

2011/12 YEAR-END REPORTS OF THE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Chair: Robert Aboolian

Members: Robert Aboolian, Janet Barajas, David Barsky, Pam Bell, Gerardo Gonzalez, Tejinder Neelon, Thomas Swanger, Sue Thompson

Tasks completed

APC has worked on a number of policies through Fall 2011 and Spring 2012. The following are the list of APC policies approved by the Senate, on the next Senate meeting agenda, and the carry forward items for 2012-13.

APC policies brought to Senate as informational item due to restructuring

1. Graduate Probation, Disqualification, and Reinstatement policy (revision)
2. Credit by Challenge Examination policy (reviewed)- no restructuring changes needed
3. Human Subjects Protection in Research policy (reviewed)- no restructuring changes needed

APC policies approved by the Senate in Fall 2011

Undergraduate Probation, Disqualification, and Reinstatement policy (revision) – It was approved by the Senate.

APC policies approved by the Senate in Spring 2012

1. Course Repeat Petition policy (revision) – It was approved by the Senate and by the administration.
2. Graduation Requirements for Second Bachelor's Degree policy (revision) – It was approved by the Senate and by the administration.
3. Extended Learning Roles & Responsibilities policy (revision) – It was approved by the Senate.
4. Credit Hour policy (new) – It was approved by the Senate.
5. Online Instruction policy (new) – It was approved by the Senate.
6. Humane Care and Use of Animals (revision) – It was approved by the Senate.

APC Action Items on the Senate agenda 05/02/12

1. Second Master's Degree policy (new)
2. Independent Study, Research, and Internship Courses policy (new)
3. Academic Program Discontinuance policy (revision)

APC carry forward items for 2012-2013

Maximum Number of Units During Intersession policy (new)

BUDGET & LONG-RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Restructuring of Academic Affairs:

The anticipated restructuring of Academic Affairs (announced in AY 2010-2011) took effect last July 1. The Provost's cost estimate for this restructuring, provided at BLP's request, was \$390,450 (the cost of an additional dean and an additional associate dean). In April, BLP requested an update regarding the actual costs to date; that request and the Provost's reply are attached. The Provost's memo identifies "ongoing expenses of restructuring" of \$441,000 per year (i.e., salaries and benefits for a new dean, an additional associate dean, and one additional CHABSS staff position). Further, \$150,000 in one-time funding was allocated in "start-up" funds for the new Colleges. BLP invited senators to share any analysis or questions regarding these figures with BLP members as we consider additional questions and/or feedback for the administration on this issue.

Academic Affairs Long-Range Planning and Budget Planning Cycle Process:

The Academic Affairs (AA) Strategic Planning and Budget Cycle that was launched in January 2009 requires linking AA budget proposals to the Division's strategic plan. The process includes an approximate 18-month

calendar and a rolling three-year planning cycle, and it includes multiple joint AALC/BLP meetings during each academic year. This year, given such factors as the flat budget anticipated for next year and the recent extensive turnover within AALC, the Provost decided that no three-year rolling plans would be reviewed this year. Thus, unlike in previous years, there were no joint meetings between BLP and AALC. BLP anticipates that the units within Academic Affairs will be submitting their new three-year rolling plans over the summer for review next AY.

Long-range Academic Master Planning (LAMP) Process:

Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate tasked BLP with taking a leading role in updating and revising the University Academic Master Plan (UAMP). The Academic Blueprint Committee (ABC) (AY 2002-03 to AY 2005-06) played a valuable role in providing a thoughtful path for curricular development, but it is time to create a new Long-range Academic Master Plan (LAMP) to guide CSUSM's programmatic development for the next 8- 10 years. After discussion throughout the Fall and much of the Spring, BLP's proposed LAMP process was approved by the Senate in March and was forwarded to the Provost.

Curriculum Reviews:

A-form revision approved: BLP's A-form serves as an abstract for a forthcoming program proposal, requiring a program proposer to outline the proposed degree, make an initial case about anticipated demand or need, and sketch out an early estimation of the resources needed to launch the program. Approval of the proposal places the program on CSUSM's University Academic Master Plan (UAMP) and is an invitation for proposers to submit a Program Proposal (P-form), discussed below. While BLP did not review any A-forms this year, the Senate approved our proposed revisions to the A form in November. This will be increasingly important as the Long-Range Academic Master Plan (LAMP) process is launched next year.

P-forms reviewed & approved by Senate:

P-Forms provide a comprehensive vision of a proposed program, including resource needs for initiating and sustaining the degree program. Originators of major and minor degree programs, options, and certificates submit P-forms, which are reviewed by both the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and BLP before being submitted to the Academic Senate. P-forms approved by the Senate are forwarded to the Provost to the President, and (if necessary) to the Chancellor's Office for official authorization. After multiple past BLP reviews of the Child and Adolescent Development (CHAD) program, the Senate at last approved this new major in November. BLP also completed its review of a teaching certificate program proposed by CEHHS; this proposal still awaits Senate approval.

P-2 form reviewed:

BLP typically does not review P-2 forms, which propose major changes in an academic program. But in light of possible resource implications, we were asked to review COBA's P-2 form for its proposed revisions to the M.B.A. program. That proposal was approved by the Senate in December.

Regarding Extended Learning and the Expansion of Self-Support Program Offerings:

In AY 2010-2011, the Academic Senate charged BLP with several tasks in response to the expansion of for-credit academic programs via self-support through CSUSM's Extended Learning:

- #1 Investigate and address A form changes for self support credit programs
- #2 Investigate accessibility of self-support credit courses
- #3 Investigate self-support use in relation to Academic Master plan

BLP did provide a report on #2 in AY 2010-2011, based on limited available data. The issue of accessibility must be kept in mind as the LAMP process moves forward in AY 2012-13.

Regarding #1, the Senate approved BLP's proposed A-form revisions in November. The new A-form, which is required to place a new proposed program on the University Academic Master Plan (UAMP), requests information regarding anticipated funding streams for proposed programs (i.e., self-support and/or state resources) as well as anticipated use of online and off-site instructional resources.

Regarding #3, the Senate approved BLP's proposal for a new Long-range Academic Master Plan (LAMP) process in March, and Extended Learning will be integrally involved in the LAMP process. As proposals are vetted for placement on the LAMP, conversations about the when, where, and how of self-support programs will be ongoing.

Report from Extended Learning on changes in AY 2011-2012:

EL's Dean has kept BLP apprised of various changes in that unit since the start of AY 2011-2012. Accompanying handout materials are posted on BLP's Moodle page under the heading "Additional Documents for BLP Members & Public Viewing." We urge faculty members to review those materials and to contact EL if you have questions.

In AY 2009-2010, BLP's Subcommittee on Data Reconciliation and Analysis analyzed (1) recent spending patterns at CSUSM with trends and comparisons to reasonably equivalent CSU campuses, and (2) analyses of metrics for reporting student faculty ratios (SFR). These reports are available on BLP's AY 2010-2011 website.¹ Shortly after these reports were made public and the state's budget for AY 2010-11 was approved, 31 tenure-track faculty searches were approved, with many of these hires filling critical gaps left by resignations or retirements. However, departments lost \$20,000 in lecturer funding for each tenure-track hire, mitigating the impact of these hires as mechanisms for addressing instructional funding gaps. In some instances, SFR's may even rise as a result. BLP was not invited to participate in discussions regarding the faculty hires or the allocation of funds for instruction. BLP is, however, eager to participate in such conversations and will continue to advocate for sufficient attention and funding for instructionally-related activities.

The 2010/11 SFR report's uncovering of ongoing problems with the accurate accounting of faculty instructional assignments inspired significant efforts to improve the Faculty Activity Report (FAR). A new online tool was launched by which faculty members can enter and review their own workload data to improve the accuracy of workload reporting.² BLP's current subcommittee (Wayne Aitken, Staci Beavers, Chuck De Leone, Michael McDuffie, and Kathleen Watson) has been reviewing the accuracy of the Fall 2011 Academic Personnel DataBase ("APDB 55") report that is forwarded to the Chancellor's Office each semester. We hope to have an update submitted by the end of the Academic Year.

BLP's chair served as a member of the search committee to hire a new AVP for Planning & Academic Resources; this position serves as the Provost's liaison to BLP and will be integrally involved in long-range academic master planning as well as WASC accreditation. Dr. Graham Oberem was ultimately hired to fill this position; he will join BLP at our May 7 meeting to discuss next year's BLP agenda and the LAMP process.

Recommendations for AY 2012/13:

- BLP should continue to learn about Extended Learning and self-support program offerings, and we anticipate that including the Dean of EL as an ex-officio member of BLP will facilitate this effort.
- The LAMP proposal approved by the Senate establishes that a BLP member will co-chair this task force, so BLP should plan to stay abreast of the LAMP process.
- The proposed teaching certificate for "Wikis, Widgets, and Web 2.0" (from CEHHS) awaits Senate approval.
- Several program proposals from the School of Nursing were received near the end of the Academic Year; they should be reviewed by BLP at the start of the Fall 2012 term.

Committee Members: *Voting Members:* Staci Beavers (at large, chair), Ahmad Hadaegh (representing COAS, now of CMS), Laurie Stowell (CEHHS), Kathleen Watson (COBA), Hua Yi (Library). *Ex-Officio Members:* Jennifer Ehrhart (ASI rep for Fall semester), Don Chu (Dean, CEHHS), Janet Powell (Provost's rep, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs), Wayne Veres (Dean of IITS). *Non-Voting Guests:* Mike Schroder (Dean, Extended Learning) NOTE: Pursuant to the faculty's Spring 2012 constitutional referendum, the Dean of Extended Learning (or his/her designee) will join BLP next year as an ex-officio member.

Voting Members for 2012/13

Staci Beavers (at large, 12-14), Linda Holt (CMS, 12/13), Laurie Stowell (CEHHS, 11-13), Kathleen Watson (COBA, 12-14), Hua Yi (Library, 11-13), Open Seat (CHABBS, 12/14)

BLP's Fall 2012 meeting time is still pending.

¹ BLP again wishes to recognize and thank the subcommittee members: faculty members Wayne Aitken, Charles De Leone, and Mohammad Oskoorouchi, and administrative representatives Matthew Ceppi, Bill Ward, and Daniel Zorn for their efforts toward more sound budget analysis and decision-making.

² We recognize particularly the efforts of April Grommo in IITS for her work to develop and refine the FAR tool.

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

1. Members: Steve Nichols, Marion Geiger, Sue Thompson, Elizabeth Matthews, Glen Brodowsky/ Martin Lorri Santamaria (CHAIR), Jackie Borin, Ilene Dunagan/ Deb, Laura Makey, Janet Powell, Mayra Besosa,

2. Meeting schedule: FAC met weekly for 1.5 hours. For the fall 2011 semester FAC met from September 26-December 12. In spring 2011 FAC met from February 6-May 7.

3. Items referred to FAC from 2010-11: The following items were listed as unfinished business from the previous year:

- **There was no unfinished business at report at the end of 2010-11.**

4. Business conducted by FAC in 2011-12.

- **Consideration (and testing) of Paperless RTP Process & PTC Report:** FAC discussed security measures and the process by which P&T members review electronic files. After considerable debate, the committee decided on (1) guidelines concerning the inclusion of letters of recommendation in the file and (2) a process for submitting WPAF online, as additional University RTP revisions presented to March Senate and passed at the April Senate meeting.
- **Restructure related CEHHS RTP 'package':**
 - Overarching CEHHS RTP Document,
 - SoE,
 - SoN,
 - HD, and
 - KINE RTP documents

Presented to Senate after working through unit governance structures (Sept 11-Dec 11), FAC (Jan 12), and EC (Feb 12). Arrived at Senate March 12 and were passed (pending friendly document consistency amendments) April 2012.

- **Restructure related Temporary Eval - SoN policy revision:** Presented to Senate after working through unit governance structures (Sept 11-Dec 11), FAC (Jan 12), and EC (Feb 12). Arrived at Senate March 12 and were passed (pending friendly document consistency amendments) April/ May 2012.
- **Restructure related Temporary Eval - CoE policy revision:** Presented to Senate after working through unit governance structures (Sept 11-Dec 11), FAC (Jan 12), and EC (Feb 12). Arrived at Senate March 12 and were passed (pending friendly document consistency amendments) April/ May 2012.
- **Restructure related University RTP policy revision:** Name changes, addition of e-WPAF submission information, guidelines added for inclusion of letters of recommendation, guidelines for COF addressed and additional revisions and friendly amendments added over course of 2011-12 year including change in P&T committee membership for one year only. Presented to Senate after working through EC (Feb/ March). Arrived at Senate March and passed April 2012.
 - **Part of this work earlier (October/ November) entailed a closer look at the P&T composition.** FAC Chair approached Senate Chair and NEAC Chair with concerns this issue not related to FAC charge. FAC asked to come up with series of recommendations for P&T committee as well as process including role of P&T and alternative P&T processes. Recommendations were forwarded to NEAC Chair and Senate Chair. There was talk about picking up this work in 2012-13 with a sub-committee.
- **Range Elevation Policy:** Approved with amendments by EC 10.26 and presented November Senate meeting, approved February Senate.
- **Misconduct in Research Policy:** February FAC reviewed changes and made recommendation to EC February 29 indicating no further review needed. Reported to March Senate, no further review necessary.
- **Difference in Pay Leave Policy:** FAC discussed and amended in order to update policy, which was dated, and align to restructure. Done February 29, presented to Senate EC. Presented at March Senate and passed.
- **Interim Chair Procedure needed to be further vetted by FAC**
 - 1st on manner in which lecturers would be voting following guidelines sent to colleges by AVP Faculty Affairs
 - Resolution presented to EC February Senate
 - 2nd on procedure of process of Chair selection

- Senators voted in favor of lecturer voting, and a procedure.
- FAC took a thorough consideration of the policy, drafted a recommendation and accepted charge to write a policy 2012-13.
- **Review of AY 2012-13 RTP calendar.** FAC reviewed the AY 2012-13 RTP calendar for consistency during 1 meeting and forwarded the RTP calendar to EC for review. Forwarded the revised calendar to EC. Item will on late April or May Senate agenda. Passage expected
- 5. Unfinished business from FAC 2011-12:** The following items will have to be address by the AY 2011-12 FAC. Items are not listed in any particular order of importance:
- **Following up with colleges and units on RTP policies:** Any and all unfinished College RTP documents need to be followed up by FAC, particularly that of CMS provided for FAC review at close of 2011-12 AY, Library, and COAS which did not provide documents in 2011-12 to FAC.
 - **Working on a policy for Department Chairs:** This is work that was referred in the first April Senate meeting.

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Submitted by Sharon Elise, GEC Chair, 2010-12

GEC Voting Members: Judy Bauerlein, Allison Carr, Annette Daoud, Sharon Elise, Scott Greenwood, Katherine Hijar; Michael Schmidt, Xiaoyu Zhang

GEC Non-Voting Members: David Barsky, Andres Favela, Sharon Hamill, Virginia Mann, Daniel Mahoney

Tasks completed

Curriculum Review

Throughout the academic year, GEC continued to review courses submitted for GE credit. This academic year we received 27 proposals for general education credit; we approved 24 of these. The following courses were approved:

VSAR 361	New Documentary Film	CC
GEOG 341	Nature and Society in Calif	Dg
ID 370-8	Indigenous Anthropology	DD
KINE 310	Adventure, Teambdg & Exper Educ	E
PHIL 390-1/WMST 300-1	Feminist Ethics	CC
PSCI 413A	Const Law: Civil Liberties	DD
PSCI 413B	Const Law: Equal Protec & Civil Rts	DD
DNCE 130-3	Contemporary Ballet	C1
LTWR 302-1	Native American Lit	CC
SOC 468/PSCI 418	Am Indian Pol Econ Dev	DD
SOC 348	Am Indian Comm	DD
GEOG 202	World Regional Geog	D2
CHEM 101	Preparatory Chem	B1
EDUC 364	Role of Cult Diversity in Schooling	DD
EDUC/HD 380	Apps in Child & Youth Development	DD
LING 351	Language Acquisition	DD
TA 101	Intro to Acting	C1
TA 222	Intro to African Am Theatre	C1
WMST 300-16	Feminist Geography	DD
MUSC 180-2	Music of World Religions	C1
MATH 200	Mathematical Statistics for Nursing	B4
COMM 420-2	Asian Am and Media	DD
DNCE 200	Movement Awareness	C1
HLSCI 200	Personal Health and Wellness	E

ESW 120 has been created for Early Start to correspond to GEL 120 for area E credit
 ESM 111 has been created to correspond to GEL 110 for area E credit

GE Revision

Lower-division GELOs were approved at Senate on April 4th.

- Area A: Basic Skills
 - A1: Oral Communication
 - A2: Written Communication
 - A3: Critical Thinking
- Area B: Scientific Inquiry and Mathematical Reasoning
 - B1: Physical Sciences (with B3: Lab Component)
 - B2: Life Sciences (with B3: Lab Component)
 - B4: Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning
- Area C: Arts and Humanities
 - C1: Arts
 - C2: Humanities
 - C3: LOTER
- Area D: Social Sciences
 - D/D7: Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Social Science
 - Dc/g/h: American Institutions
- Area E: Life-long Learning and Self-Development

Upper-division GELOs Drafted for Diversity and Global

Faculty subcommittees have drafted GELOs for areas in global studies and diversity/equity responding to charges from the President and Provost; GEC Chair S. Elise sent a letter to department chairs describing the background of the GE revision, the place of diversity and global in that, and the draft GELOs, calling for widespread consideration and discussion of a ‘thematic approach’ to the 9 units of upper division GE currently configured as BB, CC, and DD. There is still not clear support for a thematic approach to the upper division GE as, for example, department chairs are concerned about the potential impact on various disciplinary department engagement in GE and related FTES distributions. Further, some are also concerned about the failure of a model based on diversity and global to address the question of interdisciplinarity. Finally, faculty in CS&M and those (in Psychology) who teach BB courses did meet to create GELOs for the upper division BB requirement but did not resolve the question of an articulation of BB courses (as currently constituted) with a thematic approach to the 9 units of upper division GE.

Responded to charges from the Chancellor as articulated in campus “graduation initiative” plans and “transfer models” from community colleges (see related proposal for satisfying American Institutions requirement by exam); Passed and forwarded to Senate, a new policy, “American Institutions and Ideals: Certification by Examination” for a 0 credit American Institutions examination.

Examined the Chancellor’s new Executive Order # 1065 that supplants 1033 governing General Education. **In particular, this EO allows students who are seeking a second BA to be exempt from any further general education requirements.** See <http://www.calstate.edu/eo/eo-1065.html>

CONTINUING

Several spring forums were held inviting faculty to express their thoughts on the proposal for UDGE themes. The consensus seemed to be that the current UDGE structure should remain in place, with an “Bingo approach” describing the overlay of themes of global and diversity. The forum also produced a renewed commitment to interdisciplinarity, which may be added at a later date as an additional theme. Faculty members present spoke in support of the themes, but were not prepared to move to a complete theme structure. Faculty also voiced support for all area faculty to participate in themes, responding in part to the BB area faculty failure to articulate with a thematic approach to upper division GE.

Grade Standards in GE Courses

The committee discussed raising the minimum grade of D- to pass a general education course, and changing to allow grades of credit/no credit for general education courses, which may require a change in academic policy (e.g., consultation with APC). The committee has not resolved this given recent information about statewide changes to require a grade of C in the “golden four” (oral comm., writing, critical thinking, math).

English Proficiency: Two local area high schools seek approval for courses to establish English proficiency. The GEC decided to establish a task force to assess their course proposals and Elise formed a task force of: Martha Stoddard-Holmes and Catherine Cucinella from LTWR and Laurie Stall from School of Education.

Recommended tasks for next year's GEC

Finalize development of upper division GELOs, whether thematic or not:

Determine Diversity/Global Articulation in General Education How shall diversity and global be defined and articulated, and what about interdisciplinarity? The committee began this work in response to the need to rearticulate our diversity aspect of GE pursuant to LEAP goals embedded in E.O. 1033, campus commitment to diversity, and the need to “determine if issues of diversity can be better integrated” in our GE curricula as President Haynes requested Spring 2010 following incidents of hate on campus, and then charged by the Academic Senate. A related task is the need to develop matrices that illustrate where we are meeting LEAP and CSUSM goals.

GE Handbook We need to include a statement on information literacy in the Handbook, along with the GELOs, which clearly explains how CSUSM is defining information literacy. In addition, there should be a simple, easy-to-locate link from the GE website. We still need clear language about writing across the curriculum, along with equally clear language about oral communication and interdisciplinarity. This will be added in the GE Handbook after the philosophy statement but before the GE areas.

Give examples of assessments.

GE Forms Create new forms reflecting the revision

Work with the Faculty Center to provide faculty with clear information on developing and assessing writing in their curriculum.

LIBRARY & ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Voting Membership: Aníbal Yáñez-Chávez, Chair [to April 2012], CoAS 10-12; Ian Chan, Chair [April-May 2012], Library 10-12; Greig Guthey, CoAS 11-13; Nancy Romig, Nursing 11-13; Rong-Ji Chen, CoE 11-13; Shaoyi He, CoBA 11-13; Steve Espinoza, Library Staff, 10-12; *open seat*, IITS Staff; *open seat*, Staff at-large 11-13
Ex officio: Barbara Preece, Dean Library; Wayne Veres, Dean IITS; Veronica Macias, ASI, 11-12

I. Intellectual Property Policy

In Fall 2011, LATAC and then the Academic Senate approved an Intellectual Property Policy for the University. Prior to this, there did not exist an official Intellectual property policy for our university. Over the years, the University's Academic Senate attempted to address this gap through the work of successive Library and Academic Technology Advisory Committees. However, no policy was approved by both the Academic Senate and the University Administration. In AY 2010-2011, a new approach was taken with the creation of an Intellectual Property Task Force composed of Gerardo Gonzalez, AVP-Research & Dean of Graduate Studies (convener), Don Barrett (CFA), Grant Hubbard (UARSC), Pearl Ly (SAC), Teresa Macklin (IITS), George Vourlitis (FAC), Lori Walkington (ASI), and Aníbal Yáñez-Chávez (LATAC).

Based on a careful review of intellectual property policies developed at other universities and discussions of the merits of various approaches, the Task Force produced a draft policy modeled on what it considered to be the best and clearest language and policies from other academic institutions. (Teresa Macklin and Gerardo Gonzalez were the principal drafters.) This was the draft CSUSM Intellectual Property policy approved by LATAC. The policy now approved by the Academic Senate will apply to all individuals at CSUSM engaged in work that is supported by the University or by sponsored projects through the University Auxiliary Research Services Corporation (UARSC). It outlines the incentives and protections for intellectual property matters. Regarding copyright, the key point in a nutshell is that anything that a faculty member creates in the course of research or instructional work belongs to that faculty member, unless he or she used “extraordinary support.” (What constitutes “extraordinary support” is defined in the document.) Regarding patentable work, rights are split between the faculty member and the University.

II. Technology and Learning

LATAC has engaged in an on-going discussion of the use of technology in the education, including "Cal State Online." There are now a series of relevant hyperlinks, documents, and views on this initiative posted on the LATAC Moodle page, including:

- Cal State Online official site file
- Cal State Online Start Up Status and Vision: slides from Ruth Black keynote at CATS 2012 file
- Resolution Calling for Suspension of the Cal State Online Initiative - Academic Senate, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona PDF document
- The “For-Profit” Model in the CSU: Cal State Online (CFA Fact Sheet) PDF document

- White paper on the “for-profitization” of the CSU file
- 2011 CSU Online Forum @ CSUSM - Dr. Karen Haynes file
- 2011 CSU Online Forum @ CSUSM - Watch Video (Login required) file
- CFA: Open Letter to Chancellor Charles Reed about the “CSU Online” Plan file
- CFA: Open Letter to Chancellor Charles Reed about the “CSU Online” Plan (downloadable) PDF document
- Who Owns Online Courses and Course Materials? (Center for Academic Transformation, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute) file
- AAUP Statement on Distance Education (1999)

III. TULIP (Technology Utilization in Learning and Information Platforms)

LATAC discussed IITS’s ideas for summer 2012 TULIP. Multiple tracks:

- “Learning object” track – modules, mediasite, video, instructor material (objectives, other resources) widely available –e.g. cell division, how to in chem. lab, GIS, math
- Course redesign and redevelopment – using “quality rubric” to make it a high quality learning experience
- E-textbooks – CSU’s Affordable Learning Solutions Campaign (ALS) – provide alternatives to textbooks for students –get digital texts into student hands –faculty produce their own texts? See CSU website: <http://als.csuprojects.org/>

Funds may be available for faculty to develop, improve technology use in teaching, mini-grants of \$100 to \$600. IITS will work with the Faculty Center to disseminate this resource to the campus community.

IV. Release time funds for LATAC

The officers of Academic Senate reduced release time funds for LATAC this year from 3 to 2 WTUs. Due to a significant increase in the Senate vice chair’s workload, 1 additional WTU was assigned to that seat for AY 11/12, which necessitated a reduction for LATAC.

V. LATAC chair

Aníbal Yáñez-Chávez stepped down as committee chair; in coordination with the Senate Executive Committee, Ian Chan was elected to serve as LATAC chair from April through the end of the Academic Year. Ian Chan now represents the committee at Academic Senate and Executive Committee meetings.

VI. Tasks for LATAC in Academic Year 2012-1013

- The Executive Committee has asked that LATAC become more knowledgeable about the Cal State Online system-wide initiative launched in June 2011. LATAC members can take the lead in discussions of this initiative within the Academic Senate as this faculty body responds to the development of Cal State Online and its impact on the Faculty.
- Another task for LATAC is to facilitate the committee’s potential to serve as a key resource for faculty and proposers of academic programs to understand how academic technology can strengthen the proposed programs. This may be accomplished in the program proposal review process, for example, if the IITS representative on BLP and LATAC serves as a liaison between the two committees: when new course proposals come before BLP, the IITS representative can report this to LATAC. If LATAC has suggestions regarding library or academic technology resources, the liaison would report this back to BLP and the program proposers. New program proposals need not be shy about recognizing a need for additional library or academic technology resources.

VII. LATAC meetings

Committee meetings are scheduled on the 2nd and 4th Wednesdays at the month from 9-10am. The first meeting of Fall 2012 will be September 12, 9-10am in KEL 3010.

NOMINATIONS, ELECTIONS, APPOINTMENTS, & CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

Members:

David Chien, Vassilis Dalakas (chair), Carmen Mitchell, Robert Sheath, Richelle Swan

Accomplishments This Year

NEAC’s work this year focused on revising the Constitution to reflect changes that occurred as a result of the restructuring. A first set of amendments reflecting such changes was approved through a referendum in March

2012; subsequently, we conducted elections for committees reflecting the recently approved membership. An additional set of amendments, reflecting other issues, was included in a second referendum. Voting on the second referendum was 16 votes of the necessary number for a valid election, resulting in running it again. The second voting (ending May 1) was successful and the Constitution will be updated to reflect all the amendments.

NEAC's other major focus was filling seats for committees throughout the year issuing several calls to address the vacancies and making recommendations based on the people who showed interest in each seat.

NEAC Chair and Meeting Time for AY 2012-13

Vassilis Dalakas will be Chair for NEAC for AY 2012-2013.

NEAC conducts most of its business electronically; meetings are scheduled on ad-hoc basis as needed each semester.

NEAC Agenda for AY 2012-2013

During the next academic year, NEAC will continue to focus on filling all vacant seats in committees. It will also revisit potential amendments to the Constitution and Election Rules as a result of this year's discussion.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Members:

Donna Goyer, Faculty at Large; Olaf Hansen, CSM; Moses Ochanji, CEHHS; Toni Olivas, Library; Linda Shaw, Chair, CHABSS

David Barsky, AVP-AP; Jennifer Jeffreys, former AVP-PAA; Gerardo Gonzalez, Graduate Studies and Research; Karen Irwin, Provost's Office

Accomplishments This Year:

PAC did considerable work this year to review all documents and respond to Program Reviews with recommendations for consideration by program faculty and those involved in the MOU process as stipulated by the Program Review Policy and Guidelines. PAC responded to Program Reviews for the following programs: Social Sciences B.A., Liberal Studies B.A., Computer Science and Information Systems B.S. and M.S., History B.A. and M.A., and Biological Sciences B.S. and M.S.

In May, the PAC Chair will also participate in the MOU process for these programs as well as orientation sessions for programs beginning their Program Reviews in AY 2012-2013.

PAC Agenda for AY 2012-2013

During the next academic year, PAC will review and respond to Program Reviews from the following programs: Criminology and Justice, and Sociology B.A. The Chair of PAC will also participate in the MOU process for these programs, provide support for programs that are preparing their Self Studies in 2012-2013, and participate in orientation sessions for the lead faculty in programs that will begin their Program Reviews during the 2013-2014 academic year.

PAC Chair and Meeting Time for AY 2012-13

Linda Shaw will chair PAC for AY 2012-2013.

PAC will meet every other Thursday from 3:00-5:00 p.m. in MARK 322 beginning September 6, 2012.

PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEE

Members of PTC: Beverlee Anderson (COBA), Kent Bolton (At Large), Janet McDaniel (COE), Jose Mendoza, Cynthia Chavez Metoyer (COAS - SS), Darci Strother (COAS -A/Hum, Chair), Hua Yi (Library)

The PTC reviewed 17 files during this year's cycle. Of these, 11 were requests for promotion to the rank of Professor (4 early), and 6 were requests for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (3 early). Of the 17 total files, 5 were submitted electronically as "e-WPAFs."

As of April 23, 2012, the PTC has completed its review of and provided its recommendations for each file. Furthermore, the PTC has engaged in the process of conducting multi-level review meetings in the cases where there were different recommendations at different levels of review. The files are currently at the Provost level for review and decision.

During AY 2011-2012, representatives from the current PTC attended and presented at all Faculty Center sessions on the promotion and tenure process. In addition, at the recommendation of the PTC, the Faculty Center will host a special workshop for faculty preparing for promotion to (Full) Professor, on May 3, 2012.

In the course of its work, the PTC noted several issues that it wishes to bring to the attention of the Senate and to the Associate Vice President for Academic Resources, otherwise known as the “Custodian of the Files” (COF).

I. Furlough year

During the furlough year (2009-10), the CFA and CSU agreed that faculty members could elect to extend their probationary periods by one year. If they chose to do that, they could further elect to forego evaluation (review or retention) that year. In this year’s submissions seen by the PTC, we saw our first instances of this. Our concern was the following: Would a faculty member who extended the probationary period now be considered “going up early” based on that choice? That is, if by the calendar such a faculty member was submitting the WPAF after five years of service (regular timetable for P&T), should the person be considered to be going up early? Since early tenure and promotion are treated distinctly in the CBA, University RTP policy (sections V.B.2.c. and V.B.3.c.), and some College/School documents, this is no small matter.

This year, we viewed two WPAFs for faculty members in the same college/unit. Professor X did not take the furlough option of an extended probationary period. X had completed 5 years and submitted a file that was considered “on time” for regular P&T. Professor Y did take the furlough option of an extended probationary period in 2009-10 and had not been reviewed that year. Y had completed 5.5 years and submitted a file that was considered “early” for P&T. Our committee struggled with how to evaluate these two WPAFs on different standards—“early” for a person who had in fact served a longer time on the faculty than their “regular” colleague.

Knowing that there would be faculty members in review this year who had taken the extended probationary period option, we asked Provost Cutrer and Custodian of the Files Powell for guidance at the PRC workshop in September 2011. Their response was, “Don’t hurt a faculty member for taking the furlough option.”

There are likely to be many more WPAFs in the coming years from faculty who took the option offered to them during the furlough year. In some cases, the faculty member will extend their probationary period. In other cases, the faculty member will decide to go up on the original timeline, even though they took the extension offered in 2009-10. It would be best if there were a clear understanding among all reviewers—PRCs, department chairs, deans, PTC, and provost—about what standard to apply to these files.

II. COE/SOE documents

The College (now School) of Education wrote new RTP standards that were approved by the president in 2011. The document provided existing faculty members with the option of continuing to use the COE’s 1991 RTP document for their next promotion and/or tenure, provided that this action took place no later than 2015-16. This year’s WPAFs from the SOE included submissions under both documents. Since the PTC did not have a list of which SOE faculty members had chosen which document, the only way to determine this was to see which document the faculty member inserted into their WPAF. In one set of review letters, some levels of review quoted a different RTP document than the one that the faculty member included in the WPAF. We point this out as a problematic situation that is likely to recur, as there will be two COE/SOE documents in play for several years. Since the standards are different in the two documents, it is important for faculty members to be explicit about which document—1991 or 2011—is to govern the requested action, and for reviewers to be very careful to refer to the correct document in their evaluation letters.

III. Electronic files

The PTC received five electronic files in AY 2011-2012. Electronic files may allow candidates to more readily make additions, deletions and/or revisions for their future reviews. For reviewers, electronic files remove the physical constraint of having to be in one location to review the file, and permit multiple reviewers to view a file simultaneously. As the trend moves toward the electronic submission of WPAFs, the PTC recommends that the Faculty Center offer an annual workshop about best practices in assembling an electronic file, and make available to faculty members samples of such. The PTC also recommends that IITS offer workshops to support faculty members in the technical aspects of assembling an electronic file. Whether WPAFs are submitted electronically or physically, they should be assembled in an orderly manner, and the evidence included should be selective, relevant to the narrative, and should not exceed the maximum number of allowable items.

IV. Departmental standards

The PTC strongly supports Provost Cutrer's effort to establish departmental RTP standards across the university. FAC created guidelines in 2009 to assist departments with such documents. See: http://www.csusm.edu/fa/allfrontpagedocs/documents/rtptstandards_facguidelinesfordept_092809.pdf

Detailed departmental standards for promotion and/or tenure would be useful for candidates and reviewers at all levels. While these department standards must conform to their College/School and University-wide general guidelines, they should contain a detailed, comprehensive, and fair set of standards, consistent with its own culture. Such department standards would offer candidates and reviewers at all levels guidance on department expectations for sustained, quality teaching, scholarship and service for the granting of tenure and/or promotion. In the absence of such standards, reviewers are forced to make difficult judgments about customs and practices that vary from one discipline to another, e.g., What does author order mean in a co-authored work?, What is the status or professional prestige of "invited" vs. "peer-reviewed" work?, What is expected of different ranks of faculty in terms of curriculum development, service, etc.? With the restructuring of Academic Affairs, the former COAS units need to re-write their RTP documents. Kinesiology and Human Development wrote departmental standards that were approved by Academic Senate in Spring 2012. The PTC urges all remaining departments from the "former COAS" to submit such documents in 2012-13.

V. Materials for the WPAF for Promotion to Full Professor

According to the university RTP document, "The emphasis of the WPAF will be on the accomplishments of the Candidate since the beginning of the last university-level review and not included as part of that review, i.e. items can only be considered in one promotion review....For promotion to Professor/Librarian/SSP II AR, the emphasis will be on the time period since the review for the Candidate's last promotion or since hiring if hired as an Associate Professor/Associate Librarian/SSP II AR" (II.B.5.b). There has long been difficulty in determining what should be "counted" from the year that the faculty member's WPAF was under review for P&T. While some items that were not available during that year (e.g., teaching evaluations) should be considered in the submission for Professor, other items are not as clear. The PTC decided to refer to the review letters from the P&T year to see what the reviewers counted as the faculty member's contributions that led to P&T. For example, if the P&T letters clearly credited the faculty member's book "in press," then the fact that the book came out in paper the following year (after P&T were granted) does not make that a new and different accomplishment.

This issue has implications for faculty who have submitted their WPAFs for tenure and/or promotion. If s/he receives notice that a journal article or conference proposal has been accepted while the WPAF is under consideration, s/he might well request that this news be inserted into the WPAF (section II.B.4.). This might, in fact, help the faculty member's case for promotion and/or tenure. However, the faculty member needs to be aware that subsequent levels of review might well incorporate this new information into their decision for P&T, which would keep it from being counted in the request for promotion to Professor. It is up to each faculty member to consider the advisability of requesting the insertion of new material into the WPAF during the P&T review year.

VI. External Review and Solicited Letters

The university RTP policy (Appendix C) has a process for an external review of a faculty member's record. This can be requested by the faculty member, PRC, department chair, dean, or PTC. If the faculty member feels that an external review would provide valuable information to the reviewers, s/he should request it. This might well assist a

faculty member whose disciplinary work is particularly distinct and whose reviewers might benefit from an expert opinion from the field. Faculty members should be aware, however, that outside the external review process, soliciting letters of support specifically supporting promotion and/or tenure from internal/external colleagues and current/former students is inappropriate.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Voting Members: Shana Bass (CoAS); Rong-Ji Chen (CoE); Ofer Meilich (Chair, at large); Yvonne Meulemans (Library); Wayne Neu (CoBA); Nancy Romig (SoN); Paul Stuhr (at large)

Nonvoting Members: Bridget Blanshan (*Dean of Students); Sammi Carr and Jose Parra (ASI)

I. Recommended Tasks from academic year 2010-11 and brief progress notes

Review Management of Course Records Policy	Revised, passed by Senate on 4/18/2012
Review self-support programs (in Temecula and here on campus) from student service perspective	Done, see below

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

A. SAC representation in CUGR

Shana Bass volunteered and served on CUGR (Committee on Undergraduate Research) as SAC's representative this year.

B. Review of self-support programs

SAC was tasked by the Executive Committee to examine the self-support programs from student services perspective. SAC heard presentations from the Dean of Students, Kinesiology (Witzke), and Nursing (Boren) about the programs on the main campus and in Temecula. Additionally, the Chair of SAC participated in the tour of the Temecula facilities on 03/02/2012.

Kara Witzke, Kinesiology Department Chair, came to SAC on 10/25/2011. Temecula has two cohorts, 50 student total [20 + 30 in the 2nd cohort]. First cohort started Fall 2010. The Chair personally hires all the instructors in Temecula, and is satisfied with the current instructors. It is anticipated that out of four courses per semester about 1-2 courses will be taught by TT faculty (similar to the main campus). The Temecula facility has: a distance learning lab, actual labs (for kinesiology, biology, and nursing), a student lounge with kitchen, computer lounge (with 6-7 PCs), and free parking; The current infrastructure is adequate, yet it will need to be expanded as the facility serves more students and/or more areas of study. Most pressing problem: admissions and access to CougarCourses. The EL students face difficulties being matriculated and put into the PeopleSoft system. Kara reports that student evaluations are good, and there are a variety of instructors teaching there now.

Denise Boren, School of Nursing Interim Director, came to SAC on 11/08/2011. The School of Nursing (SON) offers three programs: regular BSN (stateside), Accelerated BSN (administered by Extended Learning, both here and in Temecula), and a Master's in nursing. SON is quite satisfied with the way the self-support / Extended Learning (EL) programs work, as it has full control over the curriculum, with nearly the only difference is where the funds are coming from. SON hires and pays faculty, does program administration, scheduling, and clinical placement (and is being reimbursed by EL). SON has an MOU (memorandum of understanding) with EL regarding finances and allocation of funds (as stateside faculty serve EL students too). SON faculty teach equally across the programs and locations, as needed (e.g., faculty travel to Temecula of their course is offered there). EL provides two advisors, who work together with the other SON advisors. SON hires all faculty, across programs and locations. Graduate advising is provided regardless of student program (stateside or EL).

C. Review Management of Course Records Policy

This short but important policy was reviewed by SAC in the Fall and Spring semesters. The main changes were related to updates related to digital records, current practices (such as the use of university-assigned ID numbers and various university functionaries and practices), and clarification of what faculty must do

and what faculty are suggested to do. The policy received many comments from Senators and other university personnel and went through several revisions. The policy was passed by the Senate on 04/18/2012.

D. Guest presentations to SAC

Initiated by Student Affairs and ASI representatives, SAC benefitted throughout the year from many guests from these constituencies who came and informed SAC about their activities and role in fulfilling the University's mission. The guests were:

- Office of Community Service Learning, Val Knox, Community Partnerships Coordinator, and Alejandra Sanchez, Office Coordinator/Assistant to the Director (10/10/2011)
- John Segoria, Director of Disabled Students Services (4/21/2012)

More detailed description of the presentations and topics discussed appear on SAC's minutes.

III. Recommended Tasks

- Follow up on student grade appeals policy – the policy was passed by the Senate on 4/20/2011, and is now with the Provost's Office.
- Follow up on the Management of Student Course Records policy - the policy was passed by the Senate on 4/18/2012, and is now with the Provost's Office
- Revise student-related policies following the college restructuring, as needed.
- Follow up on Extended Learning programs, as they apply to student services.

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Voting Members: Heidi Breuer (co-chair), Judith Downie, Fang Fang, Rosemary Gaines, Michael Hughes, Sajith Jayasinghe, Brian Lawler, Yi Sun (co-chair)

Non-Voting Members: Janet Barajas, David Barsky, Virginia Mann

Work completed in 2011/12: In the academic year 2011/12, UCC reviewed and approved 18 changes to the following programs: Master of Business Administration, B.A. in Business Administration - Finance Option, Master of Arts in Education: Option in Communicative Sciences and Disorders, Communication Sciences and Disorders Preparation Certificate, Master of Science in Nursing, B.S. in Nursing, B. A. in Global Studies/Minor in Global Studies, Border Studies Option in Liberal Studies, Elementary Subject Matter Prep OPTION (ESM) - Liberal Studies, Minor in Linguistics, B.A. in Sociology - Concentration in Children, Youth and Family, B.A. and Minor in Global Studies, Border Studies Option in Liberal Studies, Border Studies Minor, Border Studies Option, Master of Science in Computer Science, Master of Science in Computer Science (twice), M.S. in Biological Sciences. In addition, UCC has reviewed and approved changes to 235 courses, and 34 proposals for new courses and 6 deletions of courses.

Continuing Work: UCC started the review of a new program: Wikis, Widgets and Web 2.0: Creating Innovative Online Classrooms. UCC also started the review of a program change to Theatre Arts Option - B.A. in Visual and Performing Arts. UCC could not finish the reviews this year and will continue in the next academic year. UCC will also review program changes to Bachelor of Arts in Human Development and Reading and Literacy Authorization and Credential in the next academic year.

Continuing Members: Michael Hughes, Sajith Jayasinghe, Yi Sun

New Members: Suzanne Moineau; Richelle Swan; Paul Stuhr; Judith Downie; Matthew Escobar

We would like to thank all members of the UCC for their excellent work, weekly attendance, and numerous discussions in our meetings. We are certain 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.