make it possible for CSU San Marcos faculty, staff and students to discover, choose, create, and use digital or open access content; and

WHEREAS, The Affordable Learning Solutions program is an initiative launched by the CSU Chancellor's Office in 2010 to assist faculty in choosing and providing quality affordable educational content for students; and

WHEREAS, The goal of the Affordable Learning Solutions initiative campaign is to make a CSU degree more affordable while protecting quality learning experiences for students; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate support CSU systemwide efforts that encourage CSU faculty to consider using high quality, low cost or no cost, accessible textbook alternatives, such as those promoted by the Affordable Learning Solutions initiative, while also preserving academic freedom; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate support the Cougars Affordable Learning Solutions Initiative (CALM) initiative developed by IITS and urges faculty to consider participating in the CALM initiative; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate urge faculty to assist in this effort by utilizing existing procedures to keep costs down such as complying with textbook request due dates in order to give the bookstore time to provide lower cost options such as buyback, used books, rentals, etc.; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate urge all faculty to continue exploring ways to increase the use of high quality, low cost or no cost, accessible instruction materials alternatives.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Policy Committee (APC)

APC is currently working on:
1. Policy for demonstrating English language competence for international students
2. Dual Listing of LD and UD Courses
3. Policy that defines online and hybrid courses
4. Challenge Exam Policy Revision
5. Guidelines for Syllabi

Budget & Long-Range Planning Committee (BLP)

Restructuring Document: At the request of the Senate's Chair, BLP has put forward a set of recommended principles and suggested procedures for the restructuring of units within Academic Affairs. The document will get a first reading at today's Senate meeting.

P-form Reviews: BLP has is reviewing the following program proposals:
    Minor in Computational Biology/Biostatistics (CSM)
    M.S. in Kinesiology (School of Health Sciences & Human Services, CEHHS)

Extended Learning Commission Grants: Per procedures developed last year to ensure faculty input on program development, BLP will once again this year review and rank CSUSM faculty proposals submitted for the CSU's annual grants from the Commission on the Extended University. Check with Dean Schroder for more information.

LAMP Process: Today's Senate agenda includes a resolution moved and seconded by the Executive Committee that would endorse moving forward with the Long-Range Academic Master Planning (LAMP) process that was launched in AY 2012-2013. BLP's chair was actively involved in the development of this proposal, in collaboration with other EC members and the task force's co-chairs, and BLP has been kept up-to-date on this collaboration as well.

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

Over the last two months, FAC has been working intensively on the highest priority charge we received from the Executive Committee--developing a RTP policy for Joint Hires. Other items pending on our agenda are:
1.   Conferring with the Office of Institutional Planning and Assessment regarding their Pilot Project on all-online student evaluation this semester;
2.   Revisiting the Post Tenure Periodic Evaluation document;
3.   Revisiting the Emeritus Policy;
4.   Update of the CEHHS RTP document

General Education Committee (GEC)

- New GE Mission statement, to replace the introduction to the 1994 GE Philosophy statement on today's agenda.
- Preparing new guidelines on inclusion of GE learning outcomes in syllabi of GE courses
- Review of the lower division GE curriculum with the 2013 lower division GE forms: departments should indicate by Nov. 15 what courses will be submitted for continuing certification; due date January 29 for filling out new GE forms.
- Studying how to review GE curriculum for diversity and global content.
- Articulating connection between program learning outcomes/LEAP goals and GE areas.
- Studying what GE areas should articulate with CLEP exams.
- Agreed to continue the 'soft enforcement' of the 60 unit rule for upper division GE. Students are advised not to take upper division GE before attaining 60 units and are denied credit if they have less than 50 units.

Library & Academic Technology Advisory Committee (LATAC)

LATAC drafted a resolution in support of IITS' Cougars Affordable Learning Materials initiative. LATAC is currently reviewing the charge to the committee; drafting definitions for face to face, online, and hybrid instruction; and analyzing the campus IP policy and EL contracts with regard to online course materials.

Nominations, Elections, Appointments & Constitution Committee (NEAC)

NEAC has worked to help recruit and recommend faculty for vacant committee seats through its fourth call for volunteers. In addition, we conducted an election for the CHABSS Humanities & Arts Promotion & Tenure Committee seat. We recommended changes to the Student Affairs Committee's (SAC's) charge and consulted the chairs of interdisciplinary programs about their thoughts on the possible addition of an interdisciplinary seat on the Program Assessment Committee (PAC).

Program Assessment Committee (PAC)

PAC is working to complete its responses to the Professional Science Masters in Biotechnology and Literature and Writing Studies B.A. Program Reviews. This includes reviewing and responding to the program Self Studies and responses from the external reviewers and Deans of the Library, IITS, and Colleges.

Student Affairs Committee (SAC)

SAC has met four times this academic year. In accordance with our priorities, we finalized the by-law revisions and field trip policy. Both were submitted to EC. EC responded positively to the changes in the by-laws so that task has been completed. SAC is waiting for feedback on the field trip policy. Co-chairs Robertson-Howell and Daniels met with Scott Gross about the President's Task Force on internships and other community learning experiences. Both groups (SAC and the task force) will work collaboratively to identify all campus activities that fall under the umbrella of "Engaged Education" and to create policies and models for supporting this work. Karno Ng from the Student Grade Appeals Committee requested help from SAC in informing students about the new processes for appealing grades. Dr. Ng will present at the November 12 SAC meeting.

University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

Work completed since the Oct. Senate meeting: Following review and consultation with proposing faculty, UCC recommended approval of 27 C-forms (new course), 5 C-2 forms (course change), 1 D form (course deletion), 2 P-2 forms (program change), and 1 P-form (new program). All of this curriculum is reflected on the consent calendar or will be brought to the Senate as discussion items at the Nov. or Dec. Senate meetings. Specific discussion items on the agenda for the current Senate meeting are four C-forms for new ROTC courses (MILS 101, 102, 201, 202). C-forms are not typically taken up as items of New Business by the Senate, but the ROTC task force (2008) recommended that all ROTC courses be brought to the Senate floor for discussion.

As an informational item, UCC plans to bring two C-forms (ANTH 360, 465) to the Senate floor as New Business at the December meeting, with a proposal to suspend the rules. The justification for bringing these courses to the Senate as items of new business and the request to suspend the rules will be elaborated in the UCC Chair's oral report. UCC encourages Senators to closely examine the ANTH 360/465 packet, which will be provided prior to the December Senate meeting.

Continuing work: UCC is currently reviewing curriculum which was originally submitted to UCC in April 2013. Curriculum is typically reviewed in the order received (i.e. the earlier the submission date, the higher the review priority). Given the substantial backlog of new curriculum yet to be reviewed, UCC encourages faculty to submit any curriculum forms for courses which they plan to implement in AY 14-15 as soon as possible. Current status of curriculum review can be monitored by faculty at the Academic Programs Curriculum Review Website at: http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/curriculumscheduling/catalogcurricula/2013-14_curriculum.html