

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE (APC)
Submitted by Rika Yoshii

Committee Members: Ian Chan, Chetan Kumar, Rika Yoshii (Chair), Evelyn Andrews, David Barsky, Gerry Gonzalez, Brittany Russo

Kathy Norman was the Chair in Fall 2008.

Jack Leu and Kathy Hayden were members in Fall 2008.

APC Web Site is <http://public.csusm.edu/rika/APC>

Fall 2008 Accomplishments

- **Administrative Course Drop policy (update)** was forwarded to the Senate. It was approved by the Senate and then the administration in Spring 09.
- **Online Instruction policy (new)** was forwarded to the Senate. It was approved by the Senate and forwarded to the administration in Spring 09.

Spring 2009 Accomplishments

At the beginning of the semester, the committee worked on updating the **Advance Placement Policy** in order to conform to the system-wide requirements. A draft was produced.

We also produced a draft of the new **College Level Examination (CLEP)** policy.

However, three other urgent items were brought to our attention.

- **EO 1037 and EO 1038** – These executive orders required us to update the following policies.
 1. **Undergraduate Probation policy** (as per EO 1038). This is at the Senate today as the second reading item.
 2. **Graduate Probation policy** (as per EO 1038). This is at the Senate today as a second reading item.
 3. **Course Repeat policy** (as per EO 1037). This is at the Senate today as a second reading item.
 4. **Academic Renewal policy** (as per EO 1037). This is at the Senate today as a second reading item.
 5. **Withdrawal policy** (as per EO 1037). This is at the Senate today as a first reading item. This policy also needed updating in order to address the concerns raised by auditors.
 6. **Grading Symbols policy and procedure** (as per EO 1037). This is at the Senate today as a first reading item.

These policy changes need to be implemented in Fall 2009.

- **Catalog Rights policy** – Based on the concerns raised by some departments which have created new options/tracks or have made significant changes to their requirements, we updated the policy on Catalog Rights to provide more choices for catalog terms. This policy was forwarded to GEC for comments. It will be presented again to EC early next semester.
- **Program Discontinuation policy** – Given a request from the Chancellor's office, we drafted a policy on program discontinuation. We will continue to work on this draft next semester.

APC Tasks for Fall 2009:

1. Catalog Rights policy – present to EC again
2. Program Discontinuation policy – finish the draft
3. Advance Placement policy – finish the draft
4. CLEP policy – finish the draft
5. International Baccalaureate policy (new)
6. Triple Majors policy (new)
7. Academic Calendar

We will meet every Monday from 2 to 3pm.

BUDGET AND LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE (BLP)
Submitted by Kathleen Watson

During AY 2008-09, the voting members of the Budget and Long Range Planning (BLP) Committee included Staci Beavers (at-large), Patricia Stall (COE), Kathleen Watson (chair, COBA), Robert Yamashita (COAS), and Hua Yi (Library). 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, Jennifer Jeffries interim Associate Vice President of Planning and Accreditation, and an ASI student representative (Zach Morrison in Fall 2008 and Diana Valdivia in Spring 2009). The committee met weekly throughout the year.

The Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee provides faculty representation on a number of University Committees and task forces. The chair of BLP serves on the University Budget Committee (UBC), the Senate Executive Committee, and as BLP representative to the Academic Senate. She also represented BLP on the Academic Affairs Restructuring Task Force, convened to propose to the Provost principles and processes for creating and restructuring schools and colleges. The task force completed their work in January 2009. The BLP chair attends meetings of the Academic Affairs Leadership Council (AALC) when budget and planning issues are on the agenda.

All members of BLP attend the newly formed University Academic Master Plan Forecasting Committee (UAMPFC) which meets three times a year. This committee replaces the Academic Blueprint Committee (ABC). BLP members attended the first meeting in March. The entire voting membership of BLP, at the invitation of the Provost, participated in two joint meetings with the AALC in January and April to provide input on Academic Affairs strategic planning. The January meeting was a strategic planning and budget cycle workshop. The proposed AA budget cycle would have joint AALC and BLP meetings at four points in the AA budget cycle: 1) review of the goals and objectives of the AA Strategic Plan, 2) review college/unit updates to their strategic plans and objectives and prepare a recommendation to the Provost, 3) review of college/unit 3-year rolling budget/hiring plans and develop a prioritized recommendation to the Provost, and 4) review the draft AA Division Budget Proposal submission for the University Budget Committee and provide feedback to the Provost. BLP members also provided input on WASC, Theme 1: Academic Master Planning, and met with the WASC team during their visit.

Curriculum Reviews

BLP conducts two kinds of curriculum review: 1) A-form reviews and 2) P-form reviews. The A-Form 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. 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. BLP did not review any A-forms this year.

Instead, for the first time at CSUSM, a pilot degree program was proposed. The pilot degree program process supports experimentation in the planning and offering of degree programs that meet fast-track criteria. They may be implemented as 5-year 'pilot programs' without prior review and comment by the Chancellor or CPEC. A P-form proposal is subject to thorough review by UCC and BLP, but by-passes the A-form stage required for placement on the UAMP. Within the five-year limit, the campus must propose to the Chancellor's Office converting the program from pilot to regular status. BLP brought to Senate a long-range planning and resource implication report for a proposed pilot program for a Masters in Biotechnology. It has undergone a first reading by the Academic Senate, and will be voted upon as old business at today's Senate meeting.

P-Forms represent the realized plan of the curriculum, including resource needs for initiating and

sustaining the degree a program. Originators of major and minor degree programs, options and certificates, and existing degree programs undergoing substantial changes submit P-forms. Once P-forms are reviewed concurrently 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, the 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. In AY 2008-09 the Senate approved a B.A. in Liberal Studies, Option in Border Studies (new Option) and a BA Child and Adolescent Development (CHAD). In the case of the CHAD program, the proposers, and their College Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee, concur that they shall not launch this new program until assured that sufficient resources are available to support the program. Senate approval of programs, in the present economic environment, will position a program to be implemented when the resources are available. BLP also brought to Senate a proposed Master of Science in Nursing. It has undergone a first reading by the Academic Senate, and will be voted upon as old business at today's Senate meeting.

Center and Institutes

Proposals for Centers and Institutes are sent to the Senate Chair, who consults with the appropriate senate standing committee, to formulate the Senate's recommendation to the Provost. BLP reviewed the proposal for the California Indian Culture and Sovereignty Center (CICSC) for its fit with the strategic mission of CSUSM and its budgetary implications. Based upon the extensive outreach of the proposers to internal and external communities, the clear connection between the Center's mission and that of CSUSM, the clearly articulated rationale relative to serving the Tribal communities, and the availability of existing resources, BLP recommended the Center proposal be approved, and drafted a letter of support to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

Information Gathering

BLP invited guests to provide input on issues that impact the budgeting process and strategic planning. In AY 2008-09, invited guests included:

- Linda Scott joined BLP members to walk us through the implications of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. All new course offerings must be compliant with the ADA starting Fall 2008. BLP decided to look at the Executive Order because compliance for any new course could have budget implications. We covered memos from the Chancellor's Office as well as CSUSM's Instructional Materials Accessibility Plan.
- David Barsky provided us with the CSU policy on Pilot Programs and discussed implications of reviewing and offering programs through this alternative process.

Recommendations for Next Year

BLP would like to see movement toward some formula funding based on FTES growth projections, associated with a specific new program proposal, which would be specifically dedicated to Library and IITS. We need predictability in order to plan for program growth and new program development.

BLP recommends inviting Extended Learning for a discussion of program delivery through Extended Learning. Many recent programs such as the Masters in Nursing and Masters in Biotechnology are proposed as self-support. Increased knowledge about issues such as space and lab usage and maintenance, alternative methods of faculty compensation (buy-out, overload, grants), IITS and library support, etc. would inform BLP in its resource deliberations.

Committee Membership for 2009-2010

Faculty membership

Ongoing:

Staci Beavers (at-large – 08-10)
Kathleen Watson (COBA – 08-10)
Robert Yamashita (COAS – 08-10)

New:

Hua Yi (Library – 09-11)
Grace McField (COE – 09-11)

Ex-Officio:

Dean COAS
Dean IITS
AVP Academic Programs
AVP Planning and Accreditation
Student, ASI

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (FAC)

Submitted by Jackie Trischman

Jackie Trischman (Chair, CoAS), Cathy James (Lecturer), Soheila Jorjani (CoBA), Carmen Nava (Faculty At Large), Jackie Borin (Library), Mayra Besosa (CFA) Jennifer Jeffries (AVP-P&AR), Fran Chadwick (CoE), Debbie Bennett (SoN), Todd Astorino (Fall 08 only)

FAC met weekly for 1.5 hours. The following business was conducted over the course of the 2008-09 academic year.

RTP: WPAF Review for Completeness. There was a disconnect between policy and practice in terms of the review for completeness. After discussions with FAC, J. Jeffries developed a checklist for the file review to be sure policy is followed. More emphasis was placed on this part of the process with both department chairs and PRCs to help put the policy into practice.

Interim Coach Evaluation Policy. The evaluation policy for coaches actually came to FAC last year and underwent a short review. Changes were suggested by FAC, and the revised document came to the Senate in late Spring of 2008. To allow for evaluation of coaches in the 2008-09 year, the policy was reviewed by the FAC Chair and Senate Executive Committee, to allow implementation until FAC reviews the policy again. With the cycle for the year completed, FAC should take this up first thing in the Fall to implement any necessary changes.

Evaluation of Temporary Faculty. The Library, School of Nursing, and the Colleges all needed to update the temporary faculty evaluation documents to bring them into alignment with the current CBA. FAC finished review on all policies that reached them during the 2008-09 year or before.

College of Arts & Sciences. This policy was the first of this type for the year, and many changes were necessary to follow the CBA. In addition, there were many pieces of the former policy that needed editorial changes or clarifications. The result was that this took several months of editing before being passed by the Senate.

School of Nursing. The differences between the SoN document and the CoAS document involved the type of appointments that are typical, the inclusion of the Director as the evaluator rather than a department chair and/or dean, and the type of observations and assignments involved. The rest of the document was similar to the CoAS policy that was just passed. Thus, this policy was revised to a format very similar to that of CoAS for ease of review and comparison. This policy was also passed.

College of Business Administration. In collaboration with the College, this policy was also revised to be similar to those that had been written and brought to Senate previously. It was brought to the Senate and is expected to be passed at the final meeting.

On-line Teaching Policy. FAC spent one meeting drafting feedback on the on-line teaching policy brought to the Senate by LATAC.

Range Elevation Policy. This policy had some language that was contradictory to the CBA, or confusing to part-time faculty. Thus, it was revised and sent to Senate. It is expected to pass in the final meeting of the Senate.

Guidelines for Department RTP Standards. In past years, several departments had attempted to write their own RTP standards, but none had been able to reach the level where they could be used in the process. For this reason, FAC was charged with writing guidelines for the development of such standards, in collaboration with the Provost. The expectations of the Provost fit well with FAC's notion that these documents simply contain standards that communicate the unique nature of the department and/or expectations of work that needs to be completed or performance levels that need to be attained or maintained to be promoted or retained. These standards are meant to inform faculty undergoing review and the evaluators at each stage. This document is in review at Senate, and may be passed at the final Senate meeting.

Lecturer Handbook. In consultation with the Chair of FAC, Cathy James made significant progress in developing a lecturer handbook. At this stage, the first draft will be handed off to Jennifer Jeffries without full FAC review. It should be brought back to FAC in the Fall. At that point, the suggestion is to create a task force to seek feedback from lecturers and the broader campus community.

Work to be referred back to the Senate for next year's FAC:

- A. College of Education Temporary Faculty Evaluation Policy – Should be addressed as soon as brought to Senate by CoE.
- B. Professional Leave Committee's Recommendations – The committee made recommendations for changes to the policy.
- C. RTP Policy Review – received input from the P&T that should be used as a basis for conversation about the RTP process and policy.
- D. Coach Evaluation – This should be reviewed right away in the Fall.
- E. Classroom Evaluation – The policy may be due to be reviewed, and we need to add a discussion of the use of on-line evaluation. Some classes that were not taught on-line were given on-line evaluations in Fall 08. It is unclear whether or not faculty understand the differences in evaluation forms.
- F. Carried over from last year, and remaining on the agenda to be investigated further:
 1. Review of Policy on Misconduct in Scholarship and Research
 2. Review of Policy on Integration of Lecturers Into Life of Institution

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE (GEC)

Submitted by Yvonne Meulemans

GEC Members: Salah Moukhlis, Youwen Ouyang, Lorri Santamarria, Marshall Whittlesey, Mark Wallace, Jill Weigt

Ex Officio members: Evelyn Andrews, David Barsky, Andres Favela, Sharon Hamill, Virginia Mann, David McMartin

GEC considers all issues related to developing and delivering the General Education curriculum at CSUSM.

Tasks completed or in process

Curriculum Review

Throughout the academic year, GEC continued to review courses submitted for GE credit. Below is a list of all courses approved to receive GE credit. GEC is currently not reviewing courses submitted for Area E credit, pending the completion of the GELO project. (See below for more information.) GEC agreed to this moratorium as a response to the general agreement that requirements for Area E courses are unclear. However, at the last GEC meeting, one course was approved for Area E credit. GEC believes it to be of utmost importance that next year’s GEC discuss how to address the issues of reviewing Area E courses given this last minute action.

B1	CHEM150
B2	BIOL 177
B3	BIOL 177, CHEM 150L
BB	BIOL326; KINE 336 decertified Fall 2009
C2	LTWR211/WMST211
CC	FMST375
D7D	HD101
DD	ID350-2, ID370-1, PSCI348-1, PSCI355, PSCI358PSCI366, PSCI390-1, PSCI/WMST343, PSCI390-3/WMST300-5, SOC489-1, WMST300-2, WMST300-3, WMST370
E	CHEM312

GE assessment

GEC received regular reports from Sharon Hamill, GE Assessment Coordinator. She also provided valuable guidance on the GELO project. Dr. Hamill was on sabbatical during the Spring 2009 semester, so only one report was delivered. GEC has recommended to Academic Programs that Dr. Hamill continue as GE Assessment Coordinator.

GELO’s

GEC began an effort to articulate General Education Learning Outcomes (GELO’s.) The purpose of this effort is to create more clear guidelines for GEC, course proposers, and students regarding learning outcomes for GE Courses. Also, Executive Order 1033, the new EO governing GE that was distributed in August 2008, requires the articulation of learning outcomes for GE courses. Initial drafts of GELO’s have been written using existing documents (Philosophy Statement of GE, GE course forms, etc.) as well as the LEAP framework (Liberal Education and America’s Promise) that the CSU has adopted. The next steps of this project are described below as business for next year’s GEC.

UDGE policy change

A policy change regarding when students can begin taking UDGE courses for GE credit has successfully passed the Academic Senate and has been forwarded on to the Provost for approval. The policy change requires that students have completed 60 credits before enrolling in a UDGE course to fulfill a GE requirement.

Computer Competency Requirement (CCR) issues

Several concerns were brought to GEC's attention regarding the CCR. Various issues about how the CCR exam is administered, the CCR exam itself, and CCR enforcement were shared with GEC. GEC will find these issues as business for next year.

Recommended tasks for next year's GEC

The following are business items for the 2009-2010 GEC.

Curriculum review

A moratorium on reviewing courses submitted for Area E credit will be entering its second year. It was anticipated by GEC that the moratorium would be lifted by the end of this year. This has not been the case. However, at the last GEC meeting, a course was approved for Area E. Next year's GEC needs to consider how to address courses submitted for Area E credit given the inconsistency of placing a moratorium yet approving a course.

GELO's

The next steps of this project for GEC will be taking the drafts for review and to solicit feedback from faculty in each of the GE areas.

CCR issues

GEC needs to discuss how to start addressing the various issues regarding the CCR. This year's GEC have discussed the need for a holistic review of the CCR exam as well as CCR administration.

Cross-listing of GE courses

Over the course of the year, several courses approved for GE credit are to be cross-listed. The 2008-9 GEC began drafting a policy clarification about students taking courses cross-listed in their major to fulfill GE requirements. Next year's GEC needs to continue working on this policy clarification.

LIBRARY AND ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (LATAC)

Submitted by Youwen Ouyang

For Academic Year 2008/2009, LATAC is composed of five faculty members [Allison Carr (Library), Joan Hanor (CoE), Shaoyi He (CoBA), Sajith Jayasinghe (CoAS), and Youwen Ouyang (CoAS)], three staff members [Robert Erichsen (IITS, Fall 2008), Chuck Allen (IITS, Spring 2009), Teresa Roudenbush (Library), and Chad Huggins (At Large)], and one student representative (Megan Omotoy, Spring 2009). Shaoyi He served as the Chair in Fall 2008 and Youwen Ouyang serves as the Chair in Spring 2009. The committee met once a month on the last Wednesday of the month from 9:00 – 10:00.

Marion Reid (Dean of Library), and Wayne Veres (Dean of IITS), and Linda Scott (Director of Academic Technology Services, IITS) attended LATAC meetings regularly throughout the year. They updated the committee with timely matters related to the Library and to academic technology, allowing the committee to inform the university community through reports to the Executive Committee and Senate important information about library and academic technology policies, financial standing, library collections and services, academic technology and services, and media issues. LATAC also worked with the Library and IITS in promoting library and academic technology related town hall and brown-bag meetings such as:

- Scholarly Publishing: A System in Crisis, November 18
- Technology Brown Bag: Instructional Materials Accessibility, November 18
- Technology Tuesday: 10 Myths About Teaching Online, February 3
- CSU System-wide Information Security Policy, February 11

- Academic Technology: Assessing the Online Learner, March 10

Another important role of LATAAC is to provide advice, as necessary, to the Dean of the Library and the Dean of IITS. Special meetings were set up for LATAAC members to meet with candidates for the new Dean of the Library on their campus visits. These members filled out confidential candidate feedback forms to provide valuable input for the Search Committee. LATAAC members were also involved with the planning for campus wide Academic Technology Retreat that will take place in October 2009 as well as possible activities leading to such retreat to engage the campus community in defining a strategic plan for the direction of academic technology on this campus.

LATAAC also served as a channel of communication for expressing faculty, staff, and student needs and expectations to the Library and IITS. When concerns from faculty, staff, and students were brought to the meetings, LATAAC worked with the Library and IITS to brainstorm and identify potential solutions. For example,

Concerns	Solutions
Cancellation of subscriptions	Library faculty contacted their departments for input with regards to the levels of impact different cancellation may have. In April, Library sent out a list of titles earmarked for cancellations to all faculty so that feedback would be collected by the end of the semester.
E-Reserves	Library and IITS worked closely to provide better access for faculty and students by adding appropriate links to multimedia materials such as video-on-demand.
Budget implication for new courses and programs	Both Deans expressed concerns about their units not being contacted early enough in the process of new course/program development to allow adequate input on budget implication. The concerns were brought forward to UCC, the committee which subsequently revised appropriate forms to allow early involvement of the Library and IITS in new course/program proposal process.
Adjunct faculty's access to their campus email accounts.	IITS provided new adjunct faculty members with Outlook email accounts and developed a plan for switching over the existing WebMail accounts to Outlook.
Student access to the Computer Competency Requirement (CCR) exams	IITS created a WebCT shell for administering the CCR exam. Students who are still in need of passing the CCR exam were added to the CCR WebCT shell so that they could be reminded to sign up and take the exam. Study questions were also included in the CCR WebCT shell to allow easy access for students to prepare for the exam. Students will still need to go to a designated computer lab to take the exam. However, IITS has developed an online registration process so that students will not have to wait in long lines before finding out whether they will be able to take the exam.
Shift of computer operating system to Vista	IITS reported extensive and continuous testing of Vista among IITS personnel. IITS also sought faculty volunteers to test Vista starting in March 2009. Four of the LATAAC faculty members are part of this testing team.
Faculty's tendency to avoid posting resources online in fear of accessibility in compliance	IITS received a lottery grant to support five Faculty Accessibility Reps from across the campus. Each is redesigning a course. This experiment will allow IITS to identify potential challenges and corresponding solutions in achieving accessibility compliance. Two of these five representatives are LATAAC faculty members.

Allison Carr (Chair, 2009/2010), Shaoyi He, and Youwen Ouyang will be returning to LATAAC next year. The committee welcomes two new faculty members for LATAAC: John Halcon (CoE) and Wayne Aitken (CoAS).

The following are issues that LATAAC was not able to fully address this year. We hope the discussions can be continued in 2009/2010.

- The General Education Committee (GEC) will review the Computer Competency Requirement in 2009/2010. LATAAC should work with GEC to provide input with regards to adequate academic technology expectations for students.
- As resources and publications are increasingly developed by teams whose members come from different groups of the campus community, LATAAC should work with the Office of Graduate Studies and Research on the issues of intellectual properties.
- LATAAC should work with FAC or department/college units to discuss ways to recognize the risk and efforts faculty members need to take to incorporate academic technology in their classes.
- The field of open access publications should be further investigated.

NOMINATIONS, ELECTIONS, APPOINTMENTS, AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE (NEAC)
Submitted by Marie Thomas

Committee Members: Glen Brodowsky (Co-Chair), David Chien, Pearl Ly, Mohammad Oskoorouchi, Radhika Ramamurthi (Co-Chair, Fall 08), Marie Thomas (Co-Chair, Spring 09)

Ex Officio: Marcia Woolf

1. NEAC recruited for numerous committees throughout the year. At the beginning of Fall 2008, 25 Senate and committee seats were vacant. Of those vacant seats, 14 were filled before the first Senate meeting in September. NEAC held elections for Promotions and Tenure Committee seats in the Spring; next year's committee will be fully constituted. After elections in Spring 2009, 25 Academic Senate Committee positions remained unfilled. In an effort to attempt to fill these positions before Fall 2009, NEAC re-issued a call with the open seats and filled an additional 16 seats. There are still 10 committee seats open:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| • NEAC | At large | 09-11 |
| • Student Grade Appeals Committee | At large | 09-11 |
| • Student Grade Appeals Committee | At large | 09-11 |
| • Student Grade Appeals Committee | At large - alt. | 09-11 |
| • Student Grade Appeals Committee | At large - alt. | 09-11 |
| • General Education Committee | CoAS/Hum&FA | 09-11 |
| • Faculty Grants Committee | CoAS/SS | 09-11 |
| • Faculty Affairs Committee | CoE | Fall '09 |
| • General Education Committee | CoE | 09-11 |
| • Promotion & Tenure Committee | CoBA | 09-11 |

[Note: We now have enough candidates for a contested election; therefore, the CoBA PTC seat will be filled by the end of the semester.]

2. Much of the Fall 2008 semester was spent discussing the issue of the representation of new colleges and schools on Academic Senate and on committees.

3. NEAC recommended 7 Constitutional Amendments to the referendum process:

- Addition of "school" as a unit for Academic Senate representation
- Addition of "school" as a unit for standing committee representation, and removal of specified number of voting members for each committee

- Wording/grammar/usage changes
 - Addition of article 5.3.1 to specify terms for Academic Senate officers
 - Changing article 5.4.2 regarding when Academic Senators receive supporting documentation for agenda items
 - Addition of non-voting member to APC
 - Addition of non-voting member to PAC
- All amendments were passed by Academic Senate.

4. As charged by the Executive Committee of the Senate, NEAC amended the Election Rules and Guidelines to change all instances of “College/Library” to “College/School/Library.” This is to bring the Election Rules and Guidelines into alignment with the Constitution. This amendment was passed by Academic Senate.

Remaining work for 2009/2010:

1. Continue discussing changes to the Constitution, including:
 - defining what kinds of changes can be made without going through the referendum process, and
 - whether a statement should be included in Article 6.11 (Program Assessment Committee) that, if the at-large representative is from the College of Arts & Sciences, then the at-large representative cannot come from the same discipline as any of the divisional representatives.
2. Given the difficulty in filling committee seats, it might be fruitful to discuss the statewide study on shared governance that shows we have a relatively large Senate, a large number of committees, and a large number of people on committees. Can/Should Senate and the standing committees be streamlined?
3. Investigate whether current representation of temporary faculty on Academic Senate standing committees is sufficient.

NEAC thanks Marcia Woolf for her hard work, patience, and sense of humor in working with the committee to run the nominations, elections, appointments, and constitutional amendment process smoothly. We couldn’t have done the job without her!

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE (PAC)
Report not submitted in time for printing

PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEE (PTC)
Report not submitted in time for printing

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE (SAC)
Submitted by Martha Stoddard Holmes

The Student Affairs Committee shall provide advice and recommend policy on all student issues including but not limited to policies and procedures related to academic environments, student government, student diversity, student organizations or activities, athletics, student discipline and welfare, student research competition, lottery grants, and matters concerning admissions, retention, advising, and commencement. In pursuit of these duties, the committee may create ad hoc subcommittees. (Article 6.13.1: Student Affairs Committee Duties)

Voting Members:

Martha Stoddard Holmes (chair, CoAS), Ben Cherry (CoBA), Ahmad Hadaegh (At-Large – Fall Semester Only), Elizabeth Matthews (At-Large), Toni Olivas (Library)

Nonvoting Members:

Gregory Toya, Associate Dean of Students
Ben Bertran-Harris (ASI)
Ben Cherry (Faculty Athletic Liaison)

I. Summary of Activity *(in chronological order)*

A. Student Grievance Policy

SAC chair MSH met with Dean Blanshan and Student Grievance Committee Chair Jule Gomez de Garcia in Summer 08 to review a revised draft of the policy prepared by Dean Blanshan and staff. We were unable to progress with revisions in AY 2008-09.

B. Academic Honesty Web Resources.

SAC reviewed Student Affairs' Academic Honesty web resources for faculty and students and made suggestions for improvement.

C. Lottery

In 07-08, SAC prepared a Lottery Grant Fund Allocation Resolution which passed Senate in 08 and was approved by the Provost and President in Fall 09. The likelihood of reduced Lottery funding to CSUSM in AY 09-10, however, prompted the Provost to discuss suspending the Lottery Grant cycle in AY 08-09. SAC reviewed the situation and sent a recommendation to the Provost that the grant process be suspended this year and, in consultation with EC, suggested guidelines for the allocation of any funds received for the Academic Senate Lottery Grant.

D. Student Research Competition

SAC supported the efforts of the Office of Research to promote the competition to faculty and students.

E. Student Grade Appeals Policy/Procedure

Based on the state audit of Registration/Records, which found that student membership on the Committee had not been consistently in line with the policy, SAC reviewed and revised the policy to ensure consistent student participation on the Student Grade Appeals Committee. Senate approved the revised policy in Spring 09.

APC forwarded EO 1037 for SAC to review to ensure the SGAC Policy/Procedure is in compliance with the EO and prepare to propose any necessary revisions in early Fall 09. SAC will complete the review of the policy in light of the EO by the end of Spring semester and put any needed revisions at the head of SAC's Fall 09 list of new business. In addition, SAC plans to review the entire SGAC Policy/Procedure in Fall 09.

F. Student Athletes Class Absence Policy

SAC researched the need for a policy and precedents across the CSU system. We studied SDSU's policy, discussed the potential parameters of a policy with EC, and began to draft a CSUSM policy.

G. Student Role on SAC

SAC discussed ways to make student participation on SAC more robust. MSH contacted VP External Affairs-Elect Grant to discuss the process for including SAC membership in the job description for an appropriate ASI BOD member. In the interim, SAC will recommend that the student representative have a standing report on SAC's agenda in 2009-10.

H. Student Intellectual Property

EC tasked SAC with joining with LATAC and the Office of Research to form a task force to investigate the issue of student intellectual property. We were unable to form a task force in Spring 2009.

II. Representations on related committees (on behalf of SAC or Academic Senate)

A. CUGR

MSH represented SAC on this committee as well as co-chairing. Information items, but no action items, were sent to SAC from the committee this year. CUGR's survey of faculty-mentored undergraduate research will be the catalyst for a potential SAC resolution in Fall 09.

B. University Student Union Advisory Board

TO represented SAC on this Task Force.

III. Recommended Tasks

- Review Student Grade Appeals Policy
 - Revise Student Grievance Policy
 - Draft Resolution of Support for CUGR
 - Draft Student Athletes Class Absence Policy
 - Form Task Force with LATAC and Office of Research to Explore a Student Intellectual Property Policy
 - Review Lottery Grant Suspension in light of funding to Campus in Fall 09
 - Review Management of Course Records Policy
 - College of Education Student Grievance & Appeals Policy
-

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (UCC)

Submitted by Olaf Hansen

Voting Members: Robert Aboolian, Judith Downie, Jule Gomez de Garcia, Michael Hughes, Delores Lindsey, Yi Sun, Olaf Hansen (Chair)

Non-Voting Members: David Barsky, Virginia Mann, JoAnn Daugherty, Jennifer Lewis, Brittney Russo

Work completed in 2008/09: In the academic year 2008/09 the UCC reviewed five programs proposals: the new option in Border and Regional Studies, two Entrepreneurship Tracks in the College of Business Administration, the Master of Science in Nursing, and the Master of Biotechnology. We started the review of the Child and Adolescence Development Program, but UCC could not finish its review until now.

We reviewed 30 changes to existing programs, 71 changes to courses, and 119 proposals for new courses. In the Fall of 2008 UCC worked on a special reconciliation cycle which was necessary to adjust certain pre- and corequisites to a newly acquired software. We worked on an update of the P-Form

signature page with the goal to encourage program proposers to allow the library and IITS more time to prepare their reports for the P-Form.

Continuing Work: The final review of the Child and Adolescence Development Program is still pending. The proposed Minor in Kinesiology is still waiting for a clarification concerning the required number of units. Because of the huge amount of newly proposed curriculum UCC was not able to update the C-Form. Some of the questions remaining are: If and how Student Learning Objectives, Online Classes, and Service Learning Courses should appear in the C-Form and if the course review will take this additional information into account.

Continuing Members: Judith Downie, Jule Gomez de Garcia, Michael Hughes, Delores Lindsey, and Yi Sun are the continuing members of the UCC. Two new members, Fang Fang (College of Business Administration) and Deborah Kristan (Biological Sciences), were elected to the UCC in Spring 2009. The new chair will be Jule Gomez de Garcia.

As in the last years I would like again to thank all members of the UCC for their excellent work, weekly attendance, and numerous discussions in our meetings. The last year brought more curriculum proposals to the UCC than each of the previous two years. All members of UCC spent an enormous amount of time on the review of proposals. Only because of the dedication of the UCC members and the diversity of their insights a committee like UCC can work successfully. Another necessary requirement for the efficient work of a committee like UCC is the support of the Academic Senate for the chair of the committee. Only if the chair has enough release time to prepare meetings thoroughly the chair can lead the discussions in an efficient way. We hope that all decisions of the UCC will improve the quality of the curriculum at California State University San Marcos and are in the best interest of our students.