

2010/11 YEAR-END REPORTS OF THE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Chair: Robert Aboolian

Members: Robert Aboolian, David Barsky, Pam Bell, Ian Chan, Kristen Collins, Gerardo Gonzalez, Russell Jackson, Andre Kundgen, Laurie Stowell, Thomas Swanger

Tasks completed

APC has worked on a number of policies through Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. The following are the list of APC policies approved by the Senate, on the next Senate meeting agenda, and the carry forward items for 2011-12.

APC policies approved by the Senate in Fall 2010

1. Declaration of Major and Specialization policy (new) – It was approved by the Senate and by the administration in Spring 2011.
2. Course Repeats and GPA Adjustments policy (revision) – It was approved by the Senate and by the administration in Spring 2011.

APC policies approved by the Senate in Spring 2011

1. Undergraduate and Graduate Dual Listed Courses policy (new) – It was approved by the Senate and by the administration.
2. Excess-Units Seniors policy (proposed 09/10; returned by administration) – It was approved by the Senate.
3. Inactive Course policy (revision) – It was approved by the Senate.
4. Graduation Requirements policy (revision) – It was approved by the Senate.

APC items on the Senate agenda 05/04

1. Second Bachelor's Degree policy (new)
2. English Language Requirement (for Non-native Speakers of English) policy (new)

APC carry forward items for 2011-2012

Maximum Number of Units During Intersession policy (new)

BUDGET & LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Budget for 2011/12 and Beyond: Provost Cutrer visited BLP on January 31 to discuss budget projections both for the University as a whole and for Academic Affairs. Based on then-available projections for next year's enrollment (to be influenced by this year's strong enrollment) and with funding provided by student fees (including strong projections for student fees generated from this summer's self-support sessions), the Provost maintained that Academic Affairs is well-positioned for 2011-2012 despite the instability of state funding. In response to questions that committee members raised about the viability of our growth plan given the extraordinary budget uncertainty in coming years, the Provost expressed confidence that CSUSM's Division of Academic Affairs can continue to utilize existing fiscal as well as "base budget" resources to continue operations and support the growth that is being projected through next year. Since that meeting, BLP has learned that our current target for AY 2011-12 is 7450 FTEs; this number is of course subject to change at the discretion of the Chancellor's Office.

Restructuring of Academic Affairs: In October 2010, the CSUSM community was informed that Academic Affairs would undergo a significant restructuring, without regard to a proposed policy on this subject that was passed by the Academic Senate in AY 2010/2011 and that had been awaiting administrative response for several months by

that time.¹ When questioned about the pending restructuring policy, the President and Provost provided the following objections: 1. the timeline for reviewing proposals was too long; and 2. any such policy must allow the President and Provost greater administrative discretion to address what they termed "unique and extraordinary circumstances."

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). While our input was not sought by the administration, we submitted comments to the Senate and posted this feedback on our website. A special task force assigned to assist with the restructuring's implementation is currently developing an implementation budget. BLP looks forward to receiving updates regarding the actual costs once implementation takes place in AY 2011/12.

Reports Submitted by Subcommittee on Data Reconciliation and Analysis:

In AY 2009-2010, BLP appointed a Subcommittee on Data Reconciliation and Analysis, comprised of faculty and administrators, to inform the campus community regarding 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 provided sophisticated analyses of CSUSM's spending patterns and Student-Faculty Ratios compared to other CSU campuses that earned substantial praise within CSU's Statewide Academic Senate. The final versions of these reports are available on BLP's website.²

This year, BLP was tasked with following up on these reports' recommendations. Initial administrative response to the report from on comparative spending patterns prompted a meeting between President Haynes, BLP, and the Academic Senate's officers, at which all parties agreed that closer cooperation between the faculty and administration regarding funding for appropriate instructional funding was advisable. Shortly after these reports were made publicly available and the state's budget for AY 2010/11 was approved, it was announced that a number of tenure-track faculty searches would be launched. Thirty-one tenure-track faculty searches were launched in Spring 2011, with many of these hires filling critical gaps left by resignations or retirements. However, it is critical to note that Departments that fill these positions for next year will lose \$20,000 in lecturer funding for each tenure-track hire. This will very likely mitigate the impact of these hires as mechanisms for addressing instructional funding gaps. In some instances, SFR's may even rise as a result. Both faculty and administration must remain vigilant against further increases in SFR's. As noted previously, 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 SFR report's uncovering of ongoing problems with the accurate accounting of faculty instructional assignments has inspired significant efforts to improve the Faculty Activity Report (FAR). BLP appointed a subcommittee (Wayne Aitken, Staci Beavers, and Chuck De Leone) to follow up with AVP-Academic Resources Janet Powell as well as with IITS and Institutional Planning and Analysis regarding the launching of an online tool for inputting and processing Faculty Activity Reports (FARs), which provide the data utilized to report on faculty workloads to the Chancellor's Office and which provide the basis for comparisons across CSU campuses. While competing tasks in Spring 2011 prevented BLP's subcommittee from completing a planned audit of the current state of the FAR system in AY 2010/11, improvements were made in this year's process: for example, on online

¹ This policy was authored by BLP, based on the recommendations of a joint administrative-faculty committee appointed by Provost Cutrer in 2009. This policy would have provided for procedures and principles to be followed to initiate, consider, and determine changes to Academic Affairs' structure. This policy was forwarded to the administration in June 2010.

² BLP 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.

reporting tool was piloted. This tool allows faculty members to input their own work assignments directly into an online database to avoid having data "lost in translation" across levels of reporting. Further, Department chairs are asked to review their faculty members' data to improve the accuracy of the reports. While several errors were found in both the Fall and Spring FARs (for example, cross-listed courses skewed SFR counts artificially downward in Fall 2010), the system does appear to be improved. However, it is imperative that an audit be conducted in AY 2011/12 to ensure that promised reforms are in fact being realized.

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

In AY 2010-2011, CSUSM's Academic Senate charged BLP with several tasks in response to the expansion of delivering 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

We are addressing each of these tasks in a report that will be finalized by the end of the Academic Year.

Curriculum Reviews:

BLP conducts two kinds of curriculum reviews: 1) A-form reviews and 2) P-form reviews.

1) The A-Form serves as an "abstract" for a forthcoming program proposal. The A-form requires a program proposer to outline the proposed degree, make an initial case about external demand for the degree or about internal need for it, and sketch out an early estimation of the resources needed to initiate the program. The committee votes whether or not the proposed degree should be added to CSUSM's University Academic Master Plan (UAMP), which is sent to the CSU Chancellor's Office each January. Placing a program on the UAMP is an invitation to proposers to prepare and submit a Program Proposal (P-form), discussed below. This year, we reviewed the A-form for a proposed Master's in Public Health, and we recommended that the program be placed in the UAMP. As we laid out in our report to the Senate, this proposed program would be launched as a self-support program through Extended Learning. We anticipate that a fully developed Program Proposal (P-form) will be submitted in Fall 2011.

2) P-Forms represent the realized plan of the curriculum, including resource needs for initiating and sustaining the degree program. Originators of major and minor degree programs, options, certificates, and some existing degree programs undergoing substantial changes submit P-forms. Preparing these proposals requires notifications to potentially affected programs and support units so that they can provide input that can be considered during the review process. Once P-forms are reviewed by both the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and BLP, they are submitted to the Academic Senate for debate and a vote. If approved by the Senate, the P-forms are then submitted to the Provost, to the President, and (if necessary) to the Chancellor's Office for official authorization. BLP reviewed several P-forms in AY 2010-2011, engaging in discussions with originators and incorporating responses as we wrote long-range planning and resource implication reports for the Academic Senate. In AY 2010-2011, the Senate approved minors in both Video/Film Production and Music Technology, a credential in Special Education, and a waiver program in History/Social Sciences. BLP also submitted a review to the Senate for a new option for the Bachelor's of Science in Business Administration (to be offered as a self-support program through Extended Learning at the Temecula site); as of May 4, this proposal is awaiting Senate debate and approval.

Finally, near the end of the Spring term, we also received a revised P-form for a proposed bachelor's degree in Child and Adolescent Development (CHAD). BLP had previously reviewed this program proposal in AY 2008/09, but Senate review and debate were delayed at that time. We have submitted our updated report to the Senate, and the revised proposal is now awaiting Senate debate and approval.

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

Despite the ongoing uncertainties of our budgeting environment, Academic Affairs continues to engage in long-range planning. The Academic Affairs (AA) Strategic Planning and Budget Cycle that was developed and approved 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. In November, we met with AALC to discuss budget proposals submitted by all of the units within Academic Affairs. These budget proposals laid out each unit's "three-year rolling plan" of spending priorities, which were ranked and discussed by all meeting participants. This conversation provided the Provost with input that would have been used to develop the Division's budget proposal for the coming year, had a campus-wide call for budget proposals been forthcoming. However, the Division did ultimately request funding to support Global Studies' continuing recruitment of international students, the Library's inflationary subscription costs, a "Graduate Incentive Funding" proposal to return funding from graduate student fees to Academic Affairs, and various IITS campus-wide projects. All of these requests were endorsed by the University Budget Committee (UBC) in March 2011 and are currently awaiting action by the President. It should be noted that the 31 faculty searches and various administrative searches that were ultimately authorized were not part of this discussion, and BLP played no role in these conversations or prioritizations.

Further, BLP met with AALC multiple times in the Spring to participate in long-range planning activities, specifically the development of "goal statements" for the Division that will guide units' budget proposals and Divisional prioritizing of said proposals into the next 3-5 years. Each unit within Academic Affairs submitted their anticipated primary concerns for the next 3-5 years, and those statements were incorporated into the conversation.³ Additionally, AALC and BLP members participated in an event hosted by Associate Vice President for Planning, Accreditation, and Assessment that included representatives from various local K-12 public schools and local community colleges so that their perspectives could also be incorporated into the Division's goal drafting. Draft goal statements for the Division have been drafted and will be discussed at a joint meeting of AALC and BLP on May 3.

Recommendations for AY-2011/12:

- As noted above, an anticipated audit of the new Faculty Activity Report (FAR) mechanism was not conducted this year; this should be a top priority for AY 2011/12.
- The A-form revisions should be completed and submitted to the Academic Senate.
- BLP should continue to learn about Extended Learning and self-support program offerings.
- The current restructuring of Academic Affairs presents a unique opportunity for a comprehensive review of CSUSM's University Master Plan, and BLP should play an active role in this process if it moves forward.
- The Child and Adolescent Development (CHAD) program awaits approval.

Committee Members: Voting Members: Staci Beavers (at-large, chair), Jacqueline Thousand (COE), Kathleen Watson (COBA), Robert Yamashita (COAS, Fall term only), Hua Yi (Library). Ex-Officio Members: Sammi Carr (ASI rep), Dennis Guseman (Dean, COBA), Jennifer Jeffries (Provost's representative, Associate Vice President of Planning and Accreditation), Wayne Veres (Dean of IITS). Non-Voting Guests: Denise Boren (Interim Dean, SON), Eric Bullard (Associate Dean, Extended Learning)

Note: We received requests during the year to allow a representative from the School of Nursing and from Extended Learning to attend BLP meetings on an ongoing basis. The voting members agreed that inviting representatives from these units to attend BLP regularly would improve communications between these units and BLP as well as the Academic Senate. In particular, given BLP's recent charges related to Extended Learning, this has been a good step in that direction.

³ BLP submitted the following concerns for this conversation:

1. Under what conditions would a program most appropriately be offered via self-support?
2. How do we ensure a continuing, meaningful faculty voice in the planning of new programs?
3. How can Academic Affairs develop a mechanism for prioritizing new programs that are proposed?

Voting Members for 2011-2012

Staci Beavers (at-large 10-12, chair), Laurie Stowell (COE, 11-13), Kathleen Watson (COBA, 10-12), Hua Yi (Library, 11-13), Open Seat (COAS, 11-13)

For Fall 2011, BLP will meet weekly on Mondays from 3:30-5 p.m. (MARK 344).

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

1. Members:

<i>Member</i>	<i>Representing</i>	<i>Term</i>	<i>Voting?</i>
Elisa Grant-Vallone	Faculty at large	09-11	Yes
Marion Geiger	Faculty at large	10-12	Yes
<i>Open seat</i>	Faculty at large	10-12	Yes
George Vourlitis	CoAS faculty	09-11	Yes
Eun Kang	CoBA faculty	09-11	Yes
Lorri Santamaria (CHAIR)	CoE faculty	09-11	Yes
Jackie Borin	Library faculty	10-12	Yes
Ilene Dunagan	Nursing faculty	10/11	Yes
Laura Makey	Lecturer	10-12	Yes
Janet Powell	Provost or AVP	NA	No
Mayra Besosa	CFA	10/11	No

2. **Meeting schedule:** FAC met weekly for 1.5 hours. For the fall 2010 semester FAC met from September 13-November 29. In spring 2011 FAC met from January 31-April 26.

3. **Items referred to FAC from 2009-10:** The following items were listed as unfinished business from the previous year:

- **Sabbatical Leave Policy:** FAC will have to revise policy based on the new CBA (if applicable), suggestions by EC, and the Professional Leave Committee.
- **RTP Policy:** Revision to the policy must be made pending senate suggestions
- **Coach Evaluation Policy:** FAC will likely receive the coach responses to the draft policy by the end of the spring 2010 semester. These responses should be incorporated into the draft policy as soon as possible in fall 2011 for prompt review by EC and the senate.
- **Review of Policy on Misconduct in Scholarship and Research.** FAC should take this up in fall 2011.
- **Paperless for RTP process.** FAC must "test-drive" the template developed by IITS and revisit the feasibility of on-line WPAF review.

4. Business conducted by FAC in 2009-10.

- **Professional Leave Committee recommendations for changes in the Sabbatical Leave Policy.** FAC was asked to clarify the criteria for evaluating sabbatical proposals. FAC worked on changed and presented to EC and REJECTED by EC 9.29.10. FAC continued to make changes based on feedback and collaboration with PLC members. FAC also added a rubric for ease and practicality of use. Policy was passed in Senate 4.6 11.
- **Promotion and Tenure Committee recommendations for changes RTP Policy:** FAC discussed and made extensive revisions to the RTP policy following recommendations made to FAC by the 2008-09 P&T committee and feedback by EC. Policy revisions were made over a 6 week period. The draft RTP Policy was sent to EC in November 2009, and EC referred the document back to FAC with additional suggested revisions. FAC made the requested revisions over a 3 week period and sent the revised policy back to EC in February. EC forwarded the document to the Senate for a 1st read. The Senate had minor suggestions, which FAC considered during 1 meeting in March. The revised policy went back to the Senate for a 2nd read in April 2010. Policy was passed in Senate 9.1.10.
- **Interim Coach Evaluation Policy.** In spring 2010 FAC revised the Interim Coach Evaluation Policy over a 3-week period and combined multiple, disparate forms and evaluation tools into a coherent policy, which

was reviewed by coaches. Final changes were made to the draft policy, and the policy was reviewed by FAC fall 2010. Policy sent to CSUSM coaches and vetted by CBA expertise. EC reviewed, policy went to Senate and was approved for use as adjusted. Policy was passed in Senate 10.6.10.

- **Review of Policy on Misconduct in Scholarship and Research.** The policy was discussed over a 2 week period in spring 2010. FAC had many questions, specifically regarding legal issues with the draft policy. Legal concerns were forwarded to CFA lawyers for guidance; however, CFA lawyers stated that they could not comment on the policy until it was implemented by the senate. The return of the RTP policy to FAC precluded additional action on this policy in spring 2010. Fall 2010 continued work. After collaboration with Gerry Gonzalez (AVP and Dean Graduate Research, CSUSM), the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) and AVP Graduate Research at Cal Poly Pomona; FAC drafted a new policy. Policy was approved in EC 2.9.11. Policy was passed in Senate 4.6.11.
- **Paperless for RTP process.** NEW CHARGE 9.29.10: One faculty member to pilot next year. 9.21.10. EC would like FAC to assess the pilot of paperless RTP process with: committee chairs, p & t committee members, PRC, dean, and provost. Concerns include--- two processes, committee members who may not want to review files online. They claim this process warrants some kind of an assessment. Not a priority this year. To be revisited 2011-12.
- **Formalization of dept RTP Standards & Evaluation and Retaining Lecturer Standards.** Janet Powell originally asked that FAC develop a process for Senate approval for both tenure line and lecturer **department level** standards and requests for additional materials in all evaluation processes. After reexamining the RTP Department Standards guidelines, she realized this has already been done for the tenure line faculty. Thus, FAC only needed to develop a policy for the approval of departmental standards and materials for lecturers. This is necessary because such standards are essentially an extension of the evaluation policy and must not violate the CBA. Went to EC 10.13.10. Policy was passed in Senate 11.3.10.
- **Reconciliation CoAS RTP document with CBA makeup of PRC.** Referral from 9.29.10. FAC Chair met with CoAS Dept Chair and determined this task was departmental. Done 11.1.10.
- **Review revised SoN policy on evaluation of temporary faculty.** Referral 9.29.10. Policy reviewed for correctness. Done, correct policy in place. 10.10.
- **Investigate & address impact of moving programs to EL on RTP process for faculty teaching in EL; Investigate & address impact of moving programs to EL on entitlement for lecturers; Investigate & address impact of moving programs to EL on workload accounting for faculty teaching in EL.** Referral 10.20.11. FAC investigated policies and found that programs do not move. There is a distinct difference between programs moving and being started in EL and there is a distinction between EL and self-support programs. EL addressed EC and Senate to clarify concerns, FAC confident these concerns addressed in these meetings.
- **Revisit guidelines concerning EC members' service on president's awards committees.** REFERRAL 10.6.2010. FAC referring back to EC. This is not a university policy it is under the purview of the President. If EC sends it back, our position is to have NEAC send out a call as it does for the formation of other committees.
- **New Policy on moving a faculty member to another dept. considering all possible cases.** Referral 10.20.10. Upon discussion with FAC and restructurization issues; item taken off table by Janet Powell.
- **Investigate and address course evaluation of self-support credit courses.** Referral 11.10.10. Courses are evaluated the same as all matriculated courses. Furthermore, EL addressed EC and Senate to clarify concerns, FAC confident these concerns addressed in these meetings.
- **Review of CoE RTP document.** REFERRAL 12.8.2010. 1991 document needed update for alignment with new university RTP document. Passed by EC March 11. Presented to Senate April. Policy was passed in Senate 4.6.11.
- **Review of AY 2011-12 RTP calendar.** FAC reviewed the AY 2011-12 RTP calendar for consistency during 1 meeting and forwarded the RTP calendar to EC for review. And forwarded the revised calendar to EC. Item will appear on Senate agenda 5.4.11.

5. Unfinished business from FAC 2009-10: The following items will have to be address by the AY 2011-12 FAC. Items are not listed in any particular order of importance:

- **Range elevation policy review - criteria for eligibility.** Referral 1.26.11. Range Elevation Policy for Temporary Unit3 Employees. At the request of the CSU and CFA, FAC made a revision to the policy clarifying that the appropriate salary adjustment “with range elevation” will be made at the start of the next semester. The policy was forwarded to EC. Waiting to hear from CFA when to proceed.
 - **Paperless for RTP process.** FAC must “test-drive” the template developed by IITS and revisit the feasibility of on-line WPAF review.
-

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

GEC Voting Members: Judy Bauerlein, Kent Bolton, Annette Daoud, Sharon Elise, Michael McDuffie, Allison Carr (Fall)/Gabriela Sonntag (Spring), Marshall Whittlesey, Xiaoyu Zhang

Ex officio: David Barsky, Andres Favela, Sharon Hamill, Virginia Mann, Lori Walkington

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

Tasks completed

Curriculum Review

Throughout the academic year, GEC continued to review courses submitted for GE credit. Below is a list of all courses approved to receive GE credit.

BB: CHEM 390-1 Coffee, Chocolate, & Cocaine: A Chemical Investigation;

CC: DNCE 124 Screening Dance

MUSC 380-1 – Music in the Community

WMST 300-12 Disney Films: Gender & Sexuality in Animated Movies;

DD: ANTH/WMST 328 Body and Identity

BRS 364 Trade Routes: Pathways Across Borders

ID 370-5 Geography of Mexico

ID 350-3/GEOG 365 Globalization & Trade

ID 370-6 Perspectives on Rural Mexico

PSCI 345 Politics of Mexico

PSCI 390-7 Constitutional Law: Civil Liberties

PSCI 390-8 Political Movements in the United States

PSCI 415 State Politics (also carries Dg credit)

WMST 300-9 Experiences of Immigrant Women

WMST 300-11 Gender & Violence

WMST 300-13 – Reproductive Rights

Policy: Restrictions on Upper Division General Education Courses

This policy, passed by GEC Spring 2011, complements the APC Graduation Requirements policy. The APC policy clarified requirements for students pursuing multiple majors. In the course of APC’s review, it was noted that while there was a policy/procedure prohibiting students from using courses in their major for Upper Division General Education requirements

(http://www.csusm.edu/policies/active/documents/Cross_Listed_UDGE_Courses.html). This policy did not directly address the situation of students who were earning multiple majors. This policy revision adds a third clause clarifying that the prohibition only extends to the first major.

Additionally, it was observed that this policy appears to be misnamed. In 2010, a previously existing policy was amended to prohibit courses that were cross-listed with courses in a student’s major, and the policy was renamed for the special situation instead of the general rule. The name change being proposed here more aptly describes this policy.

Resolution on Title V

A Title V revision discussion underway in the CSU involves the American Institutions requirement, currently

included in our GE requirements. The revision, motivated by a desire for “efficiencies” in creating pathways from community college to the CSU, would impact PSCI/HIST departments who offer lower-division courses which count for Dh Dc and Dg as the American Institutions (AI) requirement. Discussions among PSCI/HIST chairs throughout the state have culminated in consensus to forward protests to this revision both through Academic Senate and directly, by PSCI/HIST chairs, to the Chancellor’s office. The GEC has passed and forwarded a resolution in this regard to the Senate, based on one passed by SJSU recently.

Ongoing Work

GELO’s (General Education Learning Outcomes)

This project first began in Fall 2008, driven by EO 1033 & the LEAP Initiative. GEC members have deliberated related issues at every meeting since the onset of this project. Further, the GEC Chair & Coordinator held a series of GE “Area meetings” throughout the year to further the work on this revision. A primary reason for this significant time commitment has been the work of Sharon Hamill to development of area GELO’s that will drive GE review and assessment as well as the development of related curriculum review and forms. The GEC has this year extended this work in the following ways:

- Further revision of the GE philosophy statement to reflect emphases on global studies/globalization; diversity, & interdisciplinarity (now in subcommittee)
- A related development is the work of Annette Daoud and Sharon Hamill, who joined with Patty Selesky to attend workshops on integrating our global initiative into our general education curriculum and pedagogy;
- Several open meetings were held with faculty to develop GELOs for diversity (now in GEC subcommittee for articulation)
- Articulation of GELOs for areas A1, A2, A3, B1, B2, B3, B4, C1, C2, C3. The GEC Chair and Coordinator held a series of meetings throughout the year with faculty from each area to finalize the development of GELOs in these areas.
- Refining the GE handbook to clearly describe GE philosophy, the requirements and SLOs for each area, required forms, and information on how the GEC would evaluate proposed courses.

Recommended tasks for next year’s GEC

The following are business items for the 2011-12 GEC.

- **Determine Diversity/Global Models**
Where shall we situate diversity in the GE curriculum and how shall diversity be defined and articulated, particularly with relation to emphases on global and interdisciplinarity? The committee is responding 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 as President Haynes requested last Spring following incidents of hate on campus. The committee this year reviewed a series of diversity models from various CSUs and agreed that we want to keep our infused (throughout the curriculum) approach, but also want to emphasize global and diversity in ways that concentrate student learning in this area (with in depth courses). Review of CSU models suggests such courses are generally interdisciplinary or found in humanities/social sciences. At GEC meetings and related forums we discussed varying dimensions of diversity and the need to determine and allow for differences in how these issues are approached (for example, between humanities and social sciences). A related task is the need to develop matrices that illustrate where we are meeting LEAP and CSUSM goals.
- **Area D GELOs**
Refinement of learning objectives for the social sciences will be an emphasis for Fall semester .
- **Articulation of Information Literacy/Area E**
The GEC affirmed a commitment to a broad articulation of information literacy throughout the general education curriculum, but also admitted many faculty members do not have a clear sense of the wide-ranging definitions/applications of information literacy. Library representatives will continue working with GEC to more clearly articulate information literacy and enumerate various articulations in the GE handbook. Area E has typically been the point of emphasis for this objective but the LEAP revision

suggests the need to further develop objectives for “personal & social responsibility” that ought to be articulated in this area.

LIBRARY & ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Report not yet submitted.

NOMINATIONS, ELECTIONS, APPOINTMENTS, & CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

Members: David Chien, At-large 10-12; Vassilis Dalakas, CoBA 10-12; Rosario Diaz-Greenberg, CoE 09-11; Pearl Ly, Library 10-12; Wayne Neu, At-large 09-11; Marie Thomas, CoAS 09-11

NEAC drafted amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws to:

- uncouple the Chair and Chair-elect roles so that the Chair and Vice-Chair are elected separately and can serve more than one term.
 - provide a mechanism for the removal of committee members and senators who fail to meet their obligations.
- These amendments were put to a vote during the spring elections, but too few faculty voted to make it a valid election.

NEAC suggested a change to the election rules and procedures that would allow associate professors without tenure to serve as chairs of standing committees (eligibility would be determined by rank, not tenure). This change will be voted on by senators at the May 2011 senate meeting.

For next year:

- Tasks related to restructuring: changes to constitution and by-laws and election rules and procedures
 - Lecturer seats on Academic Senate and standing committees: given the restructuring, it may be time to revisit
 - Shared governance: should there be explicit language in our governing documents?
 - Reopen poll for referenda proposed in spring 2011
 - Conduct poll in early fall for ASCSU constitutional amendment to add language in support of academic freedom
-

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Members: Donna Goyer, Faculty at Large; Olaf Hansen, CoAS; Toni Olivas, Library; Bruce Louis Rich, CoBA; Linda Shaw, Chair CoAS; Jennifer Jeffries, AVP-PAA; Gerardo Gonzalez, Graduate Studies and Research; Karen Irwin, Provost's Office; Marie Thomas, Learning Outcomes Assessment Faculty Fellow

Accomplishments This Year

PAC did considerable work this year to finalize the Program Review Policy and Guidelines for implementing program reviews. We asked the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for consideration and feedback on the draft Policy and Guidelines. We also distributed the draft Policy to faculty with experience with program review, as well as to the lead faculty from the four programs that piloted the draft policy, and revised the Policy based on their feedback. PAC brought the Program Review Policy to the Senate where it was passed in the spring 2011 semester.

PAC also considered and wrote letters in response to the following completed Program Reviews: Political Science (B.A.) and Women's Studies (B.A.). We also began our response to the Social Science Program Review and will complete our response to this program review in the fall 2011 semester.

PAC Agenda for AY 2011-2012

In the next academic year, PAC will complete its response to the Social Science program review and consider and respond to program reviews from: Liberal Studies (B.A.), Biological Sciences (B.S. and M.S.), Computer Science (B.S. and M.S.), and History (B.A. and M.A.). In addition, the Chair of PAC will participate in the MOU process for these programs, provide support for programs that are preparing their self studies in 2011-2012, and participate in orientation sessions for the lead faculty in programs that will undergo program review during the 2012-2013 academic year.

PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEE

For AY 2010/2011, the PTC consisted of the following faculty members: Soheila Jorjani (COBA), Janet McDaniel (COE), Jose Mendoza (COAS-MS), Patty Seleski (Chair, At-Large), Darci Strother (COASA/Hum), Marie Thomas (COAS-SS), Hua Yi (Library).

The committee reviewed 17 files during this year's cycle. Of these, 8 were requests for promotion to Full Professor. There was one (1) request for tenure only. There were 8 requests for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Only two of the requests for tenure and promotion were from faculty who were in their sixth year as Assistant Professors. Seven requests for promotion and/or tenure were from faculty who in their third (1), fourth (4), or fifth (2) year in rank as Assistant Professors.

As of March 14, 2011, all files had been reviewed and the committee's recommendations had been given to the candidates for promotion and/or tenure. The files will move on to the Provost for review and decision.

In the course of its work, the committee noted several issues which it wishes to bring to the attention of the Senate and to the Associate Vice-President for Academic Resources, otherwise known as the "Keeper of the Files". The three primary areas of concern are 1) digital WPAFs; 2) Solicited letters in candidate's files; 3) "Early" tenure and promotion.

I. Digital WPAFs

AY 2010/2011 saw the submission of the first, completely digital WPAF. The PTC had mixed reactions to using digital WPAFs. Everyone appreciated the convenience of being able to review files at their own computer either in their own offices or at home. This feature of using electronic WPAFs freed up more time for committee members to complete their file reviews because they did not have to come to the Provost's suite to consult files; instead, they could work late into the night or all weekend to finish their file reviews. From what we could tell, the WPAF functioned as well on Macs as on PCs.

At the same time, however, there were some issues with reviewing an electronic WPAF. Committee members found the functionality a bit clunky: cross-referencing files or going back to look at something was somewhat awkward. Those committee members who take notes on their computers reported that it was also awkward to keep switching back and forth between files or to use two computers (so that one's note file was always open). Not all committee members found it easy to read and digest complicated materials on a screen and wound up printing out materials (see below). One committee member with an older computer at home found the whole process of opening and closing files very slow. Several committee members remarked that the physical files were actually easier to use when you had access to them: the electronic WPAF was harder to use, but access to it was more convenient. If CSUSM were going to move to an all-electronic WPAF system, several things would have to be addressed beyond the question of convenience/access vs. ease of use. First, candidates for promotion and tenure would have to be trained to provide more descriptive headers for items so that reviewers could more easily find items in the file. Second, candidates should be cautioned not to submit any file or document that could be edited or changed; use of pdf files should be mandated. Third, some policy needs to be in place governing printing materials from electronic files. The PTC didn't believe that a ban on printing would be effective (or followed) but if Deans, PRC and PTC members are going to print material out, some guidance to ensure the confidentiality of the WPAF is going to have to be developed. This guidance should also include directions on keeping files on "open"

screens either in faculty offices or at home. In short, issues about file security and confidentiality still need to be thought through. Finally, since at some point the various committees (PRC or PTC) come together to discuss the file, some provision needs to be made to find a way of referring to an electronic file (checking on things, etc.) while in a group meeting. Huddling around a single computer screen doesn't seem a good solution and passing around a laptop or tablet is not as easy as passing around a file folder.

The PTC appreciated the opportunity to experiment with electronic WPAFs. We assume that the practice of submitting electronic WPAFs is likely to be encouraged. However, we are unanimous in thinking both that it is too early to require that all candidates for tenure and promotion use electronic WPAFs and that further use of electronic WPAFs will require additional thinking/guidance around issues of presentation and security.

II. Solicited letters in WPAFs

It is not uncommon for candidates for tenure and promotion to solicit letters from colleagues to document their contributions in teaching, service and scholarship/creative activity. Indeed, the use of such letters is an important way in which faculty can round out the picture of their work that they are presenting in the file.

However, the PTC noted instances in this year's files where candidates for tenure and promotion appear to have solicited letters from students as well as from colleagues both at CSUSM and externally which comment on and argue for the candidate's case for tenure and promotion. These letters provide the levels of review with evaluations of /recommendations about the candidate's "case" without any familiarity with the actual WPAF. Some candidates appear to have asked scores of students and colleagues for letters in support of their tenure and/or promotion.

The PTC wants to remind everyone involved in the promotion and tenure process that both the CBA and the CSUSM policy on tenure and promotion provide mechanisms for external review of a candidate's file. Soliciting colleagues (or worse, students) to provide letters of support for tenure and promotion is simply inappropriate. The PTC requests that Senators take this concern back to their constituencies and to keep it in mind when they are mentoring candidates for tenure and promotion.

In some cases, it was unclear if candidates for tenure and promotion had solicited a letter like this or if the faculty member providing the letter had decided on their own to write a letter supporting tenure and urging reviewers to vote in favor of granting tenure and promotion. In these cases, the faculty member undergoing review does not appear to have asked for a letter evaluating their case. The PTC would like to remind faculty that if they are asked to document a colleague's contribution to a project or to observe a class, they should respond by describing the contribution and evaluating its significance in the context of the activity. Unsolicited communications from students (e.g., emails, cards) are appropriate additions to the WPAF. However, letters should be solicited from former students only in rare cases, and should describe the faculty member's efforts on behalf of the student and should refrain from making a case for tenure/promotion. Solicited letters from current students are never appropriate.

III. "Early" Tenure

Seventy-seven per cent (77%) of the requests for tenure and/or promotion in the current cycle asked for consideration of the candidate's case prior to what is described in the both the CBA (13.3) and the CSUSM policy on tenure and promotion (I.C.23) as the "normal" period of 6 years. The PTC seeks better guidance from the Senate, colleges (particularly from COAS), departments and programs about how they regard requests for tenure and promotion that deviate from the norm. In particular the PTC is interested in how departments and programs evaluate sustained, high quality contributions in teaching and service that would merit the granting of tenure and promotion earlier than the sixth year.

This is no small issue. When more than three-quarters of all requests for tenure and/or promotion are made prior to the end of the normal probationary period, it is necessary to ask why. Although the PTC acknowledges that certain unusual factors may have been in play in AY 2010/2011 (e.g., the change of so many deans), we are nonetheless concerned by what could be seen as a culture of early tenure at CSUSM. We believe that a wider discussion and a more explicit articulation of the conditions under which tenure and promotion are awarded prior

to the end of the normal probationary period would greatly assist future PTCs in their work and would be of benefit to probationary faculty as well.

Related to the issue of “early” tenure are issues revolving around the award of service credit for previous employment. The PTC is aware that some deans have discouraged faculty from requesting service credit and have assured new faculty that it does not matter and that they can come up for tenure “anytime” after they start at CSUSM. The PTC would like to remind faculty that work done at a prior institution can only be counted in the tenure and promotion decision if a faculty member has received formal service credit for it; otherwise, the faculty member’s tenure clock is reset and it is assumed that they will serve the “normal” probationary period.

Absent some more explicit and definitive guidelines from the Senate, colleges, departments and programs about how issues related to deviations from the normal probationary period ought to be handled, the PTC can only apply policies and procedures as we believe them to be written, and we acknowledge, that given the current documents, that the PTC’s judgment may indeed vary from year to year depending on who sits on the PTC.

IV. Other issues

The PTC would like to report that, for the most part, faculty candidates for tenure and promotion adhere to the policies and procedures outlined in the university policy and in their college documents. There are still issues for some candidates around defining an “item” in reasonable ways. Some candidates still have problems writing a *reflective* narrative about their work and achievements that explains the journey to tenure and promotion and which explains (at least in part) the items included in the WPAF. In sum, however, these issues are individual ones that can be corrected by better mentoring and by attendance at tenure and promotion workshops. We hope that PRCs and other faculty mentors will work with probationary faculty closely in the years prior to tenure to ensure that their WPAFs reflect both adherence to policy and procedure and the faculty member’s best case for a positive tenure and promotion decision.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Voting Members:

Rong-Ji Chen (CoE); Vassilis Dalakas (CoBA); Ahmad Hadaegh (CoAS); Pearl Ly (Library); Ofer Meilich (Chair, at large); Paul Stuhr (at large);

Nonvoting Members:

Gregory Toya, Associate Dean of Students; Alicia Dagostino and Gabriella Pruitt (ASI); Ben Cherry (Faculty Athletic Liaison)

I. Recommended Tasks from academic year 2009-10 and brief progress notes

Review University Student Grade Appeal Policy	Revised, passed by Senate on 4/20/2011
Revise Student Grade Appeal Policy from College of Education (slightly different from the University Student Grade Appeal Policy)	Tabled; Taken back to CoE
Draft Resolution of Support for CUGR (ensure SAC representation in CUGR)	Drafted, passed by the Senate on 2/2/2011
Review Lottery Grant Suspension in light of funding to Campus in Fall 10	Provost: Still no funds.
Review Management of Course Records Policy	Revised, passed by Senate on 12/1/2010

II. Summary of Activity (in chronological order)

A. Review Lottery Grant Suspension in light of funding to Campus in Fall 10

The Provost has been contacted by SAC Chair regarding the grants. In short – there is no money for the grants. The lottery funds that were received (about \$470k) went to teacher recruitment (about \$75k) and COAS lab supplies (the balance). When and if state funds increase, the lottery grants would be directed to support grants, student workers, etc.

B. Resolution of Support for CUGR

Vassilis Dalakas volunteered and served on CUGR (Committee on Undergraduate Research) as SAC's representative this year. SAC drafted a resolution in support of CUGR, in consultation with CUGR. The resolution was passed by the Senate on 2/2/2011 and signed by the President.

C. SAC representation in the Intellectual property (IP) Task force

Pearl Ly volunteered and served on the IP task force this year as SAC representative this year. SAC has reviewed the draft IP policy, comments were provided to the task force through Pearl.

D. Review Management of Course Records Policy

This short but important policy was reviewed by SAC in the Fall semester. Changes incorporated for clarification and expansion of privacy protection to all graded material to ensure compliance with FERPA and with common practices and needs in the university. The policy was passed by the Senate on 12/1/2010 and was approved by the President on 2/3/2011.

Currently, SAC has been working on adapting this policy for electronic records. SAC investigated the issue and found that all electronic documents except those held by the course instructor are already covered by other entities in the university (ITTs backs up all Cougar Courses material, and Student Affairs / the Registrar office follows a detailed CSU-level records retention schedule. SAC is forwarding to the senate a minor revision of the policy that include instructions for keeping electronic document on a password-protected device. If the rules are not waived, the revision will return to the Senate the next academic year.

E. Revise Student Grade Appeal and Grievance Policy from College of Education

SAC was asked by COE to give feedback on this college-specific policy. It was determined that this policy is to be classified as a component of the informal process of the grade appeal / grievance policy. However, this COE policy appeared to be rather cumbersome, and combined what is a three separate university-level policies (grade appeal, grievance, and program disqualification appeal). SAC advised COE to use the existing university-level policies for grade appeals and grievance, and focus on program disqualification which is more specific to COE. These recommendations were communicated to COE for their consideration.

F. Review University Student Grade Appeal Policy

Last year's SAC (09-10) recommended this year's SAC members to revise the student Grade Appeal Policy. SAC worked extensively on this policy throughout the year. It was discovered that the Executive Order (EO) that was referred to in our existing policy (EO 792) was superseded in August 2009 by EO 1037. This newer OE stated that "procedures for dealing with allegations of improper procedure" must be provided. Yet, our current policy stated that "The [SGAC's] recommendations shall not be subject to appeal." Hence our current policy was in violation of EO 1037. Additionally, in the process of reviewing this policy, all the relevant/comparable policies in existence in the other CSU campuses were reviewed to identify best practices and appropriate ideas. The revised policy submitted to the Senate included the following changes: [1] bring it in line with EO1037 implemented 8/1/2009 that replaced EO792 (main change relates to the addition of campus procedures for dealing with allegations of improper procedure, in addition to minor typographical changes); [2] clarification of the authority of the Grade Appeals Committee when it finds in favor of the appealing student; [3] allowing (secure) electronic notifications, and specifying procedures for keeping electronic records; [4] allowing SGAC chair to facilitate the informal

appeal; [5] allowing a replacement of no more than two member of a consulting panel (see item VI.C.6.b in the policy); [6] addition of specific deadlines for completion of various tasks; and [7] provision of a general “clean-up” (removal of references to non-existent policies, guidelines, offices, and/or positions and replacing these with the appropriate ones; clarification of terms and language). The policy was passed by the Senate on 4/20/2011 and is now awaiting Presidential action.

G. 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:

- Jim Mickelson, Director of ACE Scholars Services was our guest presenter on 10/26/2010;
- Bridget Blanshan (Dean of Students), Darren Bush (AVP Enrollment Management Services), Rodger D'Andreas (ASI Executive Director), Hugo Lecomte (Director of Campus Recreation), Lorena Meza (AVP Student Academic Services) and Eloise Stiglitz (VP Student Affairs) on 12/14/2010;
- Hugo Lecomte, Director of Campus Recreation (2/8/2011);
- Pam Wells, Director of CSUSM Career Center (3/8/2011);
- Dr. Karen Nicholson, Director of Student Health and Counseling Services (3/29/2011);
- Darren Bush, AVP Enrollment Management Services (4/26/2011)
-

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

III. Recommended Tasks

Review Management of Course Records Policy – adapting the policy for electronic record (in case the current revision is not approved by the Senate this year).

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Voting Members: Eliza Bigham, Heidi Breuer, Judith Downie, Fang Fang (Chair), Rosemary Gaines, Michael Hughes, Brian Lawler and Ed Price

Non-Voting Members: David Barsky, Virginia Mann

Work completed in 2010/11: In the academic year 2010/11 the UCC reviewed P-Forms for 6 new programs, minors, options, or certificates. These are the Bachelor of Arts in Child and Adolescent Development (CoAS), Minor in Music Technology (CoAS), Minor in Video/Film Production (CoAS), Single Subject Preparation in History/Social Science (CoAS), Option in Business Administration (CoBA) and Single Subject/English Learner Authorization and Preliminary Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential (CoE). UCC also approved changes to the following programs: B.S. in Biotechnology (CoAS), Minor in Mathematics (CoAS), B.A. in Women’s Studies (CoAS), Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and/or Moderate/Server Disabilities Program (CoE), Concurrent Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Mild/Moderate and/or Moderate/Server Disabilities Program (CoE), Intern Partnership with Service Area School Districts for Preliminary Level I Education Specialist (CoE), Intern Partnership with Service Area School Districts for Preliminary Level I Education Specialist with Options (CoE), Intern Partnership with Service Area School Districts for Preliminary Level I Education Specialist (CoE), Master of Arts in Education: Option 3-Special Education Level I (CoE), International Baccalaureate Program (CoE) and Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Option (CoE and CoAS) and Master of Science in Nursing (SoN). We also reviewed and presented to the Senate 60 C-Forms, 77 C2-Forms and 2 D-Forms. In addition, UCC has participated in the university forecasting taskforce.

Continuing Work: The Academic Programs Office has requested UCC to review a new C-Form template. Feedback is provided back but the new C form will need to be finalized by the members of next year.

Continuing Members: Eliza Bigham, Heidi Breuer, Judith Downie, Rosemary Gaines, Michael Hughes, and Brian Lawler.

New Members: Sajith Jayasinghe and Yi Sun

Heidi Breuer and Yi Sun will serve as co-chairs for UCC in AY 2011-12. The meetings will be on Mondays from 11:00 – 12:30.

I 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.