

**ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING**  
**Wednesday, March 2, 2011**  
**1 – 2:50 p.m. (approx.) ~ Commons 206**

[Send an email to  
the voting  
Senators'  
listserv.](#)

- I. **Approval of agenda**
- II. **Approval of minutes of 12/01/2010 & 02/02/2011 meetings**
- III. **Chair's report: [Rika Yoshii](#)** Referrals to committees
- IV. **Secretary's report: [Mohammad Oskoorouchi](#)** *The following item has been responded to by the university administration:*
  - SAC Resolution in Support of the Committee for Undergraduate Research *Acknowledged*
- V. **Consent Calendar** *The following items are presented to the Senate for a single vote of approval without discussion. Any item may be removed for particular consideration by request of a senator prior to vote.*
  - NEAC Recommendations
  - UCC Course & Program Change Proposals
- VI. **Old Business** *The following items are presented to the Senate for a second reading. At the second reading, the item is official senate business. Debate for or against the motion is made during the second reading, and amendments to the motion are considered. A final vote is taken on whether to approve or, in the case of administrative policies and procedures, endorse.*
  - A. BLP/UCC Minor in Video/Film Production – [Beavers](#) / [Fang](#) / [Diekman](#) **Time certain 1:20 pm**
  - B. APC Undergraduate and Graduate Dual-Listed Courses – [Aboolian](#)
- VII. **New Business** *The following items have been moved and seconded, and are presented to the Senate for a first reading. The purpose of the first reading is to discuss the item; no amendments are made to items during the first reading. Comments on first reading items may also be made to the presenters via e-mail or other means. Items become senate motions at the time of the second reading (see Old Business). A motion to move a first reading item to second reading status is permitted, but should be undertaken only after any general discussion has concluded.*
  - A. APC Excess Units Seniors – [Aboolian](#) *pending EC action*
  - B. FAC Misconduct in Scholarship & Research policy – [Santamaria](#)
- VIII. **Information items**
  - A. Extended Learning – [Kern](#) / [Bullard](#) **Time certain 2 pm**
  - B. UAMP update – [Beavers](#)
  - C. PeopleSoft update – [Grommo](#) / [Swanger](#) **Time certain 2:30 pm**
- IX. **Discussion item: NEAC** Possible change to chair / vice-chair / chair-elect structure
- X. **President's report: Karen Haynes**
- XI. **Provost's report: Emily Cutrer**
- XII. **ASCSU report: [Brodowsky/Montanari](#)**
- XIII. **CFA report: [Don Barrett](#)**
- XIV. **ASI report: Amanda Riley**
- XV. **Committee reports** See written reports.
- XVI. **Senators' Concerns and Announcements**

**Hot Topics** *For more information, visit the [Senate website](#)*

Diversity	SB 1440
Early Start program	Restructuring proposal
Temecula campus / Self Support	Graduation Initiative
Next Steps Workload Committee	

*Next Senate meeting: April 6, 2011*

**CHAIR'S REPORT**

The next steps workload committee report will come to EC this week

Survey of high quality education is due March 4 Survey of graduation obstacles is due March 14 Survey of services for ESL and EFL students due Asap

The senate web site now lists details of all upcoming presentations.

The election will be happening soon.

**REFERRALS TO COMMITTEE**

- APC Consider change in TOEFL score requirement
- NEAC Provide officers with time estimate for efforts related to restructuring

---

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**NEAC Recommendations**

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Seat (#)</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Name(s)</b>
Academic Council on International Programs	At large	11/12-15/16	Francisco Martin

**UCC Course & Program Change Proposals**

<b>SUBJ</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>New No.</b>	<b>Course/Program Title</b>	<b>/ Form Type</b>	<b>Originator</b>	<b>Rec'd AP</b>	<b>To UCC</b>	<b>UCC Action</b>
GEOG	365		Globalization and Trade	C	Greig Guthey	2/9/11	2/10/11	2/21/11
HD	495		Field Experience in Human Development	C-2	Eliza Bigham	11/22/10	12/6/10	1/24/11
KINE	495		Internship in Kinesiology	C-2	Kara Witzke	12/15/10	12/22/10	1/24/11
MIS	425		Business Systems Analysis	C-2	Fang Fang	2/22/11	2/22/11	2/28/11

1 **2<sup>nd</sup> Reading - BLP/UCC Minor in Video/Film Production**

2

1 <sup>st</sup> Reading Comment	Action Taken
Concerns regarding having independent study listed in catalogue copy.	Originator has received feedback, and considered the possibility to add other courses rather than independent study. However, UCC has not heard of final decision whether the originator will change or not.
No further feedback collected after last senate meeting.	NA

3  
4  
5 **Budget & Long Range Planning Committee**

6 The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (BLP) has reviewed the P-Form for a proposed Minor in  
7 Video/Film Production, giving careful consideration to the enrollment prospects for the proposed program as  
8 well as the resource implications of initiating the program. We thank the proposer, Professor Kristine  
9 Diekman, for her collegial responses to our feedback and our queries so that we could provide a useful  
10 evaluation for the Senate's review. BLP submits the following analysis of the impact of this proposed minor  
11 to the Academic Senate to assist senators in their consideration of the proposal.

12  
13 **Program Demand:** As the P-form for this minor states, "students want an emphasis in the creation of  
14 video/film products...[and] want to be more prepared to enter graduate school and hold careers in  
15 production." While no data specific to student demand for a minor were included in the P-form, enrollment  
16 figures provided by proposer Kristine Diekman show that a number of the courses included in the proposed  
17 minor (including VSAR 303, VSAR 304, VSAR 305, and VSAR 306) have shown steady enrollments over the  
18 past several years.

19  
20 **Resource Implications:**

21 *Curricular & Faculty Resources:* Currently, VPA has one tenure-track faculty member and several lecturers  
22 who teach Video/Film production courses that would be included in this proposed minor. The proposal  
23 states that no new faculty resources will be required for at least the first 5 years of this new program. Two  
24 new additional courses are being proposed at this time, but both of these courses would be options for  
25 students rather than required courses. Further, the proposed minor incorporates two additional existing  
26 supervision courses whose resource requirements should be noted here: VSAR 495 (Internship) and VSAR  
27 498C (Independent Study) are currently covered by Professor Diekman on a regular basis in addition to her  
28 recognized (i.e., compensated) instructional workload. Correspondence from Professor Diekman indicates a  
29 typical enrollment of 3-8 students for these supervisions each semester. However, in some semesters, the  
30 instructional load for these supervisions has been substantial: for example, 18 students enrolled in VSAR 498  
31 in Fall 2007. While the P-form is not requesting additional resources to cover this workload, it is something  
32 that should be taken into account as campus-wide conversations regarding faculty workload and Student-  
33 Faculty Ratios (SFRs) continue.

34  
35 *IITS/Library Resources:* Input received from IITS indicates that software license fees requested for the  
36 program (for the software package "After Fx") should be taken into account. Currently, IITS has a 3-year site  
37 license and maintenance agreement for this program at a cost of \$12,000, of which \$5000 is currently being  
38 contributed by VPA. Librarian Judith Downie anticipates \$2500 per year for "materials funding" for several of  
39 the courses in this proposed program (VSAR 303, 304, 306, 309, 319, 402) (These materials include some  
40 production manuals that are likely to require regular updating as well as "limited-distribution" videos.)

41  
42 **University Curriculum Committee**

43 UCC has finished its review of the Video/Film Production Minor proposed as a stand-alone minor housed in  
44 the Visual and Performing Arts Department. The purpose of the minor is to provide students a minor degree  
45 that emphasizes media production, the hands on *creation* of media projects. This minor meets the needs of

46 the vibrant community of student media producers using video and film as artistic expression. Offering a  
47 minor in video and film production would give them the curricula and degree that focuses their production as  
48 artists and gives them an edge in the professional world of production. This minor differs from the existing  
49 Film Studies minor in that it focuses on production while the Film Studies Minor focuses on the theoretical  
50 study of film with only one required production course.

51  
52 The program requires that students take six units of introductory level courses from a list of three 3-unit  
53 courses: VSAR 303 Introduction to Video Arts, VSAR 306 Video in the Community, and VPA 319 Video  
54 Installation Art (3-unit, New Course, previously offered as a topic course). Then students shall take nine units  
55 advanced level courses, chosen from VSAR 304 Advanced Video (3-unit) VSAR 305 Art and Digital Video for  
56 the Web (3-unit), VSAR 309 Generating Narrative in Video and New Media (3-unit), VSAR 402 Imaginary  
57 Worlds, Video Compositing (3-unit, New Course, previously offered as a topic course) and 3 units of  
58 Independent Study. The students can also take 3 units of electives from DNCE 324 Dance and Visual Media  
59 (3-unit) and VSAR 495C Internship with Video production emphasis (3-unit).

60  
61 This is an 18-unit undergraduate minor that draws from the expertise of the Visual and Performing Arts  
62 Department Faculty and requires no new faculty resources. There are two new courses proposed which  
63 have been offered previously as topic courses with popular demands and have been approved by UCC as  
64 permanent courses.

---

65

#### 66 **PROPOSED CATALOG COPY**

67 For the complete curriculum associated with this proposal, visit the Curriculum Review website:

68 [http://www.csusm.edu/academic\\_programs/curriculumscheduling/catalogcurricula/2010-](http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/curriculumscheduling/catalogcurricula/2010-11_curriculum.html#CoAS)  
69 [11\\_curriculum.html#CoAS](http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/curriculumscheduling/catalogcurricula/2010-11_curriculum.html#CoAS)

70 The proposal is in Packet #14.

71

72 The Video /Film Production Minor is designed for students who want to focus on the production of media  
73 projects, including video, film, new media, and installation art utilizing media. It will serve as a minor degree  
74 for preparation for graduate school or a career in media production.

75

#### 76 18 Units Total for the Minor

#### 77 **Six Units of Introductory Level Courses from the following:**

78	VSAR 303	Introduction to Video Arts	3
79	VSAR 306	Video in the Community	3
80	VSAR 319	Video Installation Art	3

81

#### 82 **Nine Units of Advanced Level Courses from the following:**

83	VSAR 304	Advanced Video Production	3
84	VSAR 305	Art and Digital Video for the Web	3
85	VSAR 309	Generating Narrative in Video & New Media	3
86	VSAR 402	Imaginary Worlds, Video Compositing	3
87	VSAR 498 C	Independent Study	3

88

#### 89 **Three Units of Electives from the following:**

90	DNCE 324	Dance and Visual Media	3
91	VSAR 495C	Internship (with video production emphasis)	3

92

#### 93 New Courses being approved together with this Minor:

94	VSAR 319	Video Installation Art	3
95	VSAR 402	Imaginary Worlds: Video Compositing	3

2<sup>nd</sup> Reading - APC Undergraduate and Graduate Dual-Listed Courses

1 <sup>st</sup> Reading Comment	Action Taken
Faculty Workload concerns	Committee believes that it does not need or can address those issues in this policy.
# 9 may not exceed caps on the class sizes concerns	We change the appropriate administrator to department chair or equivalent
#4 (line 73) must be offered in same department, add: where appropriate	62 and 63 change department to department or equivalent unit
Was a confusion on the pairings	See the changes
Why not a 300 and 600 pairing	We do not believe it is advisable to have an introductory undergraduate course paired up with an advanced graduate course
Concern about the pairing in general	UCC looks at this carefully in the approval process to ensure that the quality for graduate courses does not decline and PAC will monitor this during program review
Line 47 change the word "should" and use the word "normally" instead	Change applied

**Rationale:** Many universities afford individual degree programs the option to offer upper-division undergraduate majors courses with graduate courses having similar course content in a dual-listed arrangement. Dual-listed courses have a single instructor and a common meeting schedule. A dual-listed course is not the same as a course that is cross-listed. The latter utilizes a single syllabus and is offered by multiple departments. A dual-listed course includes two syllabi with clear delineations of expectations and requirements for each course. Each course in a dual-listing is reviewed separately through the campus curricular review process.

Dual-listing of courses is necessary in order to provide sufficient offerings within some graduate program areas. This policy addresses the need to ensure the quality and rigor of dual-listed courses.

**Definition:** This policy governs the mechanism for offering undergraduate and graduate courses as dual-listed courses (also known as paired or co-listed courses).

**Authority:** Academic Affairs

**Scope:** Allows individual degree programs to offer upper-division (300 or 400-level) undergraduate majors courses (except upper division general education courses) with graduate (500- or 600-level) courses having similar course content in a dual-listed arrangement with a single instructor and a common meeting schedule.

Preamble

California State University San Marcos allows individual degree programs to offer upper-division (300 or 400-level) undergraduate majors courses (no upper division general education courses) with graduate (500- or 600-level) courses having similar course content in a dual-listed arrangement with a single instructor and a common meeting schedule. The dual-listing of upper-division undergraduate majors courses with appropriate graduate-level courses is a means of facilitating course offerings in circumstances where limited resources would prohibit the offering of courses in the same subject area in undergraduate and graduate programs concurrently. Moreover, opening one course to both advanced undergraduates and graduate students would enrich the quality of the course and programs for both undergraduate and graduate students. Dual-listing of courses is necessary in order to provide sufficient offerings within some graduate program areas. This policy addresses the need to ensure the quality and rigor of dual-listed courses.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This policy is based on a dual listing policy adopted by San Francisco State University. We acknowledge the assistance of the SFSU in developing our policy.

38 I. Criteria

39

40 In order to ensure the integrity of the degree programs and the individual courses that may be used to meet  
41 graduation requirements, approval to offer courses in a dual-listed arrangement is subject to the following  
42 conditions:

43

44 1. The upper-division undergraduate majors courses and graduate courses that are dual-listed must  
45 cover similar course content. The titles and descriptions of the two courses must reflect the  
46 similarity of the subject matter. The course must meet in the same classroom at the same time  
47 and have the same instructor.<sup>2</sup>

48

49 ~~2. Dual-listed courses pairings should normally~~ consist of one 400 level and one 500 level course.

50 Exceptions to 400 and 500 level pairing should be rare and occur only under extreme  
51 circumstances. A strong rationale must accompany proposals, ~~for exceptions. In addition, and~~ only  
52 the following pairing ~~exceptions~~ will be considered:

53 ~~0. 400/level and~~ 600 level ~~and~~

54 ~~1. 300/level and~~ 500 level.

55 ~~2.~~ Submissions of combinations other than those described above shall not be considered.

56

57 3. Dual-listed offerings must be arranged through the use of regular courses which are published in  
58 the university Catalog or supplement, and the course descriptions must indicate that the courses  
59 can be dual-listed. The descriptions must specify that if one of the dual-listed courses is completed  
60 for credit, the other one may not be taken for credit at a subsequent time, unless approved by  
61 petition to the graduate program coordinator.

62

63 4. Courses to be dual-listed must be offered within the same department or equivalent academic unit.  
64 Dual-listed courses may not be cross-listed at the same time.

65

66 5. Thesis, creative work, internship, special project, topic, directed reading, research and independent  
67 study classes may not be used as part of a dual-listed arrangement.

68

69 6. Only courses enrolling junior, senior, and graduate level students may be dual-listed. If an  
70 undergraduate student completes a dual-listed course as an undergraduate and needs the dual-  
71 listed course for a graduate degree, the graduate coordinator shall specify an alternative.

72

73 7. California Code of Regulations Title 5, Education s 40510 states that "Not less than one-half of the  
74 units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for graduate students." Dual-  
75 listed courses are not considered to be courses organized primarily for graduate students.

76 Individual graduate programs may elect to establish more restrictive requirements.

77

78 8. If the total enrollment of the dual-listed courses meets minimal enrollment expectations for at least  
79 one of the courses of the pair, the dual-listed courses shall be considered to have met minimal  
80 enrollment.

81

82 9. To maintain the quality of instruction, total enrollment in dual-listed courses may not exceed the  
83 maximum enrollment permitted for the graduate level component of the pair. Higher enrollment  
84 may be approved by the appropriate administrator department chair or equivalent.

85

86 10. The *Class Schedule* should make clear, by means of class notes that dual-listed courses meet at the  
87 same time and location, and with the same instructor, but that the two courses have different  
88 requirements reflecting the different course levels.

---

<sup>2</sup> Dual-listed courses may have WTU implications.

89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122

11. Course proposals must be submitted and approved separately for each of the courses in the proposed pairs through the campus curricular review process. The course proposals must address the following:

- a. Both course proposal forms must specify that the courses may be dual-listed and that credit may not be earned in the other course of the pair at a later time (except by approval of the graduate program coordinator);
- b. Justification for the dual-listing must be attached to each of the proposals;
- c. While course descriptions and course syllabi for dual-listed courses should be similar, specification of the requirements for the graduate course must clearly delineate greater expectations for and the additional requirements of graduate students, appropriate to the field of study. At the time of the review of the dual-listing, syllabi for both courses complete with course descriptions, course readings and activities, and Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) will be submitted to all curriculum committees as support for the dual-listing. Examples of greater expectations may include that graduate students show development of independent critical judgment and evaluation of course material, and that graduate students present the evidence of their original critical analysis. Examples of additional assignments might include significant research papers, oral presentations of research on course assignments, and/or the demonstration of more sophisticated laboratory or studio skills than those required of students in the undergraduate course.
- d. Proposals for dual-listing of courses can be submitted at the same time as the proposals for review of the courses as new courses. Approval of the courses is not contingent upon approval of the dual-listing; however, dual-listing is contingent upon the approval of the courses. Proposals for dual-listing of courses can be submitted for already-existing courses if accompanied by a complete syllabus for both courses.

All proposals for the dual-listing of courses, as well as any exceptions to the provisions of this policy, shall be reviewed through the campus curricular review process. As with all courses, the curricular review process will ensure that the above-stated conditions are satisfied and that the use of dual-listed courses preserves or enhances the quality of both graduate and undergraduate programs of the University.

In light of the special status of dual-listed courses, it is expected that the review of these courses will be especially thorough.

## 1<sup>st</sup> Reading - APC Excess Units Seniors

### *Summary of changes to Excess Units Seniors policy:*

We need to note that the policy was approved by the Senate in 09/10, but not by the administration, so the changes are being made to the Senate's proposal rather to an existing approved policy. The most significant changes to the policy are as follows:

The definition of the super senior was simplified and changed to student that have completed over 150 units which is better aligned with the CSU guidelines provided to campuses to define "Super Seniors" to be a total degree units (120 for CSUSM) plus 20% which is roughly at 144 units. The 150 unit threshold was adopted since CSUSM has many transfer students that come in with excess units. The previous policy definition of "N+11" with the many variances of calculations that was dependent on whether students had double majors, additional minors, were transfer students or not and it was too complex to find out which students were considered a super senior. Under the old definition of "N+11" students over 131 units would become super seniors which presented a significant load to campus advising units to review and intercede and was the basis why the Advising expressed significant reservations. With the change to 150 units the Advising agree that it is best aligned with their resources.

In addition CSU guidelines also suggested a petition processes be implemented to allow for due process for students degree goals and objectives. The latest version of the policy allows for that petition process. The newest policy is more balanced to be student friendly with their academic goals and objectives, aligned with campus resources to address the super seniors, represents a fair and structured methodology to track excess unit students and to guide them to degree completion.

---



1 **APC: Excess Units Seniors**

2  
3 **Rationale:** *The Chancellor's Office has asked each campus to have a policy on excess-units seniors (aka Super Seniors) to better manage our enrollment. This policy increases access for students by redirecting enrollment from students who already have earned over 150 units to students who are trying to make progress toward graduation, and it can also increase the number of prospective students that the University can admit.*

7  
8 **Definition:** This policy defines the term "excess-units seniors", outlines the procedure for facilitating graduation of such students, and gives a policy to prevent "excess-units seniors."

10  
11 **Scope:** All CSUSM undergraduate students seeking a first baccalaureate degree.

12  
13 **Authority:** The President of the University.

14  
15 I. EXCESS-UNITS SENIORS

16  
17 The term "excess-units senior" will be used in this document to describe students seeking a first  
18 baccalaureate degree who have earned 150<sup>i</sup> or more units and who have not yet graduated. There are two  
19 different groups of excess-units seniors: the first group has already applied for graduation, and the second  
20 group has not applied for graduation. For both groups, intrusive advising shall be used to facilitate their  
21 graduation.

22  
23 II. EXCESS-UNITS SENIORS WHO HAVE APPLIED FOR GRADUATION

24  
25 A. Advisors shall review the student's Degree Progress Report to determine the student's graduation  
26 status and determine if the student is on track and will be able to graduate on time.

27  
28 B. If the student has all the courses needed to graduate with their declared major(s)/minor(s); the  
29 advisor will notify the Registrar who will automatically graduate the student at the earliest opportunity (see  
30 V for the appeal procedure).

31  
32 C. If it is determined that it will not be possible for the student to graduate as planned, the following  
33 procedure shall be followed.

34  
35 1. The advisor shall review the student's records for possible course substitution approvals from  
36 appropriate departments or programs to graduate the student on time.

37  
38 2. The student shall be given the earliest priority registration date to facilitate enrollment in  
39 outstanding course requirements.

40  
41 3. The advisor will change the student's expected graduation term to keep the student in the  
42 graduation review process.

43  
44 4. A special notation shall be placed on the student record indicating to the student that their  
45 graduation has been changed to the expected semester of completion; and an email will be  
46 sent to the student encouraging the student to complete the requirements on time, and to  
47 utilize advising services as a resource for planning a timely graduation.

48  
49 III. EXCESS-UNITS SENIORS WHO HAVE NOT APPLIED FOR GRADUATION

50  
51 For students who have not applied for graduation the following procedure shall be followed:

- 53 A. Advisors shall review the student's Degree Progress Report to determine the student's graduation  
54 status.  
55
- 56 B. If the student already has all the courses needed in his/her declared major(s)/minor(s) to graduate;  
57 advisors will notify the Registrar who will automatically graduate the student at the earliest  
58 opportunity (see V for the appeal procedure).  
59
- 60 C. If the student has remaining requirements to complete, an email shall be sent urging the student to  
61 review their Degree Progress Report and come in for an advising session for timely graduation  
62 planning.
- 63 ○ An advisor will create a graduation completion plan outlining necessary courses by  
64 semester. This plan shall be emailed to the student and a copy shall be kept in the  
65 student's file.
  - 66 ○ The advisor will apply automatically for the student's expected graduation term. The  
67 Advisor will change student's expected graduation term as necessary to keep the student  
68 in the graduation review process.
  - 69 ○ A hold will be placed on the student which will be removed by the student submitting a  
70 signed copy of the graduation completion plan.  
71

#### 72 IV. PREVENTION OF EXCESS-UNITS SENIORS 73

74 Students with more than 130<sup>ii</sup> attempted units may only change their majors if the change of major allows  
75 for graduation at a date no later than the earliest date possible with current major. Similarly, students with  
76 more than 130 attempted units may only declare additional major(s) or minor(s) if the additional major(s) or  
77 minor(s) allow for graduation at a date no later than the earliest date possible with first major. In these  
78 cases, approval from a staff advisor in Advising Services will be needed. Exceptions to the 130 units limit can  
79 be granted by an appropriate faculty advisor such as the department chair or designee.  
80

#### 81 V. APPEALS PROCEDURES

82 Students choosing to appeal their graduation must submit a Degree Conferral Appeal. The appeal must  
83 include a narrative statement elaborating how excess units were accumulated, their educational intent, and  
84 completion timelines. The appeal will be reviewed by a committee consisting of Dean or Designee from  
85 the College of the students major, a designated academic advisor from the student's major, and an  
86 appropriate faculty representative from the student's academic department/program.

---

<sup>i</sup> This limit does not apply to Nursing, and Integrated Credential Program students

<sup>ii</sup> This limit does not apply to Nursing, and Integrated Credential Program students

## 1<sup>st</sup> Reading - FAC Misconduct in Scholarship and Research

**Rationale:** This set of policy and procedures are intended to carry out our institution's responsibilities under the Public Health Service (PHS) Policies on Research Misconduct, 42 CFR Part 93. This policy applies to allegations of research misconduct (fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results) in research including research that is governed by federal funding regulations.<sup>1</sup>

**Definition** A policy for investigating allegations of possible misconduct in all research including research funded by external sponsors administered by the University.

**Authority** The President of the University.

**Scope** This set of policy and procedures apply to individuals at CSUSM engaged in research projects including those governed by federal funding regulations. This policy applies to any person paid by, under the control of, or affiliated with CSUSM, such as scientists, trainees, technicians and other staff members, students, fellows, guest researchers, or collaborators.

### I. Purpose

A. It is the policy of California State University, San Marcos ("University") to adhere to and promote the highest ethical standards of conduct in research and creative activities. Despite extremely rare occurrences, misconduct in research can have a significant impact on the reputation and credibility of the University, its faculty and students, and therefore it cannot be tolerated. The purpose of this policy is to provide the University with a set of procedures for investigating and reporting instances of alleged or apparent misconduct in research and creative activity.

This policy is also intended to conform to the requirements of the appropriate funding agencies (e.g., Health and Human Services [HHS], National Science Foundation [NSF], National Institutes for Health [NIH]) pursuant to the United States Office of Research Integrity (ORI) [45 CFR, Part 689] and the Public Health Service (PHS) Policies on Research Misconduct [42 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 93].

This policy shall apply to University administrators, faculty, and staff, and students [1] conducting any research including research funded by external sponsors administered by the University.

Every effort has been made to ensure compliance with current Collective Bargaining Agreements for University employees. No part of this policy should be considered as a substitute for any part of the Agreements. Collective Bargaining Agreements do not supplant [12] 42 CFR Part 93 requirements.

### II. Definitions

A. Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, in proposing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Fabrication is making up data or results or recording or reporting them. Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or research results such that research is not accurately represented in the research record. Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. Misconduct does not include honest error or honest differences in opinion.

A-B. Preponderance [13] of the evidence means proof by information that, compared with that opposing it, leads to the conclusion that the fact at issue is more probably true than not (42 CFR 93.219).

### III. General Provisions

<sup>1</sup> This policy was largely informed by the Senate approved Cal Poly Pomona Misconduct in Research Policy. In its creation, FAC has worked collaboratively with the AVPR of CSUSM and the AVPR of Cal Poly Pomona. This policy is aligned with expectations suggested by the Office of Research Integrity (ORI).

43 A. The University shall make a good faith effort to protect the privacy of all individuals involved in  
44 research misconduct proceedings. Disclosure of identity of those involved in the proceedings shall be  
45 limited, to the extent possible, to those who need to know, consistent with a thorough, competent,  
46 objective and fair research misconduct proceeding, and as allowed by law. Misconduct of externally  
47 funded research must be reported to the relevant funding agency. The University must disclose the  
48 identity of individuals against whom allegations of research misconduct are made and complainants of  
49 research misconduct related to PHS supported activities to the United States Office of Research Integrity  
50 ("ORI"). To the extent permitted by the applicable laws, confidentiality shall also be maintained for any  
51 record or evidence from which research subjects might be identified and disclosure of the record or  
52 evidence shall be limited to those who have a need to know to carry out the research misconduct  
53 proceeding.

54  
55 B. Finding of research misconduct under this policy requires that:

- 56 1. There be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community;
- 57 and
- 58 2. The misconduct be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and
- 59 3. The allegation(s) be proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

60  
61 C. The University has the burden of proof for making a finding of research misconduct. The destruction,  
62 absence of, or failure by the individual against whom allegations are made to provide research records  
63 adequately documenting the questioned research is evidence of misconduct only if the University  
64 establishes by a preponderance of evidence that:

- 65 1. the individual ~~against whom allegations are made~~ intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly had  
66 such records and destroyed them; or
- 67 2. had the opportunity to maintain the records but did not do so; maintained the records and  
68 failed to produce them in a timely manner;
- 69 3. and that the individual's conduct constitutes a significant departure from accepted practices of  
70 the relevant research community.

71  
72 D. The person against whom allegations of research misconduct are made has the burden of proving by a  
73 preponderance of evidence, any and all defenses raised. The determination of whether the burden of  
74 proof is met shall give due consideration to admissible, credible evidence of honest error or difference of  
75 opinion.

76  
77 E. The person against whom allegation of research misconduct is made has the burden of going forward  
78 with and proving by a preponderance of evidence any mitigating factors that are relevant to a decision to  
79 impose administrative actions following a research misconduct proceeding.

80  
81 F. The University shall undertake all reasonable and practical efforts, if requested, and appropriate, to  
82 restore the reputation of individuals alleged to have engaged in research misconduct but against whom  
83 no finding of research misconduct is made.

84  
85 G. The University shall undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to protect, restore the position and  
86 reputation, and to counter potential or actual retaliation against those individuals who, in good faith,  
87 make allegations of research misconduct and other participants in part of a research misconduct  
88 proceeding.

89  
90 H. The University shall take all necessary precautions to ensure that individuals responsible for carrying  
91 out any part of the research misconduct proceedings are selected based on scientific expertise that is  
92 pertinent to the matter and do not have unresolved personal, professional, or financial conflicts of  
93 interest with the individual against whom allegations are made, the individual(s) making the allegation,  
94 or witnesses participating in the proceedings. Any conflict, which a reasonable person would consider to  
95 demonstrate potential bias, shall disqualify the individual from selection.

96  
97 I. Whenever necessary and appropriate to ~~insure~~ ensure a thorough, competent, objective and fair  
98 evaluation of all the evidence during an inquiry or investigation, individuals with special expertise will be  
99 consulted.

100  
101 J. The University will notify the appropriate funding agency, where applicable, of any decision to  
102 terminate an inquiry or investigation before completion of the process outlined here or required by law.  
103 The notice will include the reasons for such early termination. The procedural requirements of funding  
104 agencies do vary, and the investigating body is cautioned to review the current legal requirements at the  
105 time of any inquiry or investigation under this policy.  
106

#### 107 IV. Responsibility

108  
109 A. The University shall be responsible for all of the following actions:

- 110 1. Taking all necessary actions to foster a research environment that promotes research integrity  
111 and discourages research misconduct;
- 112 2. Taking all reasonable and practicable steps to ensure the cooperation of those against whom  
113 the allegations are directed and other members of the University with research misconduct  
114 proceedings, including, but not limited to, their providing information, research records, and  
115 evidence;
- 116 3. Cooperating with funding agencies during any research misconduct proceeding or compliance  
117 review and provide administration and enforcement of actions imposed by the agency on the  
118 University;
- 119 4. Filing the required assurances of compliance and aggregated information on research  
120 misconduct proceedings as required by the funding agency;
- 121 5. Establishing and maintaining appropriate policies and procedures for monitoring compliance  
122 with the provisions of this policy and upon request, and as appropriate, provide compliance  
123 information to funding agencies and members of public, informing University faculty and  
124 administrative staff of this policy;
- 125 6. Informing ~~the any~~ research project team members on externally funded projects of the  
126 policies and procedures of the funding agency for responding to allegations of research  
127 misconduct, and the University's commitment to comply with the funding agency's policies and  
128 procedures;
- 129 7. Taking immediate action in accordance with the provisions of this policy as soon as  
130 misconduct on the part of employees or individuals within the University's control is suspected  
131 or alleged;
- 132 8. Directing the maintenance and custody of and access to documents, evidence, reports,  
133 research records, and any other materials generated in the course of research misconduct  
134 proceedings;
- 135 9. Notifying the ORI or the appropriate funding agency if it is ascertained at any stage of an  
136 inquiry or investigation of a project funded by a specified funding agency that any of the  
137 following conditions exist:
  - 138 a. Health or safety of the public is at risk, including an immediate need to protect  
139 human or animal subjects,
  - 140 b. Agency resources or interest are threatened,
  - 141 c. Research activities should be suspended,
  - 142 d. There is a reasonable indication of violations of civil or criminal law,
  - 143 e. Federal action is required to protect the interest of those involved in the research  
144 misconduct proceedings,
  - 145 f. There is a belief that the research misconduct proceedings may be made public  
146 prematurely, so that appropriate steps may be taken to safeguard evidence and protect  
147 the rights of those involved,
  - 148 g. There is a belief that the research community or public should be informed.
- 149  
150 10. Taking appropriate interim actions at any time during a research misconduct proceeding, to  
151 protect public health, federal funds and equipment, and the integrity of the PHS supported  
152 research process. The necessary actions will vary according to the circumstances of each case,  
153 but examples of actions that may be necessary include delaying the publication of research  
154 results, providing for closer supervision of one or more researchers, requiring approvals for  
155 actions relating to the research that did not previously require approval, auditing pertinent  
156 records, or taking steps to contact other institutions that may be affected by an allegation of

157 research misconduct.

158  
159 11. Reporting to appropriate federal agencies any proposed settlements, admissions of research  
160 misconduct, or institutional findings of misconduct that arise at any stage of a misconduct  
161 proceeding involving federally-funded research, including the allegation and inquiry stages.  
162

## 163 V. Allegations of Misconduct in Research

164  
165 A. Any individual who alleges that an act of misconduct in research has occurred or is occurring by an  
166 employee of the University or University Auxilliary Research Services Corporation (UARSC) California  
167 State University San Marcos Foundation shall disclose such allegations through any means of  
168 communication to the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (AVPR) and Provost to  
169 determine whether the allegation warrants an investigation. Upon receipt of any allegation of  
170 misconduct in research or creative activity, the AVPR shall promptly (within 5 working days?) assess the  
171 allegation to determine if an inquiry is warranted. An inquiry is warranted if the allegation: (1) meets the  
172 definition of research misconduct in section 11[14] of this policy; and (2) is sufficiently credible and specific  
173 so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified, and (3) for externally funded  
174 research it satisfies the external agencies' research misconduct applicability requirements.

175  
176 Should a student be referred to the Dean of Students instead of going through this process?

177  
178 C. ~~B.~~ If the AVPR determines that an inquiry is warranted, they [15] shall immediately prepare a written  
179 description of the allegations and notify the individual(s) against whom the allegations are asserted.  
180 The notification shall include a copy of the description of the allegations together with a copy, or  
181 reference, to this policy statement. In addition the individual(s) against whom the allegations are  
182 asserted shall be advised in writing that they have the right to union representation and legal  
183 counsel.

184 Should we attach a copy of the timetable for this policy?

## 185 VI. The Inquiry

186  
187  
188 A. Upon determination that an inquiry is warranted the AVPR shall immediately begin an inquiry into the  
189 allegations. The purpose of the inquiry is an initial review of the evidence to determine if the criteria for  
190 conducting an investigation are met.

191  
192 B. The AVPR on or before the notification date of the individual(s) against whom allegations are made or  
193 the initiation of the inquiry, whichever occurs earlier, shall promptly take all reasonable and practical  
194 steps to obtain custody of all the research records and evidence needed to conduct the research  
195 misconduct proceedings, inventory the records and evidence, and sequester them in a secure manner,  
196 except that where the research record or evidence encompass scientific instruments shared by a number  
197 of users, custody may be limited to copies of the data or evidence on such instruments, so long as those  
198 copies are substantially equivalent to the evidentiary value of the instruments. The same steps shall be  
199 taken regarding the custody of additional research records and evidence discovered during the course of  
200 the research misconduct proceeding, including at the inquiry and investigation stages, or if new  
201 allegations arise.

202  
203 C. Within 15 working days of notification of the individual(s) against whom allegations of research  
204 misconduct is made, the AVPR and the chair of the Academic Senate shall jointly appoint a panel of three  
205 members, with appropriate expertise [16] under provisions of sections 3.8 and 3.9 [17] of this policy, to  
206 conduct the inquiry. A minimum of two members of the panel shall be full-time tenured faculty members  
207 of the University. Whenever possible at least one committee member shall represent the field or  
208 discipline from which allegations of research misconduct is made.

209  
210 D. Changes to the membership of the inquiry panel shall be made only through joint decision of the AVPR  
211 and the Academic Senate Chair.

212  
213 E. The inquiry, including submission of the inquiry report and giving the individuals(s) against whom

214 | allegations were asserted a reasonable opportunity (~~minimum of [18]~~ 10 working days) to comment on it,  
215 | shall be completed within 60 calendar days of its initiation unless circumstances clearly warrant a longer  
216 | period. If the inquiry takes longer than 60 calendar days to complete, documentation of the reasons for  
217 | delay shall be included in the inquiry record.  
218 |

219 | F. A written inquiry report shall be prepared that states:

- 220 | 1. The name and position of those against whom allegations of misconduct was asserted;
- 221 | 2. A full description of the allegations of research misconduct
- 222 | 3. The basis for recommending that the alleged actions does or does not warrant an  
223 | investigation;
- 224 | 4. Any comments on the report by the person(s) making the allegation and those against whom  
225 | the allegations were asserted;
- 226 | 5. Any additional agency requirement for externally funded projects.  
227 |

228 | G. An investigation is warranted if there is:

- 229 | 1. a reasonable basis for concluding that the allegation falls within the definition of research  
230 | misconduct and
- 231 | 2. preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding from the inquiry indicates that  
232 | the allegation may have substance.  
233 |

234 | H. The final inquiry report shall be provided to the AVPR for review, who will make a written  
235 | determination of whether an investigation is warranted. If a determination is made that an investigation  
236 | is warranted the AVPR shall within 30 calendar days:

- 237 | 1. report the findings to the Associate Vice President for Academic Resources (when the  
238 | respondent is a faculty member), appropriate unit administrator [19] (e.g., College Dean), and to  
239 | the Provost;
- 240 | 2. provide written notification to the individuals against whom allegations of research  
241 | misconduct are raised of the specific allegations to be investigated. The notification shall include  
242 | a copy of the inquiry report and include a copy or reference to this policy statement; for  
243 | comment within 10 days [10].
- 244 | 3. on a need to know basis, contact the Dean/Director or Unit Head regarding the inquiry results.  
245 | For PHS supported activities, within 30 days of finding that an investigation is warranted; the  
246 | AVPR shall provide ORI with a written finding and a copy of the inquiry report.  
247 |

248 | I. The AVPR may notify those who made the allegations whether the inquiry found that an investigation is  
249 | warranted and may provide a copy of the relevant portions of the inquiry report to them.  
250 |

251 | J. For externally funded projects the AVPR shall: follow the reporting and notification and disclosure  
252 | requirements of the agency and comply with agency requirements for maintenance and transfer of  
253 | records to the funding agency.  
254 |

## 255 | VII. Investigation

256 | A. An investigation is the formal development of a factual record and the examination of that record  
257 | leading to a decision not to make a finding of research misconduct or to a recommendation for a finding  
258 | of research misconduct, which may include a recommendation for other appropriate actions including  
259 | administrative actions.  
260 |

261 | B. Within 15 working days after the determination that an investigation is warranted the AVPR and the  
262 | Chair of the Academic Senate shall jointly appoint a panel of five members, with appropriate expertise  
263 | [11] subject to provisions of III. H. and III. I. [12]. of this policy, to conduct the investigation. None of the  
264 | members of the inquiry panel are eligible to serve on the investigation panel. A minimum of three  
265 | members of the panel shall be full-time tenured faculty members of the University.  
266 |

267 | C. Changing the membership of the investigation panel shall be made only through joint decision of the  
268 | AVPR and the Academic Senate Chair.  
269 |  
270 |

271 D. An investigation following inquiry must be undertaken within 30 calendar days of the completion of  
272 the inquiry. All aspects of an investigation must be completed within 120 calendar days of beginning it,  
273 including conducting the investigation, preparing the report of findings, providing draft report for  
274 comments, and incorporation of all comments received. If it becomes apparent that the investigation  
275 cannot be completed within 120 calendar days, the reasons for delay shall be documented and included in  
276 the final report of the investigation. For externally funded projects, the external agency requirements for  
277 requesting extension to investigation period shall be followed.  
278

279 E. The individual(s) against whom allegations of misconduct were directed shall be given written notice of  
280 any new allegations raised during the investigations within a reasonable time (5 working days) after  
281 determining to pursue allegations not addressed in the inquiry or the initial notice of the investigation.  
282

283 F. In conducting the investigation, the investigation panel shall:

284 1. make diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough and sufficiently documented  
285 and includes examination of all research records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on  
286 the merits of the allegation;

287  
288 2. t~~ake~~ reasonable steps to ensure an impartial and unbiased investigation to the maximum  
289 extent practical<sup>[13]</sup>;

290 ~~3.~~ interview both the individual(s) making the allegation and those against whom the  
291 allegations were made and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as  
292 having information regarding any relevant aspect of the investigation, providing the recording or  
293 transcript to the interviewee for correction, and include the recording or transcript in the record  
294 of investigation;

295 ~~4.~~ pursue diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to  
296 the investigation, including any evidence of additional instances of possible research  
297 misconduct, and continue the investigation to completion; and

298 ~~5.~~ for externally funded research, comply with all requirements of the supporting agency for  
299 conducting research misconduct investigation.  
300

301 G. The panel shall notify the individual(s) being investigated sufficiently (minimum of 10 working days) in  
302 advance of the scheduled interview date so that the individual(s) may adequately prepare for the  
303 interview and arrange for the attendance of legal counsel if desired.  
304

305 H. Within 90 calendar days of initiation of the investigation, the draft investigation report should be  
306 submitted to the AVPR.  
307

308 I. The individual(s) who raised the allegation may be given a copy of the draft investigation report or  
309 relevant portions of the report. If a written comment is submitted within 30 calendar days, the comment  
310 shall be made part of the final investigation report.  
311

312 J. A copy of the draft investigation report shall be provided to the individual(s) being investigated and  
313 concurrently a copy of, or supervised access to, the evidence on which the report is based. Any comments  
314 by the individual(s) being investigated that are submitted within 30 calendar days following the receipt of  
315 the draft investigation report shall be made a part of the final investigation report.  
316

317 K. The final investigation report shall:

- 318 1. describe the nature of the allegations of research misconduct;
- 319 2. describe the specific allegations of research misconduct considered in the investigation;
- 320 3. identify and summarize the research records and evidence reviewed, and identify evidence  
321 taken into custody but not reviewed. The report shall also describe any relevant records and  
322 evidence not taken into custody and explain why;
- 323 4. provide a finding as to whether research misconduct did or did not occur for each separate  
324 allegation of research misconduct identified during the investigation, and if misconduct was  
325 found,
  - 326 a. identify it as falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism and whether it was intentional,  
327 knowing, or in reckless disregard,



- 328 b. summarize the facts and the analysis supporting the conclusion and consider the  
329 merits of any reasonable explanation, evidence and rebuttal evidence provided by those  
330 against whom the allegations were asserted,  
331 c. identify any external or internal support in conducting the research,  
332 d. identify any publications that need correction or retraction;  
333 e. identify the person(s) responsible for the misconduct,  
334 f. list any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the  
335 person responsible for misconduct has pending with external agencies or internal  
336 university units;  
337 5. include and consider any comments made by those who made the allegations and the persons  
338 against whom allegations were made.  
339

340 L. Copies of the final investigation report shall be provided to the AVPR and the individual(s) against  
341 whom allegations of research misconduct were raised. The AVPR shall review the report to ensure that it  
342 complies with the provisions of this policy.  
343

344 M. The AVPR shall make recommendations [14] for corrective measures, if any, and forward the final  
345 investigation report to the Associate Vice President for Academic Resources, the Provost, and the College  
346 Dean/Unit Director. The final decision is to be made by the Provost, President, or President designee or  
347 Dean of Students if the respondent is a student?  
348

349 N. For externally funded projects, the external agency requirements for the maintenance and provision of  
350 relevant research records and records of the University's research misconduct proceedings, including  
351 results of all interviews and the transcripts or recordings of such interviews shall be followed.  
352

#### 353 VIII. Cooperation with ORI 354

355 A. The University shall cooperate with ORI during its oversight review under 42 CFR 93.400 et seq. or any  
356 subsequent administrative hearings or appeals under 42 CFR 93.500 et seq. with respect to research  
357 integrity and misconduct issues related to PHS supported activities. This includes providing all research  
358 records and evidence under the University's control, custody, or possession and access to all persons  
359 within its authority necessary to develop a complete record of relevant evidence.



## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** February 21, 2011

**TO:** Staci Beavers  
Chair, Budget and Long Range Planning Committee

**FROM:** Jennifer L. Jeffries  
Associate Vice President for Planning, Accreditation and Assessment

**SUBJECT:** University Academic Master Plan (UAMP), 2010-11 through 2018-19

CSUSM has submitted the annual update of the UAMP for 2010-11 through 2018-19 to the Chancellor's Office.

As reported to BLP, there were no programs added to the UAMP. The schedule for review of existing program (program review) dates were updated as they have been in the past.

The updated UAMP is attached.

Jennifer Jeffries, Ed.D.  
Associate Vice President  
Planning, Accreditation, and Assessment

Enclosures (1) Academic master Plan 2010-11 through 2018-2019

**ACADEMIC PLAN**  
**2010-2011 through 2018-2019**  
**California State University, San Marcos**

Existing Schools/Divisions and Degree Programs Offered		Proposed Degree Programs	Schedule for Review of Existing Programs
<b>College of Arts and Sciences</b>			
Anthropology	BA(ST)		2012-13
Applied Physics	BS(ST)		2012-13
<u>Biochemistry</u>	BS(ST)		2011-12
Biological Sciences	BS(ST)-MS(ST)		2016-17
Biotechnology	BS(ST)-MBt(SE)+		2013-14
<u>Chemistry</u>	BS(ST)	MS 2008*	2011-12
Child and Adolescent Development		BA 2009	
Communication	BA(ST)		2014-15
Computer Science	BS(ST)-MS(ST)		2016-17
Criminology and Justice Studies	BA (ST)		2011-12
Digital and Media Arts		BA 2008	
Economics	BA (ST)		2012-13
Environmental Studies		BA 2007	
Ethnic Studies		BA 2010 (ST)	
Global Studies	BA(ST)		2013-14
History	BA(ST)-MA(ST)		2016-17
Human Development	BA(ST)		2014-15
Kinesiology	BS(ST&SE)		2014-15
Liberal Studies	BA(ST)		2016-17
Literature and Writing Studies	BA(ST)-MA(ST)		2011-12 (BA) 2014-15 (MA)
Mass Media	BA(ST)		2014-15
Mathematics	BS(ST)-MS(ST)		2011-12
Music		BA 2009	
Philosophy		BA 2008	
Political Science	BA(ST)		2016-17
Psychology	BA(ST)-MA(ST)		2013-14
Social Sciences	BA(ST)		2016-17
Sociological Practice	MA(ST)		2011-12
Sociology	BA(ST)		2011-12
Spanish	BA(ST)-MA(ST)		2013-14
Special Major	BA(ST)		2012-13
Visual and Performing Arts	BA(ST)		2013-14
Women's Studies	BA(ST)		2016-17
<b>College of Business Administration</b>			
Business Administration	BS(ST)-MBA(ST))		2015-16
<b>College of Education</b>			
<u>Education</u>	MA(ST)		2011-12
Educational Leadership	EdD**	EdD 2010	2011-12
<b>School of Nursing</b>			
Nursing	BS(ST&SE)-MS(SE)		2011-12 (BA) 2013-14 (MS)
<b>Other</b>			
Public Administration		MPA 2007	
Social Work		MSW 2007	

Note: Underlined program is a nationally accredited subject area.

+ Pilot program.

\*Approval will be contingent on evidence of sufficient student demand to sustain a viable program.

\*\*Offered jointly with the University of California, San Diego

(ST) = state-support; (SE) = self-support

1 **Discussion Item: NEAC Possible change to Constitution & Bylaws**

2  
3 **Rationale:** *This possible change to the Constitution and Bylaws was prompted by a recommendation by Past Chair*  
4 *Janet McDaniel that NEAC consider changing the Vice Chair/Chair-Elect office so that the Vice Chair does not*  
5 *automatically assume the role of Chair. NEAC discussed this recommendation after checking the constitutions of all*  
6 *other CSUs. Almost all other CSU Academic Senates use the Chair/Vice-Chair model. Both officers are elected each*  
7 *year, and have the possibility of re-election. The Chair may serve for a second term, thereby capitalizing on the*  
8 *experience gained during the first term. The Vice Chair has the opportunity to run for the office of Chair but will no*  
9 *longer be committed to serving as Chair. More faculty may be willing to try out the Vice Chair role knowing that it*  
10 *doesn't commit them to assume the Chair seat.*

11  
12  
13 **Article 5.3: Senate Officers**

14 The Officers of the Senate shall consist of a Chair, Vice-Chair/~~Chair Elect~~, and Secretary. ~~The Vice-~~  
15 ~~Chair serves as Chair elect prior to becoming Chair.~~The officers of the Senate shall be voting members  
16 of the Senate. For election procedures, see the Academic Senate Election Rules and  
17 [GuidelinesProcedures\[naa15\]](#).

18  
19 **Article 5.3.1: Senate Officers' Terms**

20 The Officers of the Senate shall serve one-year terms. The Chair and Vice-Chair may be re-elected to  
21 serve one additional consecutive term. The Secretary may be re-elected to serve ~~an~~ additional term(s).  
22 In the event the Chair becomes unable to serve, the Vice-Chair/~~Chair Elect~~ shall assume the role of Chair  
23 for the remainder of the term, ~~as well as the term for which s/he was elected,~~ and an election will be  
24 conducted by NEAC for Vice-Chair/~~Chair Elect~~. If the Vice-Chair/~~Chair Elect becomes~~ is unable to  
25 ~~serve his/her term as~~ fill the vacant Chair seat, NEAC ~~will~~ shall conduct an election for Chair in  
26 accordance with the Academic Senate Election Rules and [GuidelinesProcedures](#). ~~If the Vice-Chair or the~~  
27 [Secretary are unable to serve in their roles, NEAC shall conduct an election in accordance with the](#)  
28 [Academic Senate Election Rules and Procedures.](#)  
29

## Standing Committee Reports

### APC

Currently working on:

- Dual Listed Courses policy
- Excess Units Seniors policy
- Inactive Courses policy
- Multiple Major policy

Will work on this next:

Length of / Max. no. of units in / Add-Drop period for winter intersession  
TOEFL score requirement

---

### BLP

### FAC

Currently working on:

- Misconduct in Research Policy- To be presented to Senate for first reading today (3.2.11)
- COE RTP Policy- Committee is reading through and making appropriate changes to policy before moving document on to Senate April or May
- Professional Leave Policy and Rubric- Being vetted by current PLC membership before being presented to EC sometime in March

Will work on this next:

- Range Elevation Policy as it relates to SSI eligibility. Currently there is no range elevation. We are waiting for CFA representation findings to move forward on this item per discussions in EC.
- 

### GEC

Currently working on:

- GE Philosophy and handbook
- diversity
- finalizing Area A and B Learning Objectives

Will work on this next:

- Area C Learning Objectives
  - discussions of interdisciplinary and global SLOs
- 

### LATAC

### NEAC

- After discussion at EC, it was decided that NEAC will bring to Academic Senate the suggestion that we uncouple the Chair and Chair-elect roles so that the Chair and Vice-Chair are elected separately and can serve more than one term.
  - NEAC has drafted a Constitutional amendment to provide a mechanism for the removal of committee members and senators who fail to meet their obligations. Senators will vote on this amendment during the spring elections.
  - The spring election and referendum vote will be conducted the week of April 5 - April 12. Vacant seats have been announced, and the sample ballot will be distributed by March 15.
  - NEAC has a referral to consider suggestions for shared governance. We will do so later in the semester.
  - NEAC continues to fill open committee seats.
-

## PAC

Currently working on:

- PAC is working on the final draft of the Program Review Policy and Guidelines
- The committee is also working on its response to the Women's Studies Program Review

Will work on this next:

- PAC will next work on its response to the Social Science Program Review
- 

## SAC

---

## UCC

Currently working on:

- Curriculum reviews: detailed list of review proposals and status can be found at [http://www.csusm.edu/academic\\_programs/curriculumscheduling/catalogcurricula/2010-11\\_curriculum.html](http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/curriculumscheduling/catalogcurricula/2010-11_curriculum.html)
  - List of completed P2/C/C2 proposals can be found from Consent Calendar
  - SoN package has been reviewed. Most of the proposals approved. Waiting for a conversation between Academic Programs office and SoN to identify a satisfactory solution to address the course numbering issue.
  - CoE package (1P + 5P2 + 3C + 2C2) review started. Questions were sent to originators and the originator is coming to UCC for an in-depth discussion.
  - CoBA: New options in B.A. Reviewed and originators have been invited to UCC for an in-depth discussion.
  - Single Subject Preparation in History (P form) approved. UCC report sent to Marcia.
- C form revision

Will work on this next:

- More curriculum reviews
- C form revision
- UCC members are invited to attend the University Forecasting Task café, helping identify goals for the next several years.