

## AGENDA

Executive Committee Meeting

CSUSM Academic Senate

Wednesday ~ May 7, 2014 ~ Commons 206 – 11:30am-1 pm

- I. Approval of agenda
- II. Approval of minutes of 4/30/2014 meeting
- III. Chair's report, [Vivienne Bennett](#)  
Referral: LATAC -- Faculty Preparation for Online Teaching
- IV. Provost's report, Graham Oberem
- V. Consent calendar  
UCC Recommendations
- VI. Discussion items
  - A. NEAC Parliamentarian
  - B. FAC University RTP Policy, Article on Applicability of new/revised departmental RTP standards *attached*
  - C. SAC Definitions of Engaged Learning *attached*
  - D. EC Principles for state support vs. self support in program development
  - E. Chair Senate chair & vice chair terms
- VI. Information items
- VIII. EC members' concerns & announcements

EDMX	635	Education Specialist - Curriculum and Instruction: Moderate/ Severe Disabilities	C-2	Jodi Robledo	11/4/2013	4/24/2014
BUS		B.S. in Business Administration	P-2	Wayne Neu	2/10/2014	4/24/2014
BUS	204	Business Statistics	C	Fang Fang	2/10/2014	4/24/2014
BUS	322	Introduction to Data Analytics	C	Fang Fang	2/10/2014	4/24/2014
BUS	324	Introduction to Business Analytics	C	Fang Fang	2/10/2014	4/24/2014
KINE		B.S. in Kinesiology	P-2	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	4/24/2014
KINE	300	Biomechanics of Human Movement	C-2	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	4/24/2014
KINE	305	Movement Anatomy	C-2	Jeff Nessler	3/11/2014	4/24/2014
KINE	311	Movement Pedagogy	C	Paul Stuhr	3/11/2014	4/24/2014
KINE	326	Introduction to Exercise Physiology	C-2	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	4/24/2014
KINE	403	Measurement and Evaluation in Kinesiology	C-2	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	4/24/2014
KINE	404	Introduction to Epidemiology	C-2	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	4/24/2014
KINE	405	Health and Drug Education	C-2	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	4/24/2014
KINE	407	Principles of Health Promotion and Education	C-2	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	4/24/2014
KINE	415	Eating Disorders and Weight Control in Sports	C	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	4/24/2014
KINE	495	Internship	C-2	Jeff Nessler	10/29/2013	4/24/2014
MSW	525	Law and Ethics	C-2	Gigi Nordquist	9/24/2013	5/1/2014
GBM	495	Global Business Experience	C	Catalin Ratiu	4/16/2014	5/1/2014
NURS		B.S. in Nursing - Traditional Option	P-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014
NURS		B.S. in Nursing - Accelerated Option	P-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014
NURS		B.S. in Nursing - RN to BSN Option	P-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014
NURS	212A	Pathophysiology and Pharmacology of Nursing Practice I	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014
NURS	316A	Pathophysiology and Pharmacology for Accelerated BSN Students I	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014
NURS	320	Nursing Care of Adults III	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014
NURS	321	Nursing Care of Adults III Laboratory	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014
NURS	370	Health Promotion and Patient Education Strategies	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014

NURS	445	Nursing Case Management of Vulnerable Populations Laboratory: Community-Based	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014
NURS	491	Transition to Nursing Practice Internship	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014
NURS	493	Senior Nursing Externship	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/6/2014	5/1/2014
ENVR		B.A. in Environmental Studies	P-2	M. McDuffie, P. Stricker, G. Vourlitis	11/27/2013	5/1/2014
ENVR	105	Introduction to Biology/Ecology	C-2	M. McDuffie	3/18/2014	5/1/2014
BIOT		Biotechnology	P-2	Bianca Mothe	11/8/2013	5/1/2014
BA	680	Masters Project	C-2	Beverlee Anderson	10/14/2013	5/1/2014
MATH	440	Introduction to Mathematical Probability and Statistics	C-2	David Barsky	11/8/2013	5/1/2014
PSCI	319	Special Topics in American Politics	C	Cyrus Masroori	11/14/2013	5/1/2014
PSCI	349	Special Topics in Comparative Politics	C	Cyrus Masroori	11/14/2013	5/1/2014
PSCI	369	Special Topics in International Relations	C	Cyrus Masroori	11/14/2013	5/1/2014
PSCI	379	Special Topics in Political Theory	C	Cyrus Masroori	11/14/2013	5/1/2014

1 ***Faculty Affairs Committee***

2 ***Second Reading: Applicability of Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP***  
3 ***Standards***

4

5 *FAC Rationale:*

6

7 *During FAC's review of new department standards for the Department of Speech Language Pathology*  
8 *(SLP) and the Department of Psychology, it became clear that some faculty in the CEHHS and the*  
9 *Library have an "opt-out" option regarding new or significantly changed college RTP standards.*  
10 *Further, SLP proposed to extend this same option in their new department standards. The Department of*  
11 *Psychology, by contrast, submitted a department RTP document that was silent on the issue, meaning that*  
12 *the new standards would apply to all.*

13

14 *The Executive Committee charged FAC with developing a policy that would apply to all probationary and*  
15 *tenured faculty, and so this element has been removed from the SLP document and it is being addressed*  
16 *separately here as a new rule that would be added to the university RTP document.*

17

18 *FAC is attempting to create a mechanism through which a faculty member may formally signal their*  
19 *choice to exempt themselves from the new or substantially revised department/college document. FAC*  
20 *does not envision that the faculty member must present their reasons, and FAC believes such a request*  
21 *should be granted automatically (if the rules are followed).*

22

23 *Update for Second Reading*

24 *Nava posted on the FAC website a document called "Notes on the Applicability of Department RTP*  
25 *Standards (5/1/14) which contains all feedback received upon the first reading in the Academic Senate on*  
26 *4/23/14. The notes are seven pages long and so are not included here. The feedback varied broadly but*  
27 *significantly, there was strong support for FAC's exemption concept. Some commenters suggested that*  
28 *FAC work with a student "catalog rights" model, but that does not pertain precisely because the*  
29 *university has created and revised RTP documents over the years, and up until now, the principle has*  
30 *been that they all automatically apply. The "opt-out" exemption model gets as close as possible to*  
31 *"catalog rights" by giving all tenure-track and tenured faculty the right to exempt themselves, but the*  
32 *norm is that new/revised RTP standards otherwise apply to all.*

33 *FAC would like to clarify that it has carefully read relevant articles in the Collective Bargaining*  
34 *Agreement (CBA): 12.2, 15.1 and 15.3. In it's feedback to FAC following the first reading, CFA*  
35 *emphasized CBA 15.3:*

36 *15.3 Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the faculty unit employee no*  
37 *later than 14 days after the first day of instruction of the academic term. Evaluation criteria and*  
38 *procedures shall be made available to the evaluation committee and the academic administrators*  
39 *prior to the commencement of the evaluation process. Once the evaluation process has begun,*  
40 *there shall be no changes in criteria and procedures used to evaluate the faculty unit employee*

41           *during the evaluation process.*

42   *The CFA Faculty Rights team’s interpretation of 15.3, lead them to recommend that*

43           *... FAC ... support an opt-in version instead. Namely, since faculty (will) have been hired under a*  
44           *previous set of standards, they should be held to them, much like students have “catalog rights”*  
45           *protection. Instead, the faculty member should have the ability to opt in by requesting to be held*  
46           *to the new standards if they so choose. ”*

47   *Please note that at FAC’s meeting on 5/5/14, FAC heard an oral report from CFA, presented by CFA*  
48   *representative Mayra Besosa. She summarized CFA’s continuing recommendation for an “opt-in” model*  
49   *rather than FAC’s proposal. FAC discussed the matter in detail.*

50   *FAC declines to change to an opt-in model because this would not be consistent with the established*  
51   *practice that RTP policies apply to all upon presidential approval. FAC is attempting to create an*  
52   *exemption **only** for Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP standards; changes to*  
53   *the university RTP document should continue to apply to all.*

54   *FAC reads 15.3 to mean that the Candidate shall have fair notice of the standards **before** an evaluation*  
55   *process begins. Since CBA 15.1 defines “evaluation” as either a periodic evaluation or performance*  
56   *review, FAC’s proposed exemption rule would be fully compliant with the spirit and letter of 15.3.*

57   *FAC emphasizes that individual tenure-track and tenured faculty that participate in the process of writing*  
58   *or revising their unit’s department/college (equivalent) standards are participating in a fundamentally*  
59   *important aspect of shared governance. Faculty are participating in the drafting of the standards by*  
60   *which their performance will be evaluated, and this is both an important responsibility and right. FAC*  
61   *assumes that each faculty member will participate actively in this process, and further, FAC assumes that*  
62   *the document ultimately approved by the department is intended to assist and support all tenure-track and*  
63   *tenured faculty as they develop their careers. That said, FAC is committed to establishing the right for a*  
64   *tenure-track or tenured faculty member to exempt themselves from those new/revised standards.*

65   *Significantly, as a result of the feedback on the first reading, FAC has changed the “4 year” exemption*  
66   *period to allow exemption until the **next promotion/tenure review** and any periodic evaluations that*  
67   *precede it. The feedback we received argued that it makes more sense to define the exemption in terms of*  
68   *the significant reviews rather than a number of years.*

- 69
  - *For probationary faculty, who are on a “tenure clock,” this allows the exemption for the*  
70           *remaining probationary period.*
  - *For tenured faculty, who undergo periodic evaluation every five years, and who may request*  
71           *promotion at any time, this allows them to exempt themselves until they obtain promotion.*  
72

73   *In sum, these proposed rules give all continuing tenure-track and tenured faculty the option to exempt*  
74   *themselves from new/substantially changed department/college (equivalent) RTP standards, which FAC*  
75   *believes is fair and appropriate. These proposed rules would improve the situation by clearly presenting*  
76   *rules that apply to all tenure-track and tenured faculty.*

77   *All text from the first reading version is included below. Additions are underlined and deletions are struck*  
78   *through.*

79

80

81 **Applicability of Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP Standards [to be**  
82 **added to University RTP document]**

83

84 Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP standards express values, expectations,  
85 and/or requirements that are more specific than the university RTP document. These specific standards  
86 provide clear guidance to probationary and tenured faculty members and also provide important  
87 information to reviewers at all levels.<sup>1</sup>

88

89 ~~For all probationary and tenured faculty, whether or not an exemption was obtained following the~~  
90 ~~approval of new/substantially revised RTP standards, New/significantly revised Department (or~~  
91 ~~equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP standards apply four years from to all probationary and~~  
92 ~~tenured faculty upon the date of approval by the president, except those who exempt themselves~~  
93 ~~according to the rules below.~~

94

95 When new or substantially revised department/college (or equivalent) RTP documents standards are  
96 approved, all affected faculty will be ~~sent~~ provided a copy and be informed that the new document applies  
97 to all except those ~~probationary and tenured faculty that~~ who obtain an exemption.

98

99 The following rules specify who may and may not obtain an exemption:

100

101 Newly Hired Faculty (probationary or tenured) whose first periodic evaluation happens after (but within  
102 the same semester as) the approval of new or substantially revised Department (or equivalent) and  
103 College (or equivalent) RTP standards are not eligible for an exemption.

104

105 All continuing probationary and tenured faculty may exempt themselves from new or substantially  
106 revised Department (or equivalent) and College (or equivalent) RTP standards through the relevant  
107 review for (1) tenure and promotion to Associate Professor; or, (2) promotion to Full  
108 Professors/Librarian/SSPAR III; or, Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty<sup>2</sup>. This is a one-time  
109 exemption.

110

---

<sup>1</sup> This article does not address the situation where minor changes are made to college or department (or equivalent) RTP standards.

<sup>2</sup> What was formerly called PTPE or post tenure review was renamed “Periodic Evaluation of Tenured Faculty” (Academic Senate 4/23/14.)

111 To be exempted, the faculty member shall submit a form indicating their exemption to the application of  
112 the new/significantly revised RTP standards. The completed form shall be included in the WPAF/PAF  
113 along with any applicable standards.<sup>3</sup> Once this decision has been made, it may not be changed.

114

115 ❖—~~All new probationary tenure track faculty members and tenured faculty members with hire dates after~~  
116 ~~the president's approval of a new or substantially revised department/college (or equivalent) RTP~~  
117 ~~document will be governed by that document.~~

118

119 ❖—~~Probationary faculty:~~

120 ➤—~~Prior to the first evaluation following the president's approval of the department/college (or~~  
121 ~~equivalent) RTP document standards, each probationary faculty member shall submit a form~~  
122 ~~indicating their exemption to the application of the new/significantly revised RTP standards.~~

123 ➤—~~The completed form shall be included in the WPAF/PAF along with any applicable standards.~~  
124 ~~Once this decision has been made, it may not be changed.~~

125

126 ❖—~~Tenured Faculty~~

127 ➤—~~Within six months following the president's approval of the new/substantially revised~~  
128 ~~department/college RTP document, the tenured faculty member who shall undergo Periodic~~  
129 ~~Evaluation of Tenured Faculty or request promotion to Full Professor/Librarian/SSP AR III, shall~~  
130 ~~complete a form indicating their exemption from the new/substantially revised department (or~~  
131 ~~equivalent) and/or College (or equivalent) RTP standards.~~

132 ➤—~~The completed form shall be included in the WPAF/PAF. Once this decision has been made, it~~  
133 ~~may not be changed.~~

134

---

<sup>3</sup> The WPAF checklist will need to be updated.

135 Exemption Form<sup>4</sup>

136 *This form is to be used by faculty exempting themselves from new or substantially revised*  
137 *department/college standards. This form must be included in the WPAF.*

138

139 *By signing this form I am indicating that I will be exempt from the specific department or college*  
140 *standards indicated below, and that the RTP standards attached to this document must be used by my*  
141 *reviewers.*

142

143

144

---

145 *Department or College RTP Standards from which I am exempt*

146

147

148

---

149 *Signature & Date*

150

151

152 *Attachment:*

---

153 *Prior RTP standards to be used in lieu of those I am exempt from*

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

---

<sup>4</sup> To be added as an appendix in the university RTP document.

Co-Curricular/Engaged Education: Scheduled activities outside of the classroom that enhance student understanding of concepts and activities that are introduced in the classroom. Engaged learning activities provide students with opportunities to develop deeper knowledge and expertise related to the practical settings in which topics of study apply.

Activity	Defining Characteristics	Key Ideas
Research	<p><b>Structure:</b> Credit-bearing independent course project involving multiple visits to site or sites outside of the classroom allowing application of course concepts outside the classroom, with positive learning outcomes for the student.</p> <p><b>Supervision:</b> Faculty</p> <p><b>Ultimate goal:</b> Promoting student learning and personal development through the application, contemplation, and integration of course concepts in conjunction with practice in the routine setting to which those concepts apply.</p>	<p>Multiple visits to sites outside of the classroom in order to collect and/or analyze data related to the environments and activities in which the course topic applies. Examples include studies in organizational settings and studies of geographical or biological environments. Students engaging in research outside the classroom as part of their coursework learn about and reflect upon the application of concepts and research methods in the conditions of actual research practice. They also have access to data that would not be available in the classroom. This provides content-specific practice in certain research methods. Research that supports students' understanding of the connection between actual lab or field research environments and their academic course work.</p>
Service learning	<p><b>Structure:</b> Credit-bearing course project allowing application of course concepts outside the classroom, with positive learning outcomes for both student and community</p>	<p>Service-learning is an educational methodology which combines community service with explicit academic learning</p>

	<p><b>Supervision:</b> Faculty</p> <p><b>Ultimate goal:</b> Promoting student learning and personal development through application, reflection, and integration; fostering stronger ties between institution and community; meeting relevant community needs; disseminating work done into the public discourse</p>	<p>objectives, preparation for community work, and deliberate reflection. Students participating in service-learning provide direct and indirect community service as part of their academic coursework, learn about and reflect upon the community context in which service is provided, and develop an understanding of the connection between service and their academic work. These learning experiences are designed through a collaboration of the community and the institution or academic unit/program, relying upon partnerships meant to be of mutual benefit. Improvement and sustainability of the experiences and the partnerships are enhanced through formal assessment activities that involve community, faculty, student and institutional perspectives (Gelmon, Holland, Driscoll, Spring, &amp; Kerrigan, 2001).</p>
Senior experience	<p><b>Structure:</b> Student groups working with local businesses or organizations.</p> <p><b>Supervision:</b> Faculty</p>	<p>Senior Experience is the capstone course for the business administration major. Under the direction of a faculty supervisor, small groups of students work on real-world projects submitted by local businesses and organizations. A trade show is held at the conclusion of the semester to showcase</p>

	<p><b>Ultimate goal:</b> Application of classroom knowledge to real-world business problems that help students enhance their skills to be the future business leaders of tomorrow.</p>	<p>students and their projects (COBA website).</p> <p>Teams of students work with businesses as consultants on real-life problems.</p>
<p>Internships</p>	<p><b>Structure:</b> On- or off-campus organizations partnering with CSUSM academic departments to provide unpaid or paid internships for academic credit.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Many internships obtained for academic credit are unpaid; however, employers are encouraged to offer students a regular wage. If unpaid, the employer must ensure the internship meets federal guidelines from the Department of Labor (DOL):</p> <p><a href="http://www.dol.gov/whd/regs/compliance/whdfs71.htm#.UHXKLRXA_cw">http://www.dol.gov/whd/regs/compliance/whdfs71.htm#.UHXKLRXA_cw</a></p> <p><b>Supervision:</b> Students will be supervised both on site by a designee at the internship organization and by the instructor of the course providing the academic credit. Faculty supervisors will communicate with internship organization supervisors to assess student performance prior to assigning credit or grades.</p>	<p>An academic internship is a University-sanctioned activity that formally integrates the student’s academic study with practical experience with a cooperating on- or off-campus organization. An internship may be paid or unpaid, part-time or full-time but in all cases must be a closely monitored, structured activity that complements academic experience from the classroom environment by including agreed upon scope and outcomes<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> See, for example, the “Learning Plan” in the 2011 CSU Resource Guide for Managing Risk in Service Learning, pp. 46-47</p>

	<p><b>Ultimate Goal:</b> To provide students with <u>a</u> high impact educational practice in which they can apply learned academic skills to real world experience.</p> <p><b>Ultimate goal:</b> Promoting student experiential learning and professional development within their field of study in a professional setting off campus.</p>	
Clinical practice experiences in nursing and education	<p><b>Structure:</b> Individual placements in K-12 classrooms (education), clinics or hospitals (nursing) where candidates apply knowledge learned from coursework to the contexts in which they will work professionally.</p> <p><b>Supervision:</b> Placement facilitated by placement coordinators within either the SOE or SON. Field supervision is completed by faculty.</p> <p><b>Ultimate goal:</b> (1) Application of theoretical knowledge into professional contexts; (2) Compliance with accrediting organizations and credentialing bodies</p>	<p>Clinical Practice experiences model the belief that relevancy is crucial in professional education. Learning developed in the university courses is designed to complement and support the candidate's fieldwork.</p> <p>Clinical Practice experiences in both the School of Education and the School of Nursing will be specifically excluded from oversight by Engaged Education as they have specific mandates from outside accrediting agencies</p>
International Service Learning  (AACU calls it Global Learning)	<p><b>Structure:</b> Credit-bearing course project providing a structured and culturally-immersive academic experience in another country, working reciprocally with local institutions to address host community needs while developing our students' cross-cultural understanding of daily life and global issues.</p>	<p><b>International Service Learning (ISL)</b> is a variation on global education. Combining aspects of traditional study abroad and international volunteerism, these programs give students the opportunity to earn credit abroad while participating in community-</p>

	<p><b>Supervision:</b> Faculty</p> <p>*Supervision may be on or off site and may include direct supervision of the student work, indirect supervision through coursework, or indirect supervision through the Office of Global Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ultimate goal:</b> Provides students with valuable international experience that requires engagement and dialogue in order to widen their perspectives and deepen their intercultural understanding. Helps develop global citizens by providing an experiential foundation for global understanding and global action. Allows students to critically analyze and reflect on the service activity for a better appreciation of course content. Cultivates and enables long-term, and mutually-beneficial engagements between the university and specific international partners. Establishes and enhances university reputation outside the United States</li> </ul>	<p>based service projects in communities around the globe (Rutgers University). It emphasizes organized service activities that meet/addresses community needs, provide direct interaction and cross-cultural dialogue with others, allow reflection and connection of experience with course content, and a provide a deeper understanding and appreciation of the host country, discipline, and their own responsibilities as citizens, locally and globally (Bringle &amp; Hatcher 2011).</p>
--	--	--

\*Works Cited

*Service Learning:* Gelmon, Sherrill B., Holland, Barbara A., Driscoll, Amy, Spring, Amy, & Kerrigan, Seanna (2001). *Assessing Service-Learning and Civic Engagement: Principles and Techniques*. Campus Connect: Brown University, Providence, RI., p. v

*Internships: Learning Plan*” in the 2011 CSU Resource Guide for Managing Risk in Service Learning, pp. 46-47  
[http://www.calstate.edu/cce/resource\\_center/documents/CCE\\_ResGuide\\_2011\\_webvs\\_Final.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/cce/resource_center/documents/CCE_ResGuide_2011_webvs_Final.pdf)).

*International Service Learning/Global Education:* Bringle, R. G., and J. A. Hatcher. (2011). *International Service Learning*. In *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research* (Ed.) R. G. Bringle, J. A. Hatcher, and S. G. Jones. Sterling, VA: Stylus

Publishing, Inc.

Service learning: Gelmon, Sherrill B., Holland, Barbara A., Driscoll, Amy, Spring, Amy, & Kerrigan, Seanna (2001). Assessing Service-Learning and Civic Engagement: Principles and Techniques. Campus Connect: Brown University, Providence, RI.

International Service Learning. 2014. Rutgers Center for Global Education 2010 [cited April 15 2014]. Available from [http://studyabroad.rutgers.edu/index.cfm?FuseAction=Abroad.ViewLink&Link\\_ID=4593FF15-ED36-68EA-D602557B0503D8F1](http://studyabroad.rutgers.edu/index.cfm?FuseAction=Abroad.ViewLink&Link_ID=4593FF15-ED36-68EA-D602557B0503D8F1).