Newly Elected Senators
Spring 2006

CoAS Senator 06-08
Jocelyn Ahlers
Jonathan Berman
Katherine Brown
Tracey Brown (06/07)
Darel Engen
Matthew Escobar
Jule Gomez de Garcia
Merryl Goldberg
Rocio Guillen
Deborah Kristan
Brian Norris
Youwen Ouyang
Edward Price
Radhika Ramamurthi
Patty Seleski
Richelle Swan
Jackie Trischman
Jill Watts
Xiaoyu Zhang

CoBA Senator 06-08
Ofer Meilich
Mohammad Oskoorouchi
Ted Shore
Wenyuh Tsay
Kathleen Watson

CoE Senator 06-08
Annette Daoud (06/07)
Rosario Dìaz-Greenberg
Robin Marion
Janet Powell
Laurie Stowell

Library Senator 06-08
Judith Downie

Date: May 3, 2006

To: Academic Senate
From: Mohammad R. Oskoorouchi, APC Chair
Subject: Final report of committee activities for AY 2005-2006

Members: Nancy Dome (COE), Mohammad Oskoorouchi (CoBA), Michael Pass (At
              large), Rika Yoshii (COAS)
Ex-officio: David Barsky (AVP-AP), Candace Van Dall (Enrollment Office).

The Academic Policy Committee (APC) met 20 times during the 2005-2006 academic
year on Mondays from 2:00 – 3:00 p.m. in LIB 2413. During this period the committee
worked on the following:

1. **Academic Calendar:** APC developed the Academic Calendar for AY 2006-2007
   and 2007 – 2008 according to the following principals:
   a. Balancing instruction across the days of the week,
   b. Increasing time for grading final exams,
   c. Adding an additional day of final exams in the Fall to reduce the number
      of weekday classes with Saturday final exams,
   d. Creating a longer break between the Fall and Spring semesters,
   e. Keeping Commencement before Memorial Day weekend,
   f. Restoring a Fall start date that allows Financial Aid checks to be mailed
      out further in advance of the start of the Fall semester,
   g. Satisfying the Assembly Bill 720 requirement that all CSU campuses be
      closed in observance of Veteran's Day; and
   h. Correcting an unintended consequence of the current calendar which
      sometimes eliminates January benefits for adjunct instructors.
   The Academic Calendar was unanimously approved by the Academic Senate on
   11/5/2005 and accepted by the president and provost on November 14, 2005.

2. **University Hour:** APC prepared a resolution that supports a two-year trial
   implementation of a University Hour in Academic Years 2006-07 and 2007-08
   from 11:50 a.m. – 12:50 p.m. on Monday through Friday during which only
   laboratory courses three or more hours in length may be scheduled. The
   committee further proposed that the Director of Institutional Planning and the
   Office of Institutional Research be asked to conduct a study of the effectiveness
   and impact of University Hour after Spring Break in the Spring 2007 semester
   with the study to include a minimum list of criteria (see the resolution). APC
   suggested that the findings of this study be communicated to the Academic Senate
   and, in particular, the Academic Policy Committee prior to the start of the Fall
   2007 semester and that the APC be charged with reviewing this study and
   bringing to the Academic Senate for a first reading no later than the October 2007
   meeting a recommendation that either University Hour be discontinued effective
   with the Fall 2008 semester, or University Hour be continued indefinitely, or

University Hour be continued on a trial basis for a fixed period time, at which point another study would be made to serve as the basis for a future recommendation.
This resolution was approved by the Academic Senate on 11/5/2005 and accepted by the president and provost on November 14, 2005.

3. **Unifying Degree Terminologies:** Based on the information gathered from interviews with department chairs and discussion of the similarities and differences between different terms used in various degrees, APC concluded that the terms can be unified into two major categories. We now have only "option" and "concentration" in our undergraduate program, with one exception being CoBA's GBM track which is a sub-option. This item was resolved without a resolution.

4. **Early Declaration of Major:** As a part of the facilitating graduation, APC was asked to prepare a policy on early declaration of major. The committee met with some parties from student services and enrolment services and considered pros and cons of different points for major declaration. Eventually, APC decided that the current policy of having "no policy" is actually working fine. The issue has been referred back to the task force on facilitating graduation with a recommendation that a procedure be developed to urge students to declare their major as soon as they know it

5. **Add/Drop and Withdrawal Policy:** The old policy prevented students to add a course on the first day of the semester. This had created some difficulties for the Enrollment Services Information Center as students who had obtained a signed Schedule Adjustment Form expected to be able to turn it in immediately. APC amended this policy by removing the ban on the first day registration.
This resolution was approved by the Academic Senate on March 1, 2006.

6. **Maximum Number of Summer Units:** APC revised the catalog language for maximum number of units that undergraduate students are allowed to take during summer to reflect the new Academic Calendar's feature of 5/10-week summer sessions. This revision was documented as Revision 1 to Senate Item APC 227-02 and approved by the president and provost on April 17, 2006.

7. **Certificate Programs Policy:** APC reviewed the Certificate Programs policy and prepared a resolution to renew the policy indefinitely. The resolution was unanimously approved by the Academic Senate on 4/19/2006.

8. **Concurrent Post-Baccalaureate Credit Policy:** APC noticed that same forms are being used by the Office of Registration and Records for both master's and credential applicants to receive concurrent credits for the undergraduate courses. The committee informed GSC of this matter.

9. **Standards and Goals for Online Education:** After meeting with the director of Academic Computing, APC determined that a policy for online courses should address several issues such as instructional methods and academic responsibility, quality, assessment, curriculum instructions, contracting, intellectual property rights, and recourses.

10. **Advanced Placement Credits and CLEP:** APC reviewed the current policy on AP Credits. APC will develop the general policy of AP tests. The General Education part was referred to GEC. This agenda item will be forwarded to next year's APC as a priority item: See Recommendation for next year's APC.

The Academic Policy Committee recommends that next year's committee:

- Review the policies for AP and CLEP exams,
- Proceed with standards and goals for online education,
- Review and update the Academic Calendar, and
- Follow up on University Hour implementation.

Budget and Long Range Planning Committee
Annual Report for AY 2005/2006
May 3, 2006

Submitted by: Bonnie Bade and Kathleen Watson, Co-Chairs

During AY 2005-06, the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee was Co-Chaired by Kathleen Watson (COBA) and Bonnie Bade (At-Large). In addition to Watson and Bade, the voting members of the committee included Kit Herlihy (Library), Robin Marion (COE) and Patty Seleski (COAS). Ex-Officio members of the committee included Vicki Golich, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Wayne Veres, Dean of Instructional Information Technology Services, David Barsky, Associate Vice President for Academic Programs. Tom Bennett, Associate Vice President for Strategic Planning and Assessment joined BLP mid-year. Mary Hinchman, Director of University Budget Office represented Finance and Administrative Services, and provided budget analysis as needed. The committee met weekly throughout the year.

As Co-Chairs, Watson and Bade shared various responsibilities of the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee, including faculty representation on a number of University Committees. Kathleen Watson served as a member of the University Budget Committee (UBC), the Academic Affairs Budget Subcommittee, the Senate Executive Committee, the President's Cabinet, and as BLP representative to the Academic Senate. Bonnie Bade served as a member of the Academic Blueprint Committee (ABC). Under Bonnie's coordination committee members wrote program reviews, requests for feedback from program originators, and reports to the senate. Throughout the year, Watson and Bade reported back to BLP and Academic Senate on actions associated with each of the committees. Robin Marion and Kit Herlihy took detailed minutes and submitted them to Senate for posting to the website.

Curriculum Reviews
During AY 2005-06 BLP conducted two kinds of curriculum review: 1) A-form reviews and 2) P-form reviews.

A-Form Reviews -- Under current curriculum policies, colleges, departments and programs proposing new majors (minors do not require A-forms) must complete and submit an A-form, which broadly outlines the proposed degree, makes an initial case about external demand for the degree or about internal need for it, and sketches out an early estimation of the resources needed to initiate and sustain the program. A-Forms go through college curriculum committees (not all colleges have them), and then are distributed by Academic Programs to key planning stakeholders for comment. After these reviews, the A-forms and stakeholder's comments come to BLP.   The packages are assessed for long-range planning and resource implications. The committee votes whether or not the proposed degree should be added to CSUSM's University Academic Master Plan (UAMP) which is sent to the CSU Chancellor's Office each January.

In AY 2005-06, BLP reviewed A-forms for the following proposed degree programs and voted to add them to the UAMP:

- B.A. in Arts and Technology
- B.A. in Environmental Studies
- B.A. in Global Studies
- B.A. in Philosophy
- Master of Social Work (MSW)

BLP revised the existing A-form to better delineate for proposers:
- ✓ what planning information should be included,
- ✓ how the process leading to the UAMP works,
- ✓ directions for filling out the form, and
- ✓ the need for fully developed outlines of proposed programs.

BLP further notes that substantive program revision may require A-forms rather than just the current P-form process that is required.

<u>P-Form Reviews</u> -- Originators of major and minor degree programs, options and certificates, and existing degree programs undergoing substantial changes submit P-forms. P-Forms represent the realized plan of the curriculum, including resource needs for initiating and sustaining the degree program. Once P-forms are reviewed by the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and BLP, they are submitted to the Academic Senate for approval. If approved by the Senate, the P-forms are then submitted to the Provost, President and (if necessary) to the Chancellor's Office for official authorization.

BLP reviewed the following P-forms, provided feedback to initiate discussions with originators, and incorporated responses as we wrote long-range planning and resource implication reports to Academic Senate. We moved the following out of BLP during AY 2005-06:

- B.A. in Anthropology (new program)
- B.S. in Biological Sciences (add new concentration in Physiology)
- B.S. in Applied Physics (new program)
- M.A. History (new program)
- Masters in Business Administration (MBA) (major revision)
- Master of Social Work (MSW) (new program)
- Certificate in Communication Sciences and Disorders Preparation (bundling of existing courses)
- Minor in Linguistics (new minor)

The committee also did preliminary review prior to a postponement for revision for:
- M.A. in Education: Option in Communication Sciences and Disorders (new option)

In AY 2005-06 BLP continues to focus on producing an analysis of a program's projected costs and resource implications, as well as long range planning implications that inform senators' debate about the program. BLP further provided input to UCC as they revised the P-form.

Procedural Committee Actions
  ➢ BLP representation on the President's Cabinet
  ➢ Add IITS representation to BLP
  ➢ Add Strategic Planning and Assessment representation to BLP
  ➢ Reactivated BLP participation on Academic Affairs Budget Subcommittee
Each of the above was intended to increase reciprocal information flow between faculty and administration with respect to Budget and Long Range Planning issues.

Budget Reviews
Serving as the budgeting arm of the Academic Senate, BLP members were the first to review and rank all of the Strategic Initiatives submitted through the Academic Affairs budget call process in the Spring. The results of our deliberation were carried forward to the Academic Affairs Budget Subcommittee (AABSC) by Kathleen Watson, who then represented BLP at the AABSC deliberations. Considerable agreement was noted in the recommendations of the two committees, helping to confirm and support BLP recommendations. The recommendation from the AABSC then went to the Provost for the final decision from the division.

Recommendations for Next Year
  ✓ Work with Academic Affairs to more fully develop fiscal implications of new colleges, and establish base costs for setting up infrastructure;
  ✓ Make more transparent the organizational costs associated with setting up a new college, as BLP currently sees only direct costs associated with individual programs;
  ✓ Early each Fall, have Mary Hinchman present to BLP the multi-year projection of budget for the university.
Each of the above are designed to provide context for understanding the resource implications of new programs.

Committee Membership for 2006-07
Faculty membership for 2006-07:
Ongoing and re-elected:
Kit Herlihy (Library – 05-07), Robin Marion (COE – 05-07)
Patty Seleski (COAS – 06-08), Kathleen Watson (COBA – 06-08),
New:
(at-large) – BLP recommends seeking HHS representation, or representation from an area not currently represented, such as a Science area of COAS.

Chair – Kathleen Watson (UBC, Senate Exec, AA Budget Subcommittee, Academic Senate)
Co-chair for Fall – Robin Marion (President's Cabinet, ABC and minutes)

Ongoing administrators:
Dean COAS
Dean IITS
AVP Academic Programs
AVP Strategic Planning and Assessment

BLP meeting time Fall 2006 is Monday 2 – 4 pm.

FAC Year-End Report to the Academic Senate
AY 05/06

Members: Marie Thomas (Chair), Beverlee Anderson, Kathleen Bates/Mayra Besosa, Tracey Brown, Kathy Hayden, Lance Newman, Youwen Ouyang, Sue Thompson/Ann Fiegen
Ex-Officio: John Halcon (CFA), Mary Elizabeth Stivers (AVP-AR)

- **CoAS RTP policy:** Approved by AS and sent to the Provost. FAC is currently working with the college to address some minor issues.

- **Emeritus policy:** Approved by AS and sent to the Provost.

- **SSP-AR Temporary Faculty Evaluation policy**: Approved by AS and sent to the Provost.

- **Process for approval of college RTP standards:** Change in university RTP document approved by AS and sent to the Provost. This returns the approval process to its original form (pre AY 04/05).

- **UPD/RSCA grants:** FAC reviewed 32 grants; recommendations have been submitted to the Provost.

- **Political Science Department RTP standards**: FAC reviewed the standards and returned the document to the department with comments. The department revised the standards, FAC has reviewed them again, and will discuss remaining issues with the department chair.

- **CoBA RTP policy:** Provost Sheath reviewed the policy and returned it with comments. FAC conveyed comments and concerns to the college.

- **CoE RTP policy:** FAC returned the policy to the college with comments and concerns.

- **Misconduct in scholarship and research policy and procedures:** FAC revised this policy. It is being checked by the Chancellor's Office to determine whether there are bargaining issues embedded in it. The policy will be presented to AS next year.

- **Other items**

  - **Timetable for periodic evaluation and performance review, 2006/07:** FAC approved the calendar.
  - **CBA Article 15.14 violation regarding student evaluations of teaching:** FAC determined that we have been in violation of the CBA in situations when faculty do not administer student evaluations in all courses or include all evaluations in the WPAF. In these cases, faculty must discuss which courses to evaluate/include with the department chair. FAC and M. E. Stivers have worked on a memo and process to correct this problem.
  - **Endowed positions policy:** M. Thomas discussed issues with R. Keith.

(Unfinished business on next page)

Unfinished business

- Misconduct in scholarship and research policy and procedures
- Independent supervision (M.A. theses, independent study/research) workload implications: M. E. Stivers has collected information from other CSUs. FAC has information from CoAS, CoBA, and CoE. A report needs to be written.
- University or college P&T committee? Given the high workload of the university P&T committee, the question has been raised about the use of college-level committees rather than a university-wide committee. M. E. Stivers has collected information from other CSUs. FAC may want to interview faculty and administrators involved in the review process.

General Education Committee
Final Report to CSUSM Academic Senate
May, 2006

Personnel:

Voting members: Jocelyn Ahlers, Michael Hughes, Yvonne Meulemans, Moses Ochanji, Richelle Swan, Jacqueline Trischmann, Marshall Whittlesey (chairman).

Advisory members: David Barsky, Candace Van Dall, Andres Favela.

Staff: Virginia Mann

Curriculum approved for GE credit this year:

B2: BIOL 211 (recertification)
B3: GES 110
C2: WLAN 115, WLAN 116

D7/D: SOC 105, GBST 100
E: GEL 110, GEL 120

BB: MATH 315, PHYS 356, PHYS 351

CC: WMST 401M, LTWR 336D, LTWR 334A
Decertified for CC: VSAR 404 (per request of department)

DD: HIST 379, PSCI 348C, PSCI 348D, ID 370P, NATV 380A, HIST 350, LING 331, SOC 323, GBST 300, WMST 416, PSCI 419C

Actions taken, and policy considered:

The GEC approved and Senate passed two measures which modified the manner in which GE requirements may be satisfied in 2005-2006:

The first measure concerned the manner in which natural science majors satisfy the BB requirement:

A major in the natural sciences (Biological Sciences, Biotechnology[1], Biochemistry, Chemistry, Computer Science, Mathematics, Applied Physics[2]) may satisfy the BB requirement as follows. He or she may take any upper division course offered by one of

---

[1] For the purposes of this resolution, Biotechnology is to be viewed as belonging to the Biological Sciences department, so Biotechnology majors may not take any BIOL course to satisfy BB.
[2] This major does not currently exist at CSUSM, but is in the process of approval and may as well be included for planning purposes.

the departments in the natural sciences (Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Computer Science, Mathematics, Physics) as long as the following hold (1) the course is not offered by the department of the student's major, (2) the course is not cross-listed in the department of the student's major. This course may be used (and double count) toward the requirements of the student's major. Students should consult their academic advisors before choosing such a course. This measure shall take effect immediately and apply retroactively to all CSUSM students.

The second concerned the manner in with majors in Social Science satisfy the DD requirement:

A student in the Social Sciences major may use (and double count) a DD course taken in one of his/her secondary fields toward the Upper Division General Education requirement in the Social Sciences (DD).
        This measure shall take effect immediately and apply retroactively to all CSUSM students.

        The GEC considered a third proposal that would a have allowed limited transfer of upper division GE credit from other CSU campuses. (Current policy has all students take the courses at CSUSM.) The GEC decided to withdraw the proposal, but agreed that extreme cases that the policy was intended to address could be dealt with on a petition basis. (Executive Order 595 explicitly empowers the GEC to consider exceptions to rules in special cases where official regulations impose "demonstrable hardship, such as the need to extend the time required for completion of the degree in the case of a senior-level transfer student.") But there are no further plans to consider institutionalization of transfer credit.

In November 2005, the GEC empanelled a *Subcommittee on Second Language Learners* to study the difficulties Second Language Learners have in satisfying the A2 requirement. The subcommittee considered a proposal of Dr. Peter Zwick to allow such students to satisfy in ways that would be more beneficial to them than the current process allows. The subcommittee wrote a report considering the Zwick proposal and advised the GEC on the related issues and options that the university might consider. The GEC accepted the report and decided to take no action at this time. The GEC wishes to thank members of this subcommittee: David Barsky, Rosario Diaz-Greenberg, Sherrie Kelly, Ken Mendoza, Lorena Meza, Joanne Pedersen, Michael Hughes and Darci Strother.

The GEC reconsidered the university's certifications which grant GE credit for performance on Advanced Placement examinations. Some modifications have been made. Implementation of these changes will be delayed until Summer 2007, out of courtesy to new students who may have expected credit based on current policy.

The GEC, in coordination with David Barsky, has agreed to appoint Professor Sharon Hamill as GE Assessment Coordinator. She is expected to serve for two years, with an option for a third.

The GEC completed a CSU system-wide GE survey concerning what changes should be made state-wide. The committee recommended no major changes, but suggested some minor ones. The survey was included as an information item in a March Senate agenda packet.

Charged by the Senate to examine the Language Other Than English requirement, the GEC decided that problems involving articulation seem not serious enough to require a major overhaul of the requirement at the present time.

Recommended items that the GEC could consider in 2006-2007:

The GEC has a part to play in the Provost's directive to organize university policies, as there are many general education policies extant.

The GE package at CSUSM is currently 51 units, 3 higher than the CSU minimum of 48. The GEC might want to consider whether it is prudent to reduce the package to 48. Arguments in favor include facilitation of graduation; and the fact that no adjustment was made to the GE package size when the size of the degree was cut from 124 to 120 units. Arguments against this include loss of interdisciplinary breadth in area D – where the reduction would have to occur if implemented.

The GEC may wish to reconsider the current policy of allowing community college courses to count for the CCR requirement. Currently, no on-campus course will satisfy CCR, and the community college option is considered by some to be a loophole to avoid the CCR exam.

The GEC may wish to reconsider the role of History in general education – currently History straddles both areas C and D. This might be reconsidered, but the GEC should be advised that this issue was discussed during the recertification of upper division GE courses several years ago.

Unofficial motto of the year:

"The policy doesn't make sense, but that doesn't mean that making it make sense will make the policy better."

LATAC
End of Year Report to Senate
April 28, 2006

The Library and Technology Advisory Committee (LATAC) spent most of the year rewriting the proposed Intellectual Property policy. The committee was co-chaired by David Walker and Pamela Stricker. The committee elected Shaoyi He to chair next year.

Emeriti Faculty Impact

In consultation with Marion Reid, Dean of the Library, and Wayne Veres, Dean of Instructional and Information Technology Services and Chief Information Officer, LATAC reviewed the costs and impact of emeriti faculty on the Library and campus information technology.

Intellectual Property

Carry over item from 04-05: Last year LATAC passed through the Senate an Intellectual Property policy, which the Administration returned to the Senate with recommended changes. With the approval of the Executive Committee, LATAC reduced the scope of the policy to only address matters of copyright, and addressed additional concerns raised by the Administration. LATAC submitted a revised draft to the Senate, which approved the policy.

Issues carried forward

LATAC has no issues to carry forward to next year.

NEAC 2005-2006

Annual Report

Committee Members: David Chien, Hua Yi, Olaf Hansen, Delores Lindsey, Jill Weigt, Glen Brodowsky, Chair, Marcia Woolf, Ex Officio

Most of NEAC's activities this year centered on ensuring that committee and task force positions were full. Elections were held early in the Spring 2006 semester to provide ample time for newly-elected committees to meet and agree on weekly or bi-weekly meeting times for the new term. Efforts were made to establish meeting times among continuing committee members prior to the elections so that we could publicize them in the call for nominations. This would allow potential members to select committee assignments that would fit into their teaching schedules in the Fall. The newly implemented University Hour should alleviate some of the meeting schedule bottlenecks that committees faced in past years.

The committee did little constitutionally. We met with the Parliamentarian, Don Barrett to discuss the following parliamentary issues,

1) Most importantly, we decided to put off until next year any modifications of the Standing Rules. This is due to the fact that ours clearly need substantial revisions and we should allow for multiple debates in the Senate.

2) We did go ahead and talk about information items and time certains and the new committee should more formally address these issues in the Fall.

3) Rules of debate: Concern was expressed that we violate the rules of debate and that this may be problematic in these next few sessions where we have quite a bit of work to do. Don Barrett noted that this was addressed in his memo to the EC of 2/17/06 and that what we operate under is rules of 'informal consideration'.

Standing Rules: I had not noticed until today that the Standing Rules are essentially invalid. They are rules of the Senate, but have been extensively amended by EC without a full Senate vote. This is inappropriate, which thus essentially invalidates them. Luckily, we haven't really used them.

Thus, with most of the electioneering completed by the current committee, (see attached) the newly elected NEAC will have the time needed to address these standing rules and procedural issues in the next term.

Membership of the Academic Senate
2006/07

Chair: **Gilbert Valadez**
Vice-Chair: **Patty Seleski**
Secretary: **Rosario Dìaz-Greenberg**

Parliamentarian: *Don Barrett*

ACADEMIC SENATORS

CoAS
Ahlers, Jocelyn 06-08
Bass, Shana 06/07
Beavers, Staci 05-07
Berman, Jonathan 06-08
Besosa, Mayra 05-07
Brown, Katherine 06-08
Brown, Tracey 06/07
Elise, Sharon 05-07
Engen, Darel 06-08
Escobar, Matthew 06-08
Garcia, Jule Gomez de 06-08
Goldberg, Merryl 06-08
Grimshaw, Gina 05-07
Guillen, Rocio 06-08
Hadaegh, Ahmad 05-07
Kristan, Deborah 06-08
Kundgen, Andre 05-07
Moukhlis, Salah 05-07
Nava, Carmen 05-07
Neelon, Tejinder 05-07
Norris, Brian 06-08
Ouyang, Youwen 06-08
Price, Edward 06-08
Ramamurthi, Radhika 06-08
Reid, K. Brooks 05-07
Seleski, Patty 06-08
Shaw, Linda 05-07
Swan, Richelle 06-08
Trischman, Jackie 06-08

CoAS (cont.)
Watts, Jill 06-08
Weigt, Jill 05-07
Yoshii, Rika 05-07
Zhang, Xiaoyu 06-08

CoBA
Aboolian, Robert 05-07
Meilich, Ofer 06-08
Montanari Dick 05-07
Oskoorouchi, Mohammad 06-08
Shore, Ted 06-08
Tsay, Wenyuh 06-08
Watson, Kathleen 06-08

CoE
Daoud, Annette 06/07
Dìaz-Greenberg, Rosario
Marion, Robin 06-08
McDaniel, Janet 05-07
Powell, Janet 06-08
Stall, Patricia 05-07
Stowell, Laurie 06-08
Valadez, Gilbert 05-07

Library
Downie, Judith 06-08
Yi, Hua 05-07

Dept. of HHS
Astorino, Todd 05-07

SSP-AR
Kreisler, Fritz 05-07

Lecturer
TBD

ASCSU (Statewide Senate)
Brodowsky, Glen 06-09
Montanari, Dick 05-08

ASI Rep. 06/07
TBD

Staff Rep. 06/07
TBD

Committee Chairs (Art. 5.1)
Mohammad Oskoorouchi, APC
Watson/Marion, BLP
Kathy Hayden, FAC
, GEC
Shaoyi He, LATAC
, NEAC
, PAC
TBD, PTC
, SAC
Olaf Hansen, UCC

Ex-Officio Members (non-voting): President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents and Deans within Academic Affairs, CFA representative, and Past Senate Chair.

Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (EC)

Gilbert Valadez, Chair
Patty Seleski, Vice Chair
Rosario Dìaz-Greenberg, Secty.
Mohammad Oskoorouchi, APC
Kathleen Watson, BLP
Kathy Hayden, FAC

, GEC
Shaoyi He, LATAC
, NEAC
, PAC
, SAC
Olaf Hansen, UCC

Brodowsky/Montanari, ASCSU
Ex-Officio (non-voting):
Karen Haynes, President
TBD, Provost
Judy Papenhausen, HHS
Janet Powell, CFA Rep.

Standing Committees of the Academic Senate – Faculty Members

Bold type denotes chair.

Academic Policy Committee (APC)

Robert Aboolian, At-large 06-08
Rika Yoshii, CoAS 05-07
Mohammad Oskoorouchi, CoBA 06-08
Nancy Dome, CoE 05-07
Hua Yi, Library 06/07

Budget & Long-Range Planning Committee (BLP)

Jackie Borin, At-large 06-08
Patty Seleski, CoAS 06-08
Kathleen Watson, CoBA 06-08
Robin Marion, CoE 05-07 *(co-chair – Fall '06)*
Kit Herlihy, Library 05-07

Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

Patricia Stall, At-Large 06/07
Janet McDaniel, At-large 06-08
Betsy Read, At-large 06-08
Silvia Rolle-Rissetto, CoAS 06/07
Beverlee Anderson, CoBA 05-07
Kathy Hayden, CoE 05-07
Ann Fiegen, Library 06-08
Mayra Besosa, Lecturer 06-08

General Education Committee (GEC)

Oliver Berghof, CoAS-Hum/FA 06/07
Alicia Gonzalez, CoAS-Hum/FA 06-08
Marshall Whittlesey, CoAS-M&S 05-07
Brian Norris, CoAS-M&S 06-08
Jocelyn Ahlers, CoAS-SS 05-07
Open seat, CoAS-SS 06-08
Open seat, CoBA 06-08
Moses Ochanji, CoE 05-07
Yvonne Meulemans, Library 05-07

Library & Academic Technology Advisory Committee (LATAC)

Radhika Ramamurthi, CoAS 05-07
Youwen Ouyang, CoAS 06-08
Shaoyi He, CoBA 05-07
Joan Hanor, CoE 05-07
David Walker, Library 06-08

Nominations, Elections, Appointments & Constitution Committee (NEAC)

Jill Weigt, At-large 05-07
Staci Beavers, At-large 06-08
David Chien, CoAS 05-07
Jeffrey Kohles, CoBA 06-08
Delores Lindsey, CoE 05-07
Ann Fiegen, Library 06-08

Program Assessment Committee (PAC)

Ted Shore, At-large 06-08
Dawn Formo, CoAS-HumFA 06-08
Tejinder Neelon, CoAS-M&S 06-08
Open seat, CoAS-SS 06-08
Camille Schuster, CoBA 06/07
Kathy Norman, CoE 05-07
Gabriela Sonntag, Library 05-07

Promotion & Tenure Committee (PTC)

K. Brooks Reid, At-large 05-07
TBD, CoAS-HumFA 06-08
Victoria Fabry, CoAS-M&S 06-08
TBD, CoAS-SS 06-08
Sheldon Lou, CoBA 05-07
Juan Necochea, CoE 05-07
Kit Herlihy, Library 06-08

Student Affairs Committee (SAC)

Zulmara Cline, At-large 06-08
Maribel Garcia, At-large 06-08
Manuel Arriaga, CoAS 05-07
Ben Cherry, CoBA 05-07
Moses Ochanji, CoE 06-08
Melanie Chu, Library 05-07

University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

Kara Witzke, At-large 06-08
Silvia Rolle, CoAS–HUM/FA 05-07
Olaf Hansen, CoAS – M&S 05-07
Open seat, CoAS – SS 06-08
Jack Leu, CoBA 05-07
Annette Daoud, CoE 06-08
Gabriela Sonntag, Library 05-07

Other Committees – Faculty Members
Membership elected via NEAC.

Faculty Awards Selection Committee 06/07
Traditionally chaired by prior year's Brakebill award recipient

Dawn Formo, Chair & Past Recipient
Veronica Añover, CoAS
Rajnandini Pillai, CoBA
Laurie Stowell, CoE
Jackie Borin, Library
Ernest Wendt, Lecturer

Professional Leave Committee
*Chair TBD

Rocio Guillen, At-large 06/07
Veronica Añover, CoAS-Hum/FA 06-08
Youwen Ouyang, CoAS-M&S 05-07
Gina Grimshaw, CoAS-SS 05-07
Rajnandini Pillai, CoBA 06-08
Open seat, CoE 06-08
Ann Fiegen, Library 05-07

Faculty Center Advisory Council
Chaired by Center Director

Oliver Berghof, CoAS-Hum/FA 06-08
Judit Hersko, CoAS-ID 05-07
Tejinder Neelon, CoAS-M&S 06-08
Marisol Clark-Ibanez, CoAS-SS 05-07
Michael Pass, CoBA 06-08
Kimberly Woo, CoE 05-07
Judith Downie, Library 06-08
Hassan Haft, Lecturer 05-07

Student Grade Appeals Committee
(not elected, but appointed by NEAC)

Open seat, At Large 06/07
Staci Beavers, At Large 05-07
Open seat, At Large 06-08
Open seat, At Large 06-08
Open seat, Alternate, At Large 06/07
Open seat, Alternate, At Large 06/07
Open seat, Alternate, At Large 06-08
Open seat, Alternate, At Large 06-08

Student Grievance Committee
(not elected, but appointed by NEAC)

Beverly Anderson, 04-07
Jule Gomez de Garcia, 04-07
Fang Fang, Spr. '06 (temp. replacement/Moon)
Dream Moon, 04-07 (on sabb. leave Spring '06)
Tejinder Neelon (alt.), 04-07
Richelle Swan (alt.), 04-07

Program Assessment Committee
Final Report to the Academic Senate
2005-2006

Members
Gabriela Sonntag   Library
Pat Stall   At-Large
Al Schwartz   CoAS
Camille Schuster   CoBA
Kathy Norman   COE
Tom Bennett   Strategic Planning and Assessment
David Barsky   Academic Programs

The Committee has general oversight of all issues related to Program Assessment and Planning including examining, reviewing, and reporting to the Senate with regard to the progress and outcomes of program self-assessment and planning processes, and making recommendations to the Senate regarding the outcomes of these review processes. In addition the committee shall make recommendations to the Senate regarding revisions and amendments to these policies and procedures.

Accomplishments this year
Review of the current PEP guidelines was begun early in 2005, with an eye to simplifying and aligning them more closely with the new WASC accreditation procedures. The pilot guidelines were used this year by all 3 departments under review. Their questions and feedback were used to evaluate and revise the document. As the review cycle does not end until next year, the PAC will continue to seek feedback and make necessary revisions and present the document to Academic Senate next year. An important part of the new guidelines are the department annual academic assessment reports.

Graduate Studies Program Review has also been a main accomplishment for the PAC this year. After numerous revisions, the draft guidelines were presented to the Graduate Studies Council. A subgroup of the Council consisting of Beverlee Andersen, Tracy Brown and Gerardo Gonzalez met with the PAC chair to continue to review and discuss the document. These will be pilot tested this upcoming year and we hope to present them to the Academic Senate as part of the new guidelines.

The Assessment Support Task Force was charged by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate with determining what type of support structure is needed to engage academic departments in meaningful assessment strategies for the PEP process. The Taskforce report was used to craft a resolution requesting funding for assessment. This was passed by the Senate and supported by the administration.

Last year's Academic Senate election included the addition of three members to the Program Assessment Committee. The Committee requested this change in order to provide for ample representation of the various disciplines within the College of Arts and Sciences. We felt it was

important that the College with the largest number of undergraduate programs have greater representation on the Committee.

The PAC chair met several times during the year with Program PEP coordinators and presented at departmental meetings explaining the new guidelines, answering questions and providing support.

Program reviews underway during 2005-06 are the Literature and Writing, Chemistry, Biochemistry, and Psychology. Additionally the Computer Science review is nearing completion. In support of these program reviews, the PAC recommended that funding for PEP-related assessment projects be allocated to Psychology and to Literature and Writing departments. An important task left for next year is to develop form Request for Proposals to be sent to the campus every semester to allow departments to formalize their funding requests.

Status of Program Reviews. The PAC was impressed with the program reviews that were completed this past year – the BA in History, BA in Political Science and Mathematics BS and MS. Highlights of the findings and recommendations include:

History: The Committee agrees with the External Reviewer, Dr. Sharon Sievers, and the Dean in recognizing the "many stellar accomplishments of the faculty" and their dedication to teaching and research. The Program has developed a list of 9 student learning outcomes. We urge the department to continue to review and revise their student learning outcomes with the aim towards measuring student attainment of these outcomes. Publicizing the outcomes on the web and including them in course syllabi also allows students to own them. History is fortunate in having a well developed program for student portfolios. The sense of the PAC is that the portfolio requirement is working well. The External Reviewer recommends using the portfolios to assess student learning in the core course, HIST 301, and again in the senior seminar.

Political Science: The PAC concurs with the External Reviewer, Dr. Michelle St. Germain, in stating that the Program "offers students an excellent variety of teaching and learning styles and activities," and "students and alumni rate the quality of instruction highly." The Program has developed a list of 7 student learning outcomes and suggests an 8th encompassing civic engagement or political participation. The requirements of the curriculum are aligned with these student learning outcomes as seen in the complex matrix of student learning outcomes and assessments for each course. The report describes the use of pre/post tests and suggests that the department is working on guidelines, objectives and measuring criteria to evaluate student learning. Based on its PEP analysis, the department recognizes as a weakness the "failure to convey the importance of course sequence to students." The department is frustrated by the need to review background material in upper-division courses.

Mathematics: The External Reviewer, Dr. Magnhild Lien, recognized that the faculty are "committed to creating a challenging and effective learning environment for the students." During her visit she found that "undergraduate students report that the faculty are caring, informative and dedicated to their profession." The PAC was pleased to see that Mathematics has identified 10 outcomes for student learning. We encourage the Department to publicize

these outcomes as publishing them on the web and including them in course syllabi also allows students to own them. The matrix provided by the department lists various courses and displays where the outcomes are taught. The PAC notes that the core math courses alone provide ample and balanced coverage of all the stated outcomes.

Issues that span multiple programs include:

- **Curriculum Review** -- An integral part of the program review is the discussions surrounding the curriculum that is offered, how it is serving the needs of the students and what changes are necessary to strengthen student learning.
- **Student Readiness** -- Student readiness concerns are shared throughout the CSU system. Discussions include issues of first-year students' lack of preparation and how to provide support for their success as well as the needs of transfer students and how to better work with our feeder community colleges to prepare them for upper-division work. However this issue also highlights the need for expanding and enforcing prerequisites and working with the Office of First Year Programs and Undergraduate Advising Services to develop the system-required graduation roadmaps. Both will help solve the problems created by students' failure to take courses in the proper sequence and help assure they are adequately prepared when they enter a course.
- **Resources** – It is important to recognize the results of years of budget crisis, all departments have suffered from resource cuts – in tenure-line faculty allocations, OE&E allocations, and faculty professional development funds. Departments also suffer from the need to replace faculty "lost" to reassignment, retirement, or other extra-campus employment opportunities.
- **Assessment** – The best assessment plans have multiple points and methods of measuring student progress and accomplishment. Developing a systematic assessment plan that begins with focused assessment of one learning outcome can provide clear feedback on student learning. The Committee feels strongly that assessment is on-going and geared toward establishing a system for continual re-evaluation and revitalization of the curriculum. The PAC seeks to provide more consultation and guidance to departments undergoing program review as well as additional resources to support this process.

As the final step in the program review process, the PAC reports to the Academic Senate in this annual report and forwards summaries of these program reviews to the Chancellor's Office for presentation to the Board of Trustees. The report is available at: http://www.calstate.edu/BOT/Agendas/Mar05/EdPol.pdf and San Marcos section begins on the bottom of p. 146.

NEAC Recommendations
May 3, 2006

Name	Committee	Representing	Term
Bass, Shana	Academic Senate	CoAS	06/07
Gonzalez, Alicia	General Education Committee	CoAS – Hum/FA	06-08
Parsons, Sandy	Foundation Board of Directors	At Large	06-08

TIMETABLE FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE REV
2006/07

REVIEW	WPAF due	Pre-review for completeness Begin	End	Candidate adds requested material no later than	Peer Review Committee Review Begin	End	Candidate picks up recommendation no later than	End of rebuttal/response period *	End of PRC response period **	Dean Review Begin	End	Candidate picks up recommendation no later than	End of rebuttal/response period *	End of Dean's response period **	P&T Committee Review Begin	End	Candidate picks up recommendation no later than
Periodic Evaulation (typically 1st, 3rd, and 5th year)	JAN 17	JAN 18	JAN 25	FEB 02	FEB 05	MAR 02	MAR 12	MAR 19	APR 03	APR 04	MAY 01	MAY 09	MAY 16	MAY 24	N/A	N/A	N/A
2nd Year Retention	SEP 05	SEP 06	SEP 13	SEP 21	SEP 22	OCT 12	OCT 20	OCT 27	NOV 06	NOV 07	NOV 28	DEC 06	DEC 13	DEC 21	N/A	N/A	N/A
2nd Year Retention w/ optional Tenure and/or Promotion	Use above timeline for 2nd Year Retention and continue with the following P&T Committee/President schedule:														FEB 12	MAR 23	APR 09
3rd thru 5th Year Retention (typically 4th year)	SEP 20	SEP 21	SEP 28	OCT 06	OCT 09	NOV 13	NOV 21	NOV 28	DEC 06	DEC 07	JAN 17	JAN 25	FEB 01	FEB 09	N/A	N/A	N/A
3rd thru 5th Year Retention w/ optional Tenure and/or Promotion	SEP 20	SEP 21	SEP 28	OCT 06	OCT 09	NOV 13	NOV 21	NOV 28	DEC 06	DEC 07	JAN 17	JAN 25	FEB 01	FEB 09	FEB 12	MAR 23	APR 09
Tenure and/or Promotion Review	SEP 20	SEP 21	SEP 28	OCT 06	OCT 09	NOV 13	NOV 21	NOV 28	DEC 06	DEC 07	JAN 17	JAN 25	FEB 01	FEB 09	FEB 12	MAR 23	APR 09

Holidays/Breaks:
Labor Day: Sep 04
Thanksgiving: Nov 23-25
Winter Holiday/Break: Dec 22 - Jan 16
Spring Break: Mar 26 - 31

* Candidate may submit a rebuttal/response within 7 days of receipt of the recommendation end date listed on timeline - whichever comes first.

** Reviewing committee/administrator may submit response to a candidate's rebuttal within se... end date listed on timeline - whichever comes first.

Catalog Copy

MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Philosophy

The fundamental mission of the College of Business Administration is to educate the leaders of tomorrow's business and non-profit organizations by concentrating on the management skills needed in the complex, multicultural and technological environments of the future. The design philosophy for the graduate program is to integrate rigor with relevance and theory with practice.

The program has been influenced by the writings of premier educators, commissions, and mangers, as well as by the talents of our faculty and by the needs of our constituencies. It is modern in structure and pedagogy as well as content. It recognizes the sea-changes such as diversity, a global economy, technology, the cooperative nature of decision making, and the accelerating rates of change that are occurring in business, government and society, and in higher education.

The program emphasizes a commitment to values: ethics, respect for the individual and the environment, intellectual curiosity, commitment to lifelong learning, and self-direction. It makes use of information technologies in the delivery of the program and requires that students develop a significant level of proficiency in the application of technology. Information literacy and library research skills are salient in the dynamic world of global business and as such are emphasized in the program. The curriculum stresses the importance of good communication skills for successful management; thus written and oral presentations are part of every course.

Description of the Program

The Master of business Administration is designed for the employed student who has several years of work experience as a professional and is either preparing to enter management or has moderate management experience.

The program requires 64 units of course work. Each MBA course (except the MBA Project course, BA 680) will include a one-unit theme project. The instructor is responsible for selecting the theme for the courses/section from the following: *Ethics, Evolving Technology, Globalization* or *Environment* themes. New themes may be introduced in the future. For each section of each course there will be only one theme and all students enrolled in a section will engage in activities related to the assigned theme. Throughout the program, it is hoped that students will be exposed to multiple themes.

Program Schedule

The program is designed for working professionals. Groups of 25-40 students take courses in a predetermined sequence. The full Master's Program can be completed in 32 months. Students attend Fall, Spring, and Summer terms.

Catalog Copy

Admission Requirements

1. A GMAT score of 500 or above, with a minimum 30th percentile score in the Verbal section, a minimum 30th percentile score in the Quantitative section, and a 4.0 score in the Analytical Writing section.

2. A Grade Point Average (GPA) of "B" (3.0) or better in the last 60 graded semester units, from a WASC-equivalent university. Only regular courses from four-year colleges and/or universities will be used in calculating an applicant's GPA–no extension courses or community college courses will be included.

3. The Work Experience requirement is at least three years of full time, professionally relevant work experience.

The primary data for assessment includes the following required items:

- Transcripts of university–level course work. GPA will be computed from most recent 60 semester units of academic coursework taken at the graduate or upper-division level.

- The Graduate Management Aptitude test (GMAT), taken within the last 5 years.

- Resume documenting 3 years of relevant work experience.

- Two essays covering career achievements plus expected challenges and rewards from the MBA Program.

- Three Letters of Recommendation.

The admissions committee will also evaluate the applicant's skills in quantitative methods (including basic calculus), communication, and computer applications. Where deficiencies are identified, the applicant may be required to complete equivalent courses or workshops.

Advancement to candidacy

In order to be considered for advancement, MBA students must be in good standing with an overall graduate GPA of at least a 3.0, have no more than 8 units (Including BA 680) remaining towards the completion of the MBA program.

Graduation Requirements

Catalog Copy

Completion of the MBA degree requires: (1) an overall GPA of at least 3.0 (B average) in all coursework within the program, (2) a minimum grade of 2.0 (C) in each course, and (3) Advancement to candidacy.

The program requires a total of 64 units.

Required Courses
(52 units)

BA 611	4
BA 615	4
BA 616	4
BA 617	4
BA 621	4
BA 625	4
BA 626	4
BA 630	4
BA 635	4
BA 645	4
BA 650	4
BA 680	4
ECON 600	4

Elective Courses
(12 units)

BA 628	4
BA 641	4
BA 646	4
BA 664	4
BA 667	4
BA 681	1-4
BA 690	1-4
BA 698	1-4

University Hour* Implementation Matrix
(based on Spring 2006 Implementation Survey)

MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
Department Meetings Campus Services	Department Meetings Campus Services Club Meetings	Academic Senate Campus Services Club Meetings	Central Event/Activity Campus Services Workshops/Seminars	SOC Meeting Campus Services
Department Meetings Campus Services	Department Meetings Campus Services Club Meetings	Central Event/Activity Campus Services Club Meetings Workshops/Seminars	Campus Services Workshops/Seminars	Campus Services
Department Meetings Campus Services	Department Meetings Campus Services Club Meetings	Campus Services Club Meetings Workshops/Seminars	Central Event/Activity Campus Services Workshops/Seminars	SOC Meeting Campus Services
Department Meetings Campus Services	Department Meetings Campus Services Club Meetings	Central Event/Activity Campus Services Club Meetings Workshops/Seminars	Campus Services Workshops/Seminars	Campus Services

* 11:50 a.m. – 12:50 p.m.

Notes:
Established meeting days are suggestions and for planning purposes only. With the exception of Central Event/Activity on Wednesday/Thursdays, these are not intended to be required guidelines.
Departments typically meet semi-monthly
Clubs typically meet weekly
Faculty Office Hours may be held throughout the week

4/27/06 FINAL - M. Ceppi
Per discussion at 4/24/06 University Hour Implementation Task Force meeting