

**AGENDA**  
 Executive Committee Meeting  
 CSUSM Academic Senate  
 Wednesday ~ February 12, 2014 ~ Kellogg 5207

- I. Approval of agenda
- II. Approval of minutes of 02/05/2014 meeting
- III. Chair's report, [Vivienne Bennett](#)  
 Referrals to committee:   FAC   RTP Standards: Psychology  
                                   BLP   Policy re self-support delivery of existing programs
- IV. Vice chair's report, [Laurie Stowell](#)
- V. Provost's report, Graham Oberem
- VI. Discussion items
  - A. Discuss and finalize EC recommendations re Halualani & Assoc. *see 2/10/14 email*
  - B. Bonnie Bade's email and draft replies (serve as response to attached CHABSS department chairs' letter?) *see 2/10/14 & 2/11/14 emails*
  - C. Directors as eligible faculty *attached*
  - D. APC   Grad. probation, disqualification, & reinstatement policy revisions *attached*
  - E. FAC   Sabbatical leave policy revisions *attached*
  - F. FAC   Brakebill award policy revisions *attached*
  - G. BLP   Self-support delivery of existing programs *attached*
  - H. LATAC Proposed revised charge *attached*
  - I. UCC   Flow chart re opposition to a course/program *attached*
  - J. Addressing UCC's workload/creating Graduate Studies Program & Policies Cmte.
  - K. Senate chair & vice chair terms
- VII. EC members' concerns & announcements

Coming soon to EC & Senate	
<b>EC</b>	3/19 President Haynes will attend
<b>Senate</b>	3/5 Graduation Initiative update, Palliative Care presentation

*Next meeting: February 19, 12-2 p.m. ~ Kellogg 5207*

1   **DATE:**            **January 17, 2014**  
2  
3   **TO:**               **Vivienne Bennett, Chair, and**  
4                       **Executive Committee**  
5                       **Academic Senate**  
6  
7   **FROM:**           **Concerned Chairs**  
8                       **College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences**  
9                       Jocelyn Ahlers, Liberal Studies  
10                      Roger Arnold, Economics  
11                      Michael Hughes, Modern Language Studies  
12                      Sheryl Lutjens, Women’s Studies  
13                      Cyrus Masroori, Political Science  
14                      Elizabeth Matthews, Global Studies  
15                      Michael McDuffie, Philosophy  
16                      Salah Moukhlis, Literature and Writing Studies  
17                      Liliana Rossmann, Communication  
18                      Miriam Schustack, Psychology  
19                      Jill Watts, History  
20  
21   **RE:**               **Curriculum Process and December Academic Senate Meeting**

22  
23   We write to share with the Senate Executive Committee our deep concern about the Senate  
24   discussion of the Anthropology course proposals at the December 4, 2013 Academic Senate  
25   meeting. The issues of concern are several, and from our perspective, each of them requires urgent  
26   action on the part of the entire Senate and its committees.

27  
28   First, the procedural concerns: the Senate facilitated a discussion of courses that had already been  
29   vetted and approved by two required levels of faculty scrutiny of curricular proposals. In terms of  
30   process, the CHABSS curriculum committee had already reviewed, reconciled, re-reviewed, and  
31   approved the courses. The CHABSS curriculum committee sent the approved courses forward to  
32   UCC with memos from Native Studies, Anthropology, and the committee itself in order to provide  
33   UCC with a complete account of the college’s decisions to support the Anthropology courses. The  
34   UCC received the Anthropology proposals (after this lengthy and surely delayed review and  
35   decision), conducted its own review, and unanimously approved the courses. UCC’s decision to put  
36   the courses on the agenda for floor discussion and vote, rather than onto the consent calendar, ran  
37   counter to its usual practice. To agendize these courses rather than placing them on the consent  
38   calendar had the effect of undermining of the work of the CHABSS CAPC and the UCC; it had the  
39   further effect of privileging the concerns raised by the non-approving faculty member above the  
40   responses of the proposing department *and* the careful consideration of the curriculum  
41   committees. UCC’s decision to not place these courses on the consent calendar represents a  
42   change in practice that should be examined and articulated; it also implies that the “do not  
43   approve” mark made by one faculty member should take precedence over two years of  
44   deliberation, and unanimous approval, by both College and University curriculum committees.

45

46 We therefore request that the Senate consider and articulate the meaning of the “do not approve”  
47 box on curricular forms, as well as its procedure for handling irreconcilable opposition to courses  
48 and programs in future.

49  
50 Second, concerns about the personnel affected: the UCC and Senate Executive opened the  
51 discussion of the new Anthropology courses to the full Senate and visitors, at the expense of the  
52 Assistant Professor who proposed and would teach these courses. As stated above, this discussion  
53 took place at the instigation of UCC itself, rather than because a Senator requested that the courses  
54 be removed from the consent calendar for floor discussion; such an action runs contrary to the  
55 usual practice and happened in spite of UCC’s unanimous approval of the courses. These facts  
56 together had the effect of heightening the impact of the discussion, because they implied that UCC  
57 and the Senate shared the concerns raised by the objecting faculty. This was compounded by the  
58 fact that the discussion was allowed to focus in many points on the qualifications of the proposer of  
59 the courses, rather than the course content and curricular value. Decisions about who might or will  
60 teach proposed new courses are solely a departmental responsibility, and subjecting the courses to  
61 the scrutiny of a large group of Senators, ad hoc observers, and non-faculty guests had costly  
62 consequences for Dr. Laurette McGuire, who was hired to teach the very courses that had been  
63 proposed. The debate about the courses impugned Dr. McGuire’s credentials, expertise, and  
64 experience, and did so publicly; in essence, her competence, rather than the content of the courses  
65 and their curricular appropriateness, became part of the debate. One outcome of this is that Dr.  
66 McGuire has, understandably, withdrawn from the Senate; another, broader, outcome is to create a  
67 general climate of fear and hostility on the Senate floor, particularly for junior faculty members who  
68 may wish to participate in the Senate.

69  
70 It is our recommendation to you that the Senate take immediate action to restore Dr. McGuire’s  
71 reputation and to do so publicly.

72  
73 Beyond the inappropriate critique of an assistant professor’s ability and right to teach courses for  
74 which she was hired, important matters of disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity are raised.  
75 Specifically, who has the right or privilege of criticizing Anthropology’s disciplinary methods, subject  
76 matter, and development? More broadly, what assumptions about the relationships among  
77 disciplines inform the curriculum process? And the necessary interdisciplinarity which means,  
78 among other things, that our social and intellectual realities can be studied from varied disciplinary  
79 perspectives at the same time, and that one department or unit does not own a part of reality? As  
80 Department Chairs, these questions concern us greatly. We would like to see a careful look at the  
81 spaces of conflict created by the curriculum process, including, for example, how approvals are  
82 sought and from whom and what understanding of the horizontal approvals (or vetoes) is  
83 imbedded in curricular traditions. It also seems crucial to us that we restate the principles of  
84 collegiality, respect, and trust that have for so long informed our acceptance of each department’s  
85 integrity and responsibility to hire qualified faculty to teach courses that are not owned by  
86 individuals.

87  
88 We look forward to hearing from the Senate leadership on these issues.

## Directors as “eligible faculty”

### Constitution & Bylaws excerpt: Article 3: Faculty Membership

Voting members of the Faculty shall consist of tenured and tenure-track persons holding faculty rank, library faculty, Student Services Professional-Academic Related faculty (hereafter, SSP-AR), and full-time temporary faculty holding at least one-year appointments in academic departments.<sup>1</sup> Faculty with the voting franchise shall be called eligible faculty.

Persons with substantial managerial and supervisory responsibilities that involve faculty and academic programs are excluded from membership. Persons holding MPP appointments are excluded.<sup>2</sup> Persons with work assignments that are substantially similar to the duties and responsibilities of persons holding MPP appointments are excluded.<sup>3,4,5</sup>

---

#### Endnotes

1. Disputes shall be resolved by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

2. MPP, addressing the employment rights, benefits, and conditions of The CSU employees designated as 'management' or 'supervisory' under the HEERA. The Calif. Code of Regulations, Title 5.Education.Division 5: Board of Trustees of The CSU, Article 2.2: Management Personnel Plan uses definitions as specified in HEERA. Supervisory and managerial employee work assignments are described in HEERA.

3. HEERA California Codes, Government Code, Section 3580.3 "Supervisory employee...With respect to faculty or academic employees, any department chair, head of a similar academic unit or program, or other employee who performs the foregoing duties primarily in the interest of and on behalf of the members of the academic department, unit or program, shall not be deemed a supervisory employee solely because of such duties; ... Employees whose duties are substantially similar to those of their subordinates shall not be considered to be supervisory employees.

4. HEERA California Codes, Government Code, Section 3560-3562.1. Definitions: Section 3562 (1) - "managerial employee means any employee having significant responsibilities for formulating or administering policies and programs. No employee or group of employees shall be deemed to be managerial employees solely because the employee or group of employees participate in decisions with respect to courses, curriculum, personnel and other matters of educational policy. A department chair or head of a similar academic unit or program who performs the foregoing duties primarily on behalf of the members of the academic unit or program shall not be deemed a managerial employee solely because of those duties."

5. CBA 2002 contract, Article 20, Workload: Administrator as used in the CBA refers to an employee serving in a position designated as management or supervisory in accordance with HEERA. The CBA provides further definitions of faculty.

"The primary professional responsibilities of instructional faculty members are: teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity; and service to the University, profession and to the community. The performance of instructional responsibilities extends beyond duties in the classroom and includes such activities as: preparation for class, evaluation of student performance, syllabus preparation and revision, and review of current literature and research in the subject area, including instructional methodology. Research, scholarship and creative activity in the faculty member's field of expertise are essential to effective teaching. Mentoring students and colleagues is another responsibility that faculty members are frequently expected to perform.

"The assignment of a librarian may include, but shall not be limited to, library services, reference services, circulation services, technical services, online reference services, teaching in library subject matter, service on system-wide and campus committees and task forces and activities that foster professional growth, including creative activity and research.

"The assignment of Counselor faculty may include, but shall not be limited to, individual counseling, group counseling, consultation and referral, intern training and supervision, teaching, service on system-wide and campus committees and task forces and activities that foster professional growth, including creative activity and research.

"Faculty members have additional professional responsibilities such as: advising students, participation in campus and system-wide committees, maintaining office hours, working collaboratively and productively with colleagues, and participation in traditional academic functions."

1                   **APC: Graduate Probation, Disqualification, & Reinstatement policy revision**  
2

3     **Rationale:** *This current campus policy is undergoing review and revision as a result of emerging*  
4 *issues in addressing graduate student academic probation cases. The current policy is not clear*  
5 *about specific terms and procedures for implementing academic probation and disqualification.*  
6 *The policy clarifies distinctions between academic and administrative probations and*  
7 *procedures for implementing administrative probation and disqualification based on CSU*  
8 *Education Code Title 5 Sections 41300/41300.1 and CSU Chancellor’s Office Executive Order*  
9 *1038. The draft revised policy has been reviewed by the CSUSM Academic Senate Academic*  
10 *Policies Committee (APC) and the CSUSM Graduate Studies Council (GSC).*  
11

12     **Definition:**           It is the policy of California State University San Marcos to place graduate  
13                                   students on academic or administrative probation when their overall work is  
14                                   less than satisfactory, as reflected in a deficient cumulative grade point  
15                                   average, or other failure to make adequate academic progress. Graduate  
16                                   students are dismissed from the university through academic disqualification  
17                                   when the conditions needed to achieve good standing are not met in a timely  
18                                   fashion. Consideration for reinstatement is provided through a petition  
19                                   process.  
20

21     **Authority:**            Executive Order 1038.  
22

23     **Scope:**                Students admitted to Graduate Standing: Conditionally Classified; Post  
24                                   baccalaureate Standing; Classified; and Graduate Standing: Classified.  
25                                   Students admitted to Post baccalaureate Standing: Unclassified will be  
26                                   governed by the undergraduate policy on Academic Probation,  
27                                   Disqualification and Reinstatement.  
28

29           I. PROBATION  
30

31           A.           A student will be placed on academic probation if, during any academic term, the  
32                           cumulative GPA falls below 3.0 in for all course work in the master’s program  
33                           subsequent to admission to the program falls below 3.0.  
34

35           B.           A student may also be placed on administrative-academic probation by the Dean  
36                           of Graduate Studies for any of the following reasons:  
37

38                   1.           Withdrawal from all or a substantial portion of a program of studies in  
39                           two successive terms or in any three terms. (Note: A student whose withdrawal  
40                           is directly associated with a chronic or recurring medical condition or its  
41                           treatment is not to be subject to administrative probation for such withdrawal).  
42                           2.           Repeated failure to progress toward the stated degree objective or other  
43                           program objective, including that resulting from assignment of 15 units of No

44 Credit, when such failure appears to be due to circumstances within the control  
45 of the student.

46 3. Failure to comply, after due notice, with an academic requirement or  
47 regulation, as defined by campus policy, which is routine for all students or a  
48 defined group of students (examples: failure to complete a required  
49 examination, failure to complete a required practicum, failure to comply with  
50 professional standards appropriate to the field of study, failure to complete a  
51 specified number of units as a condition for receiving student financial aid or  
52 making satisfactory progress in the academic program).

53  
54 C. The student shall be advised of probation status promptly, and shall be provided  
55 with the conditions for removal from probation and the circumstances that would lead  
56 to disqualification, should probation not be removed. Notification shall occur through  
57 one the following actions, as appropriate:

58  
59 1. Students whose GPA places them on academic probation shall be  
60 informed in writing by the department/program's graduate coordinator or  
61 designee prior to the beginning of the next term (with a copy provided to the  
62 Dean of Graduate Studies).

63 2. Students shall be placed on administrative-academic probation by the  
64 Dean of Graduate Studies, following consultation with the program/department.  
65 The probationary student shall be informed in writing by the graduate dean  
66 (with a copy provided to the department/ program).

67  
68 3. The Dean of Graduate Studies shall inform Registration and Records when  
69 students have been placed on or removed from administrative-academic  
70 probationary status so that student records can be updated.

71  
72 D. When a student is placed on academic or administrative-academic probation,  
73 s/he must work with the program coordinator to develop a plan for remediation,  
74 including a timeline for completion. In the case of administrative-academic probation,  
75 the remediation plan must be approved by the Dean of Graduate Studies, who will send  
76 a letter to the student documenting the plan.

77  
78 E. A student cannot be advanced to candidacy or continue in candidate status if  
79 s/he is on either academic or administrative-academic probation.

80  
81 F. A student placed on administrative-academic probation may meet with the Dean  
82 of Graduate Studies to appeal the action.

85 II. DISQUALIFICATION

86  
87 A. A student who has been placed on administrative-academic probation may be  
88 disqualified from further attendance by the Dean of Graduate Studies if:

- 89  
90 1. The conditions in the remediation plan (for removal of administrative-  
91 academic probation) are not met within the period specified; or  
92 2. The student becomes subject to academic probation while on  
93 administrative-academic probation; or  
94 3. The student becomes subject to administrative-academic probation for  
95 the same or similar reason for which he/she has been placed on administrative-  
96 academic probation previously, although not currently in such status.

97 4.

98 When such action is taken the student shall receive written notification including an  
99 explanation of the basis for the action.

100 5.

101 B. In addition, the Dean of Graduate Studies ~~an appropriate campus administrator,~~  
102 in consultation with the graduate program coordinator, may disqualify a student who at  
103 any time during enrollment has demonstrated behavior so contrary to the standards of  
104 the profession for which the student is preparing as to render him/her unfit for the  
105 profession. In such cases, disqualification will occur immediately upon notice to the  
106 student, which shall include an explanation of the basis for the action, and the campus  
107 may require the student to discontinue enrollment as of the date of the notification.

108  
109 ~~C.~~ Disqualification may be either from further registration in a particular program  
110 or from further enrollment at the campus, as determined by the Dean of Graduate  
111 Studies. A student disqualified for academic deficiency may not enroll in any regular  
112 session of the campus without permission from the appropriate campus authority, and  
113 may be denied admission to other educational programs operated or sponsored by the  
114 campus.

115  
116 ~~D.~~ In the event that a student fails the thesis/project defense, the student may  
117 repeat the thesis/project defense once. Failure at the second thesis/project defense will  
118 result in disqualification from a program. The thesis/project committee will specify the  
119 time period and/or conditions of the repeated defense.

120  
121 ~~E.~~ A student may repeat a comprehensive examination once. Failure of the second  
122 comprehensive examination results in disqualification from a program. The  
123 comprehensive exam committee will specify the time period and/or conditions of the  
124 repeated examination.

125  
126 ~~F.~~ Students who are disqualified at the end of an enrollment period should be  
127 notified by the Dean of Graduate Studies before the beginning of the next consecutive  
128 regular enrollment period. Students disqualified at the beginning of a summer

129 enrollment break should be notified at least one month before the start of the fall term.  
130 In cases where a student ordinarily would be disqualified at the end of a term, save for  
131 the fact that it is not possible to make timely notification, the student may be advised  
132 that the disqualification is to be effective at the end of the next term. Such notification  
133 should include any conditions which, if met, would result in permission to continue in  
134 enrollment. Failure to notify students does not create the right of a student to continue  
135 enrollment.

136  
137 III. REINSTATEMENT

138  
139 If the student is disqualified, either academically or administratively, s/he may petition for  
140 reinstatement. Reinstatement must be based upon evidence that the causes of previous  
141 low achievement have been removed. Reinstatement will be approved only if the student is  
142 able to provide compelling evidence of her/his ability to complete the degree. If the  
143 candidate is disqualified a second time, reinstatement will normally not be considered.

144  
145 Master's students should submit a petition requesting reinstatement to the Dean of  
146 Graduate Studies. The petition, along with a recommendation from the student's graduate  
147 coordinator, ~~and~~ will be forwarded to the reinstatement subcommittee of the Graduate  
148 Studies Committee. The subcommittee will make recommendations to the Dean of  
149 Graduate Studies, who has final authority to approve reinstatement. The size of the  
150 reinstatement subcommittee may vary, depending on the volume of applications, but shall  
151 have one member representing each college at a minimum. The subcommittee must  
152 evaluate the probable impact of any medical condition on previous unsatisfactory  
153 performance. If the student is approved for reinstatement, the Dean of Graduate Studies  
154 will send a letter granting reinstatement that specifies the conditions and time frame for  
155 achieving good standing. Students must achieve good standing to advance to candidacy and  
156 to be eligible to graduate.

157  
158 Reinstatement for credential students is handled by a separate process in the [College](#)  
159 [School](#) of Education and is not governed by this document.

160



1 **FAC: Sabbatical leave policy revision**

2  
3 **Rationale:** *FAC has approved new language to clarify instructions for the report to be submitted by*  
4 *faculty upon completion of their sabbatical. FAC added specifics about the length of the report, the*  
5 *due date, and instructions that the report address “any reasons for modification of the original*  
6 *aims” if applicable.*  
7

8  
9 IX. FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

- 10  
11 A. A faculty unit employee on a sabbatical leave shall not accept additional and/or  
12 outside employment without prior approval of the president or the President’s  
13 designee.  
14  
15 B. A faculty unit employee granted a sabbatical leave may be required by the president  
16 to provide verification that conditions of leave were met. The statement of  
17 verification shall be provided to the president and the Academic Senate office for  
18 the Professional Leave Committee.  
19  
20 C. A faculty unit employee shall render service to the CSU upon return from a  
21 sabbatical leave at the rate of one (1) term of service for each term of leave.  
22  
23 D. A faculty member, upon return from sabbatical, shall submit a written report (250-  
24 500 words) to the department(s) (or equivalent unit(s)), Dean(s), and President’s  
25 designee. The report shall describe the progress made toward completion of the  
26 proposed project, and, if applicable, address any reasons for modification of the  
27 original aims. The report shall be submitted within two months from the start of first  
28 semester of return from a leave.

1 **FAC: Faculty awards policy revision**

2

3 *Rationale: FAC has approved changes to the policy to reflect current practice.*

4

5 ~~D. How is the Award announced? The Academic Senate chair will prepare a letter of recognition~~  
6 ~~to all nominees congratulating them on their nominations. Nominees who accept nominations~~  
7 ~~and submit their files for review shall be publically recognized on campus through Academic~~  
8 ~~Senate minutes.~~

9

10 The office of the Academic Senate notifies all faculty nominated for award and provides  
11 detailed instructions. The Senate office will keep the identity of nominees, and all deliberations,  
12 confidential.





