

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING

Wednesday, March 6, 2013

1 – 2:50 p.m. (approx.)

Commons 206

- I. Approval of agenda
- II. Approval of minutes of February 6th meeting
- III. Chair's report: [Jackie Trischman](#)

Referrals to committees: APC Graduation Requirements policy revision
 FAC Library RTP policy revision
- IV. Secretary's report: [Janet McDaniel](#) *The following Senate item has been forwarded to the university administration:*

 FAC Lecturer Evaluation policy
- V. [President's](#) report: Karen Haynes *Unable to attend*
- VI. Interim [Provost's](#) report: Graham Oberem *Unable to attend*
- VII. [ASI](#) report: Cipriano Vargas
- VIII. [VPSA](#) report, Lorena Meza
- IX. [ASCSU](#) report: [Brodowsky/Meilich](#)
- X. [CFA report](#): [Garry Rolison](#)
- XI. [Standing Committee](#) reports: *written reports are attached*
- XII. Consent Calendar *Pending EC action. 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
- XIII. Action items *These are items scheduled for a vote, including second reading items.*

 SAC Student Course Grade Appeals policy revision (1st reading was in December)
- XIV. Discussion items *Pending EC action. These are items scheduled for discussion, including first reading items.*

 A. FAC Department Chair Selection policy & procedure (cnava@csusm.edu)
 B. FAC Faculty Awards policy revision (cnava@csusm.edu)
 C. GEC All-University Writing Requirement (acarr@csusm.edu; sgreenwo@csusm.edu)
- XV. Information item

 A. Summary of restructuring survey results
 B. PAC Recommendation letter concerning Nursing B.S. degree
- XVI. Senators' concerns and announcements

Next Senate meeting: April 10th

CONSENT CALENDAR

NEAC Recommendations

Committee	Seat & Term	Name(s)
Academic Senate	CHABSS, Spring '13	Cyrus Masroori
Academic Policy Committee	Faculty at large, Spring '13	Karina Miller
Academic Policy Committee	CoBA, 12-14	Chet Kumar
Faculty Affairs Committee	Lecturer, Spring '13	Elena Gonzales
General Education Committee	CHABSS, 12-14	Reuben Mekenye
Student Affairs Committee	Faculty at large, Spring '13	Miriam Schustack
Student Affairs Committee	CEHHS, 12-14	Erika Daniels
Student Affairs Committee	CHABSS, Spring '13	Zhiwei Xiao
University Curriculum Committee	CHABSS-SBS, Spring '13	Konane Martinez

.....

UCC Course & Program Change Proposals

SUBJ	No.	New No.	Course/Program Title	Form	Originator	Rec'd AP	To UCC	Action
EDSL	P-2		Comm. Sciences & Disorders Prep Certificate	P-2	S. Moineau	9/28/12	10/26/12	3/4/13
EDSL	350		Intro to Comm. Sciences & Disorders	C-2	S. Moineau	9/28/12	10/26/12	3/4/13
EDSL	201		Hearing Disorders and Measurement	C	S. Moineau	9/28/12	10/26/12	3/4/13
EDSL	360		Diagnostics in Speech-Language Pathology	C-2	S. Moineau	9/28/12	10/26/12	3/4/13
EDSL	551		Language Dev and Assess. For Practitioners	C-2	S. Moineau	9/28/12	10/26/12	3/4/13
EDSL	357		Science of Speech & Hearing	C	S. Moineau	9/28/12	10/26/12	3/4/13
EDSL	364		The Role of Cultural Diversity in Schooling	C	S. Moineau	9/28/12	10/26/12	3/4/13
EDUC	364		The Role of Cultural Diversity in Schooling	C-2	S. Moineau	9/28/12	10/26/12	3/4/13
EDSL	473		Adult Neurogenic Comm. Disorders	C	S. Moineau	9/28/12	10/26/12	3/4/13
GRMN	314		Topics in German Culture	C	M. Geiger	2/4/13	2/12/13	2/18/13
MASS	306	VSAR 317	Media Distribution	C-2	J. Berman	2/15/13	2/15/12	3/4/13
MASS	432	VSAR 432	Media Narrative	C-2	J. Berman	2/15/13	2/15/12	3/4/13
MASS	433	VSAR 433	Screenwriting	C-2	J. Berman	2/15/13	2/15/12	3/4/13
NURS	P-2		B.S. in Nursing, Traditional	P-2	P. Kohlbray	10/12/12	10/16/12	3/4/13
NURS	320		Nursing Care of Adults III	C-2	J. Daugherty	10/12/12	10/16/12	3/4/13
NURS	321		Nursing Care of Adults III Lab	C-2	J. Daugherty	10/12/12	10/16/12	3/4/13
NURS	445		Nursing Case Mgmt of Vulnerable Populations Lab	C-2	L. Axman	10/12/12	10/16/12	3/4/13
NURS	P-2		M.S. in Nursing	P-2	P. Kohlbray	10/31/12	11/5/12	3/4/13
NURS	512		Biostatistics for Advanced Nursing Practice	C-2	L. Axman	10/31/12	11/5/12	3/4/13
PHYS	357		Science of Speech & Hearing	C-2	S. Moineau	9/28/12	10/26/12	3/4/13
VSAR	123		Ways of Seeing: Intro to the History of Photography	C	A. Liss	11/20/12	11/28/12	2/18/13
WMST	345		Gender and Violence	C	S. Lutjens	11/20/12	11/28/12	2/18/13

SAC: Student Course Grade Appeals

Rationale: This policy/procedure was approved by the Senate and sent to the Provost last spring. The Provost inquired if students serving on Student Grade Appeals Committee (SGAC) ought to have some minimum qualifications as a means to ensure that students serving on the committee fully understood the nature of the committee's work and maturity to respect confidentiality. SAC worked with ASI students and staff to determine that requiring students serving on SGAC to: 1. have at least junior status and 2. have completed 30 units at CSUSM would be an effective set of minimum qualifications.

Since initial presentation at 12/5/12 Senate meeting, no comments/suggestions have been received.

The change to the policy/procedures is located in V. Membership A. Committee Structure. Changes are highlighted/underlined.

A. Committee Structure

Membership of the Student Grade Appeals Committee (SGAC) shall consist of:

- Three students (two undergraduate, one graduate) to be named under procedures established by the Associated Students Incorporated (ASI). Student members serving on this committee must be regular students in good standing, have at least junior status, and have a minimum of 30 units completed at CSUSM. Student alternates will be named as needed; see section V.E.
- Four faculty members and four faculty member alternates selected by the Academic Senate. All faculty members of the committee and all faculty alternates must hold tenured appointments.

The Chair shall be elected yearly from the faculty membership of the committee.

FAC: Department Chair Selection Policy & Procedure

Rationale: *In Spring 2012, the Academic Senate approved an interim policy to incorporate Lecturer faculty input in the department chair selection process, in compliance with Lecturer faculty rights as per the CBA. Some in Senate voiced concerns that lecturer input might contradict that of tenure-line faculty -- that in units with a large number of lecturer faculty, the tenure-line faculty might be "outvoted" by lecturer faculty. During the Fall 2012 semester, the FAC consulted with affected university units to ascertain the extent to which such concerns were borne out in the Spring 2012 Chair recommendation process.*

The FAC inquiry found no such instances – rather, in all of the department chair recommendation processes in CHABSS, CSM, and CoBA, there was only one nominee for each department chair opening, and in no case was there any disparity between tenure-line versus lecturer faculty recommendations regarding these uncontested nominations. FAC also found substantial variation in procedures used to tabulate votes, and strongly recommends that units confer to streamline the running of the recommendation process. FAC emphasizes the importance of maintaining confidentiality of the votes.

This process is an opportunity for individual, eligible faculty to nominate, recommend or not recommend faculty for department chair, and then have the (confidential) tabulated results inform the decision of the President or designee, who exercises sole authority to appoint department chairs per the CBA.

Definition: A procedure regarding the process for selecting recommendations for department chair.

Authority: President of the University.

Scope: Departments within Academic Affairs.

I. Policy on the Selection of Department Chairs

A. Eligibility

Any full-time probationary or tenured faculty member is eligible to serve as a department chair.

B. Nomination Process

1. Nominations shall be open for a minimum of one week.
2. Potential candidates may self-nominate or be nominated by Lecturer or tenure –track faculty in the department.
3. Permission shall be given by the nominee(s) before a name is placed on the ballot.
4. Nominations shall be collected by the Dean's office.

C. Eligible voters

1. All tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote for nominated candidates.
2. All Lecturer faculty with a minimum of 2 semesters of employment in the department are eligible to vote for nominated candidates.
3. In the academic year in which the nominating process occurs,: 1) tenure-track faculty shall have a full vote; 2) each lecturer faculty member's vote shall be proportionate to the entitlement time-base for contracted lecturer faculty and rounded to the nearest tenth.
4. Faculty with split appointments will be entitled to vote in both departments in accordance with C.1 to C.3 above.

55 II. Procedure for Selection of Department Chairs

56
57 A. Ballot Preparation and Recommendation Process

58 1. The voting shall take place during the last year of the incumbent's term.

59 2. The Dean's office shall prepare the electronic ballots.

60 3. The ballot shall contain the names of one or more nominees.

61 4. The Dean's office will oversee the voting.

62
63 B. Selection of candidate to be recommended

64 1. The Dean's office will prepare separate electronic ballots for tenure track faculty, with tenure-track
65 faculty entitled to a full vote, and lecturer faculty entitled to votes as defined in C above.

66 2. Ballots will have each nominee's name and instructions to select "Recommend," "Do Not
67 Recommend," or "Abstain" for each name.

68 3. The electronic voting period will be one week.

69 4. The Dean's office will count the ballots and report the tenure track and lecturer votes separately to the
70 Dean.

71 5. When selecting the chair, the President's designee will take into consideration the total
72 "Recommend" votes cast by the department.

FAC: Faculty Awards Policy revision

Rationale: FAC (1) eliminated all references to the Wang Award, and (2) extended the timelines based on recommendations of committee last year.

Procedure

The following defines the process used at Cal State San Marcos to recognize one of our faculty each year as the Harry E. Brakebill Outstanding Professor, ~~and to determine the Cal State San Marcos nominees for the CSU-wide Wang Family Excellence Awards.~~

Timetable

Spring: Call for candidates for the Faculty Awards Selection Committee. Committee selection shall be part of the Academic Senate election process.

First week April: Distribution of information on the Brakebill Awards, the timeline, and the nomination process by the Academic Senate office.

~~Last week April~~ **Third Week May:** Last day to nominate for the Brakebill Award. Nominations due in Academic Senate Office no later than the last day of the semester.

~~First~~ **Third week May:** Selection Committee shall have met and elected its chair. Name of the chair shall be forwarded to the Academic Senate Office no later than the last day of the semester.

~~Second~~ **First week May** **June:** Acceptance letters due in Academic Senate Office from Brakebill nominees.

Summer: Preparation of Brakebill dossiers.

~~First~~ **Third week September:** Dossiers due in Academic Senate office. Selection Committee starts its review process.

~~Last week September~~ **Second week October:** Recommendation for the Brakebill recipient due to the president.

~~First~~ **Second week October** **November:** President informs campus community of Brakebill recipient.

~~October:~~ Distribution of information on the Wang Award, the timeline, and the nomination process by the Academic Senate office.

~~Last week November:~~ Last day to nominate for Wang. Nominations due in Academic Senate Office.

~~First week December:~~ Acceptance letters due in Academic Senate Office from Wang nominees.

~~December:~~ Preparation of Wang dossiers.

~~First week Spring Semester:~~ Dossiers due in Academic Senate office. Selection Committee starts its review process.

~~First week February:~~ Recommendations for the Wang nominees due to the president.

~~Second week February:~~ President informs campus community of Wang nominees.

~~Third week February:~~ Wang dossiers submitted to Chancellor's Office.

~~(or date announced by Chancellor's Office)~~

I. FACULTY AWARDS SELECTION COMMITTEE

The Faculty Awards Committee shall recommend a Brakebill recipient ~~and four Wang nominees~~ to the president. The Academic Senate shall conduct elections for this committee during its Spring election. The committee shall consist of one faculty representative from each College/Library, one part-time faculty representative, one at-large member from former recipients of the Brakebill Award, one student (recommended by ASI), and an administrator recommended by the provost. Members of the committee may not nominate candidates for the award.

II. BRAKEBILL OUTSTANDING PROFESSOR AWARD

Although we recognize that there are many outstanding faculty members at Cal State San Marcos, each year we would like to honor one of our faculty to highlight exceptional accomplishments. This Award is given to faculty on the basis of outstanding contributions to their students, to their academic disciplines, and to their campus communities. The nominees are expected to have records of superlative teaching. Quality contributions in the areas of research, creative scholarship, and service to the campus and the community are also taken into consideration, but they shall not be a substitute for the basic requirement of

excellence in teaching. The evaluation of a nominee's file shall focus on the transmission of the university values to students through evidence of excellent teaching practices and the impact of his/her teaching in positioning the University as a learner-centered institution.

A. Who can be nominated?

All Unit 3 members are eligible to be nominated for the Brakebill Award by colleagues, students, former students, alumni, and/or staff. Nominees shall acknowledge their willingness to participate by sending an acceptance letter to the Academic Senate Office. Though former recipients of the award may accept nominations for the Wang Award, they are excluded from accepting a nomination for the Brakebill Award. Members of the Selection Committee may not accept nominations for either award.

B. How are faculty nominated?

The individual nominating a professor must formally submit a letter that substantiates the nomination to the Senate Office. This letter shall indicate how the nominator knows the nominee, a statement of his/her qualifications as an outstanding professor, and, if a student, courses he/she has taken from the nominee. The same individual(s) shall assist the nominee in obtaining the necessary letters of support. It is recognized that most faculty have excellent records at Cal State San Marcos. However, the record of outstanding performance is often not well documented by the faculty members themselves. It is awkward for a faculty member to solicit such documentation on his/her own behalf. It is important that others in the campus community assist nominees in the development of a dossier that accurately represents the individual's performance and impact in teaching as well as the other areas of consideration. Individuals who are invited to submit letters of support should be aware that the dossier is open to the nominee who prepares it.

C. What are the criteria on which nominees will be judged?

The evaluation of a nominee's file shall focus on the evidence of excellent teaching practices and the impact of his/her teaching in positioning the University as a learner-centered institution. The committee shall make its recommendation based solely on the materials submitted. The file shall contain written statements from students (current and former), from faculty, and/or from members of the community which evidence excellence in teaching. A nominee's contributions to his/her academic discipline and the campus community shall be evaluated to ascertain their quality and the contribution of these activities to the nominee's teaching.

The file shall be collected in a small binder and organized according to the following:

1. Nomination letter
2. Complete curriculum vitae
3. Written statements of support (each should identify the writer and describe the type of evidence used as a basis for judgment):
 - a. Up to 5 statements from colleagues, administrators, and/or community members
 - b. Up to 10 statements from present and former students
4. Five pages (single-spaced, single-sided) of narrative of teaching philosophy, research activity and achievements as member of the campus and broader communities.
5. Evidence of achievements as a teacher: One to four course packets that include syllabus, lesson plans, student evaluations with comment sheets, 1-2 other items of the nominee's choice.
6. Evidence of achievements as a member of the profession (e.g., publications, funded grant proposals, research awards): One to three items.
7. Evidence of achievements as a member of the campus and the broader communities (e.g., service awards, products of services provided): One to three items.

101
102 *D. How is the Award announced?*

103 The Academic Senate Chair shall prepare a letter of recognition to all nominees congratulating them on
104 their nominations. Nominees who accept nominations and submit their files for review shall be publicly
105 recognized on campus through Academic Senate minutes. The president or his/her designee shall notify
106 the selected Brakebill recipient and shall then announce his/her name to the campus community.

107
108 *E. How is the Brakebill award recipient honored?*

109 The University shall provide funds to allow a substantial award and meaningful recognition in honor of
110 the Brakebill award recipient.

111
112 **III. CSU WANG FAMILY EXCELLENCE AWARD**

113 ~~The CSU Wang Family Award has been instituted to recognize faculty from across the CSU system who~~
114 ~~have distinguished themselves by making exemplary contributions in their academic disciplines and by~~
115 ~~having a discernable impact on their students. Four faculty members will be honored by the CSU each~~
116 ~~year, with each honoree receiving a substantial cash award. A nominee is a faculty member who is~~
117 ~~making multi-faceted contributions to the learning community through such activities as publishing,~~
118 ~~including students in his/her research, by being involved in community service, or by recruiting students.~~
119 ~~Successful nominees are those who go well beyond what is expected for their job responsibilities and~~
120 ~~performance.~~

121 *A. Who can be nominated?*

122 ~~All Cal State San Marcos probationary and tenured faculty members who have participated successfully~~
123 ~~in a campus peer review process within the last two years are eligible for nomination for the Wang~~
124 ~~Award. Each year, Cal State San Marcos may nominate one faculty member from each of the following~~
125 ~~divisions:~~

126 ~~Visual and Performing Arts and Letters~~

127 ~~Natural Sciences, Mathematical and Computer Sciences, and Engineering; Social and Behavioral~~
128 ~~Sciences and Public Services; and Education, Professional, and Applied Sciences Fields.~~

129 ~~The disciplines subsumed under each of the categories are included in the Appendix to this policy.~~

130 *B. How can faculty be nominated?*

131 ~~Nominations for the Wang Award may be made by faculty, academic administrators, alumni, and/or~~
132 ~~students, and may be done by email or hard copy to the Senate Office. This letter shall indicate how the~~
133 ~~nominator knows the nominee, a statement of his/her qualifications as an outstanding professor, and, if a~~
134 ~~student, courses he/she has taken from the nominee.~~

135 *C. What are the criteria on which nominees will be judged?*

136 ~~Wang Award recipients shall be faculty who have distinguished themselves by exemplary contributions~~
137 ~~and achievements in their academic disciplines and areas of assignment. The achievements must advance~~
138 ~~the mission of the University, bring benefit and credit to the CSU, and contribute to the enhancement of~~
139 ~~the CSU's excellence in teaching, learning, research, scholarly pursuits, student support, and community~~
140 ~~contributions.~~

141 ~~Dossiers for the Wang Award are limited to a curriculum vitae and a five page (single-spaced, single-~~
142 ~~sided) narrative.~~

143 ~~The president shall provide to the Chancellor's Office a separate cover letter for each Wang nominee; this~~
144 ~~letter may be up to two pages in length.~~

145 **Appendix: Wang Award Divisions**

146 **Visual and Performing Arts and Letters**

- 147 ●—Art, Music, Theatre Arts, Dance
- 148 ●—Foreign Languages
- 149 ●—English, Comparative Literature
- 150 ●—Classics
- 151 ●—Humanities
- 152 ●—Linguistics, Speech Communication

- 153 ●—Philosophy
- 154 **Natural Sciences, Mathematical and Computer Sciences and Engineering**
- 155 ●—Biology, Biochemistry, Ecology, Microbiology, Genetics, Toxicology
- 156 ●—Chemistry, Physics, Astronomy, Geology, Earth Science, Meteorology, Oceanography
- 157 ●—Mathematics, Statistics
- 158 ●—Computer Science, Information Systems
- 159 ●—All forms of Engineering
- 160 ●—Environment Science
- 161 **Social and Behavior Sciences and Public Service**
- 162 ●—Psychology, Human Development
- 163 ●—Public Administration, Recreation Administration
- 164 ●—Social Work, Gerontology
- 165 ●—Deaf Studies
- 166 ●—Criminal Justice/Criminology
- 167 ●—Fire Protection Administration
- 168 ●—Anthropology, Archeology
- 169 ●—Economics
- 170 ●—History
- 171 ●—Geography
- 172 ●—Political Science, International Relations
- 173 ●—Sociology
- 174 ●—Ethnic Studies (including Asian American Studies, African American Studies, Native American
- 175 Studies, Mexican American/Chicano/Latino Studies)
- 176 ●—Urban Studies
- 177 ●—Labor Studies
- 178 ●—Cultural Resources Management
- 179 ●—Area Studies (including American Studies, Asian Studies, European Studies, etc.), Women Studies
- 180 **Education and Professional and Applied Sciences**
- 181 ●—Professional Preparation of Teachers, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational
- 182 Leadership/Administration, Special Ed.
- 183 ●—Speech Pathology and Audiology/Communicative Disorders
- 184 ●—Library and Information Science
- 185 ●—Counseling
- 186 ●—Kinesiology/Physical Education
- 187 ●—Industrial Arts, Industrial Technology
- 188 ●—Agriculture, Agronomy, Soil Science, Animal Science, Horticulture
- 189 ●—Dietetics/Nutritional Science, Forestry, Natural Resources Management, Architecture,
- 190 ●—Environmental Design, Interior Design, Landscape Architecture,
- 191 ●—Urban/Rural/Regional, Planning,
- 192 ●—Business (incl. Accounting, Marketing, Management, Finance, Hospitality Management, Human
- 193 Resources Management, etc.)
- 194 ●—Public Relations, Journalism, Mass Communications, Radio-TV Film, Advertising
- 195 ●—Health Science, Nursing, Health Care Management, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy,
- 196 Public Health, Genetic Counseling, Biomedical Clinical Science, Radiological Health Physics
- 197 ●—Family and Consumer Sciences, Child Development, Apparel Merchandising and Management
- 198 ●—Marine Transportation

GEC: All-University Writing Requirement

Rationale: *This is a new policy that reflects the current practice of the all-university writing requirement. Using the catalog language as the basis, the policy allows for a pro-rated requirement depending on the units in the course.*

Definition: This policy outlines the pro-rated all-university graduation requirement for writing.

Authority:

Scope: Undergraduate students

All CSU students must demonstrate competency in writing skills as a requirement for graduation. At Cal State San Marcos, students complete the graduation writing assessment through the All-University Writing Requirement. This requirement mandates that every course at the University must have a writing component, of at least 2,500 words (approximately 10 pages). The All-University Writing Requirement which can be achieved in a variety of ways, depending on the course. The writing requirement for individual students will vary by course units, as follows:

3 units and up = 2,500 words (approximately 10 pages)

2 units = 1,700 words

1 unit = 850 words

Thus, each student will write a minimum of 850 words for a 1 unit course, a minimum of 1,700 words for a 2 unit course, or a minimum of 2,500 words for courses of 3 units or more.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

APC:

APC presented a revised version of the Maximum Units during Inter-session policy to EC. The revision tried to balance issues involving the time available in the academic calendar with good pedagogical practices for both online/hybrid courses and face-to-face courses. APC is currently addressing several questions raised by EC. The committee is also working on:

1. Credit by Challenge Examination policy (revision)
 2. Academic Calendars after 2013-14
-

BLP:

P-form Reviews: We are reviewing several P-forms: a proposed Master's in Social Work (MSW), a Master of Public Health (MPH), a certificate for Global Teacher Studies & Preparation, a post-MSN certificate in Palliative Care, and an M.S. in Kinesiology. All are from CEHHS. Our upcoming P-form reports to the Senate will, when relevant, include explicit discussions of space.

Space Concerns: BLP's review of pending P-forms has raised questions about the availability of office and instructional space to support so many new programs while accommodating existing programs that may be poised for growth now or in the near future. BLP recently submitted a formal request to the Provost for a clear explanation of the space implications of pending programs as well as a clearer explanation of how space is being allocated across campus.

In responding to concerns about the recent allocations of space within University Hall as well as more general concerns about space allocations, the administration has created a new web page to track space requests. All formal space requests can now be found at <http://www-dev.csusm.edu/universityspace/log.html>. Also, Interim Provost Oberem is currently establishing a formal process for considering space requests within Academic Affairs. He will be launching an advisory task force that will review space requests submitted within Academic Affairs, which will provide input directly to the Provost regarding which proposals should in fact be submitted for review by the President. Interim Provost Oberem is currently developing and requesting input on the possible composition of such a task force. BLP anticipates being directly represented on that task force. We look forward to hearing more from Dr. Oberem about this project.

Review of Three-Year Rolling Plans in Academic Affairs: Last Fall, all units reporting to the Provost submitted proposals for 3-year rolling strategic plans and budget projections that laid out possible new programs, positions, equipment purchases, etc. BLP met with AALC in November and December to provide feedback on these proposals. Interim Provost Oberem will be reporting back to the Senate's Executive Committee this month regarding the status of these plans and the anticipated growth in the AA budget in light of the campus's increased FTES target.

Regarding University Budget Committee (UBC): BLP's chair sits on UBC, which is now meeting regularly again after a lengthy period of inactivity. President Haynes' March 1 memo to the campus stated that UBC will be asked to review requests for additional funding that may come to CSUSM as a result of next year's FTES target increase.

FAC:

First Readings Agendized for Academic Senate 3/6/13:

- Department Chair Selection
- Faculty Award (Brakebill)

Business that Will Be Ready for Senate 4/10

- SSPAR RTP (FAC approved 3/4/13)

Plan to Have Ready for Senate 4/24

- Library RTP
- University RTP Document updates

Other FAC Business:

- Working on all-electronic student evaluations of teaching; IPA planning to run pilots in summer and fall
-

GEC:

The GEC has sent out an memorandum to department chairs and program directors across the university asking them and their faculty to offer comments on draft learning outcomes for the three areas of Upper-Division General Education (BB, CC, and DD). The GEC has organized meetings for each area where members of the GEC will meet with faculty to discuss the feedback received from departments and any revisions of the draft learning outcomes based on this feedback. The meetings are scheduled as follows: BB – March 14 (MARK 201), CC – March 21 (MARK 201), DD – March 21 (MARK 210).

The GEC has sent forward a revised All-University Writing Requirement to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

The GEC is currently discussing resolution AS 3020 from the CSU Academic Senate which supports “a minimum grade of C (2.0) in the ‘Golden Four’ CSU General Education areas (Written Communication/English Composition, Mathematical Concepts/Quantitative Reasoning, Oral Communication, and Critical Thinking) for both native and transfer students,” and recommends that CSU campuses consider raising their minimum grade to a C (2.0) in the “Golden Four” general education areas. The GEC is debating the potential pros and cons of raising the minimum grade for these four areas of lower-division general education and will make a recommendation to the Academic Senate.

LATAC: Not yet submitted.

NEAC:

NEAC issued a fourth call on committee vacancies, which was moderately successful in terms of response. The biggest need was for SAC, which had multiple vacancies, making it hard for the committee to operate. All vacancies in SAC are now filled. Of the remaining vacancies (which will be announced in an upcoming fifth call for the year) the biggest need is for vacancies in the GEC and a rep from CEHHS for FAC. Senators are urged to look at the calls and consider volunteering for vacant seats or nudge other colleagues to do so.

PAC:

PAC has completed its response to the School of Nursing Program Review, and the MOU meeting will be held on March 11th. The PAC is now working on its response to the Sociology Program Review.

SAC:

SAC is focusing efforts on creating a online form for faculty and students on order to fulfill the requirements of the EO regarding field trips and internships. We will tackle internships next. We anticipate making use of the approach we are using for field trips, but since internships award credit, it will be more complex.

SAC will also submit a written report to EC on March 20 regarding how student athletes are advised when they are a few credits short if eligibility.

UCC:

Work completed Since December 2012: After careful review and extensive discussion with the originators and among UCC members, UCC approved The Master of Social Work (MSW) Program with 21 new courses, Comm. Sciences & Disorders Prep Certificate P-2 form with 3 new courses and 5 C-2 forms, B.S. in Nursing P-2 form with 3 C-2 forms, M.S. in Nursing P-2 form with 1 C-2 form. In addition, UCC approved 7 other new courses and 4 C-2 forms.

Continuing Work: UCC will continue the review of the new C form template. UCC is currently working with the originators regarding VSAR 301, Master of Public Health to address UCC's concerns.

**Survey on Academic Affairs Restructure
February 2013**

Note: Some responses addressed multiple themes; each theme was counted separately. There is judgment involved in deciding how to categorize the responses. Not all responses are represented in the tables, only those with the greatest frequency. Response categories are listed in descending order of frequency.

Total respondents for the survey: Faculty (F) = 97; Staff (S) = 28

Question 1: Please list up to three positive results that have come from the restructure of Academic Affairs since Fall 2011.

Respondents for this question: Faculty = 89; Staff = 23

No positive outcomes	(F) 29 (S) 3
COAS too large; Redistributed into 2+ colleges	(F) 18 (S) 3
New leaders	(F) 14 (S) 0
Opportunities with new colleagues/collaboration	(F) 10 (S) 3
New identity/vision/governance	(F) 9 (S) 2
Left blank	(F) 3 (S) 3
Better use of resources, clearer budget	(F) 5 (S) 0

Summary

The most common responses to the request for positives were “None,” “Can’t think of any,” etc. Across colleges, there was some agreement that COAS was too big and needed some sort of division. New structures for sharing interests and vision were also appreciated. Some CHABSS and CSM responses noted benefits resulting from a more focused college, and some CEHHS responses noted the potential for collaboration with new colleagues across disciplinary lines. However, many responses were quite negative, even though the question asked for positives. When compared to the responses for “Negative Results” and “Process,” the responses were relatively short in length.

Question 2: Please list up to three problems that have come from the restructure of Academic Affairs since Fall 2011. If you have suggestions for remedies, please include these in your response.

Respondents for this question: Faculty = 83; Staff = 26

	Total
Increases in cost of administration with little or no tangible benefits seen by faculty and staff; No benefit seen for students	(F) 33 (S) 3
Lack of or Poor Leadership in some colleges; No sense of shared governance; No effort to build collegiality/ synergy; No attention to administrative needs while micromanaging departmental decisions at the same time	(F) 29 (S) 3
CEHHS is not a cohesive college; Departments do not share similarities as in other colleges; Groups within the college or from the colleges are being pitted against one another	(F) 20 (S) 0
Separation between colleges has grown and collaboration is now difficult	(F) 17 (S) 0
Blame or perception that problems are a result of behavior of colleagues or resources being given to other programs/colleges	(F) 15 (S) 1
None; I don't know; Unsure; N/A	(F) 6 (S) 8
Workloads have increased or are now distributed in any uneven manner as a result of the restructure; Need desk audits for staff	(F) 8 (S) 3
Faculty are demoralized, retiring, disengaging, and even getting sick or leaving due to problems from the restructure	(F) 9 (S) 2
Left blank	(F) 8 (S) 1

Summary

The most common responses to the request for negatives were that significantly more money is being spent on administration while no tangible benefits and many tangible negatives are seen. There was a sense that even the benefits that should have resulted are not being seen because of new leadership in some of the colleges. Faculty from across all colleges felt that the grouping of programs in CEHHS was not cohesive. It was a common comment that collaboration is more difficult as a result of the restructure. Other negatives that were not as common, but with responses across colleges, were that both faculty and staff workloads have increased as a direct result of the restructure and that faculty are demoralized. It is interesting that the Library and COBA faculty did not notice many negative impacts on them directly, but they did note that faculty from other colleges were more demoralized than they had seen them before.

Question 3: Please comment on the process used to design the restructuring during AY 2010/11, including positives, negatives, and suggestions for improvement. (Your feedback on the process can help guide a possible renewed attempt by the Academic Senate to develop policy/procedures for Academic Affairs restructuring.)

Respondents for this question: Faculty = 69; Staff = 10

	Totals
Process was top down, a done deal, and forced on the campus	(F) 35 (S) 2
Feedback was sought and then ignored; There was no real interest in the feedback given	(F) 26 (S) 1
Left blank	(F) 17 (S) 7
Lack of shared governance for the process	(F) 15 (S) 0
Don't know; N/A; No opinion; No comment	(F) 4 (S) 9
Faculty voice needed more voice and weight	(F) 8 (S) 2
There was no campus policy for conducting a restructure	(F) 8 (S) 1
Lack of transparency	(F) 4 (S) 0
Process was fine	(F) 2 (S) 1

Summary

Overwhelmingly, faculty respondents felt disenfranchised by the process used in AY 10-11 to restructure Academic Affairs. A large majority of respondents think the process was top down, bypassed shared governance, and ignored feedback. Several respondents (mostly outside of the most-affected colleges) responded that they had no opinion or did not know enough about the process to comment. Two faculty members and one staff member thought that the process worked well.



California State University SAN MARCOS

Academic Senate California State University San Marcos 333 S. Twin Oaks Valley Road San Marcos, CA
92096-0001

Tel: 760.750.4058 senate@csusm.edu www2.csusm.edu/academic_senate

Date: February 18, 2013

To: Denise Boren, Ph.D., R.N.
Director, School of Nursing

Pamela Kohlbry, Ph.D., R.N., C.N.L.
Program Review Lead, School of Nursing

From: Linda Shaw, Ph.D. *Linda P. Shaw*
Chair, Program Assessment Committee

For the Program Assessment Committee: David Barsky, Gerardo Gonzalez, Karen Irwin, Moses Ochanji, Toni Olivas, Jeff Nessler, Michelle Ramos Pellicia, Caitalin Ratiu, and Jill Weigt

Subject: School of Nursing, B.S. Degree Program Review

The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) has reviewed the Program Review documents for the School of Nursing (SoN) B.S. program. In what follows, PAC summarizes findings from the SoN Self-study Report, the external reviewers (accreditation teams), the Library Dean, the Dean of IITS, and the Dean of the College of Education, Health, and Human Services. Based on its review, PAC also offers recommendations for consideration by the SoN faculty and those who will participate in the MOU process.

I. Achieving Educational Outcomes

A. SoN Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

The SoN program SLOs are based on standards that corresponds to five core Nursing roles developed by the American Association of Colleges of Nursing, *Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice*. These SLOs reflect the University's mission through: commitment to serving a diverse community; development of technical expertise; engagement in learning through evidence-based practice; and a rich and diverse array of collaborative community partnerships that include hospitals, community agencies, schools, prisons/jails, and area colleges. Program SLOs provide the basis for course-level SLOs, and their integration throughout the curriculum is reflected in the program's SLO matrix that highlights where SLOs are introduced, developed, and mastered. Sequencing promotes building

The California State University

Bakersfield | Channel Islands | Chico | Dominguez Hills | East Bay | Fresno | Fullerton | Humboldt | Long Beach | Los Angeles |
Maritime Academy
Monterey Bay | Northridge | Pomona | Sacramento | San Bernardino | San Diego | San Francisco | San Jose | San Luis Obispo | San

knowledge and clinical experiences from the foundational courses to the more complex critical care courses and provides the basis for assessing student mastery of SLOs as they move through the program.

B. Annual Assessment Activities

AY 2005-2006: No Annual Assessment Plan; Annual Assessment Report
AY 2006-2007: No Annual Assessment Plan; No Annual Assessment Report
AY 2007-2008: Annual Assessment Plan; No Annual Assessment Report
AY 2008-2009: No Annual Assessment Plan; No Annual Assessment Report
AY 2009-2010: NA (furlough year)
AY 2010-2011: Annual Assessment Plan; Annual Assessment Report

Rather than use of the University's annual assessment process to collect data that measure student mastery of one or two SLOs, the SoN has developed the following measures of SLO mastery that take into account requirements of its accrediting bodies—the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) and the Board of Registered Nurses (BRN):

1. Formative assessment: Mastery of course-level SLOs is assessed through successful completion of the following courses: NURS 320/321: Adult Health III and the lab (BSN students) and NURS 324/325: Medical-surgical Nursing III and the lab (ABSN students). **Successful completion of these courses is used as the indicator** that BSN and ABSN students have mastered basic practice-level SLOs. RN-BSN students are expected to enter the program with this level of SLO mastery;
2. Summative assessment: SLO mastery is reflected in evaluation of performance expected of Baccalaureate graduate nurses using Level I and Level II assessment tools consisting of **faculty evaluation of student performance** and their **successful completion of courses**: NURS 440/445 and NURS 450/451; and
3. The SoN has expanded its SLO assessment tools to include:
 - 2005-2006: **Board of Registered Nurses pass rates, theory/clinical course pass rates, course evaluations, and evaluations of clinical courses**;
 - 2009-2010: **ATI scores, student satisfaction, and satisfaction of the end of program survey**; and
 - 2010-2011: **satisfaction with the program six months after graduation and employer satisfaction** with program graduates.

C. The SoN Self Study reports the following results of these assessment activities:

1. Attrition rates are low: 1% or less for the period 2006-2011;
2. Pass rates for the NCLEX are high: 2009: 95.35%; 2010: 80.65%; 2011: 90%;

3. Employer satisfaction is high: 75% extremely satisfied; 25% very satisfied;
4. Course pass rates are high: 97-98% pass rate;
5. Course evaluations are consistently excellent: from fall 2006-spring 2011 between 4-5 on a 5-point scale;
6. Graduate satisfaction is high: highest ratings for hands-on instruction in skills lab, variety of clinical content, availability of courses, specialized facilities such as the simulation center, mutual respect between students, faculty, and staff, and use of simulation; lowest ratings for: disorganization due to newness of the program, technical problems with distance learning and Moodle, flexibility of the program to meet individual needs, and availability and usefulness of open lab;
7. Faculty and Student Evaluations of Clinical Facilities are consistently excellent: between 4.0-5.0 on a 5-point scale;
8. Level I and II Student assessments: Level I: 99% of ABSN and BSN students rated 3 or higher on a 5 point scale; Level II: 100% of ABSN and BSN students rated 3 or higher on a 5-point scale;
9. Simulation experiences very helpful: over 86% of students felt that this experience helped them master learner outcomes, that instructors were supportive, debriefing was constructive, they learned from their peers, and they felt confident they would perform at a high level if the scenario happened in real life;
10. ATI scores (used to predict success on the NCLEX) above the national mean: BSN and ABSN have scored above the national mean since use of the ATI at the beginning of the program;
11. BSN and ABSN students, regardless of location, are equally successful in Level I and Level II Outcomes, ATI scoring, and NCLEX pass rates;
12. Student and post-graduate satisfaction regarding nursing competencies have been positive; and
13. Students praise positive relationships with faculty and depth of the educational program.

D. Changes to the SoN B.S. Program in Response to Its Assessment Process

1. **Curricular changes:** The curriculum has been reviewed at least every three years by specialty task groups and the program curriculum committee since the program's establishment in 2006. The following curricular changes have been made based on student feedback from surveys, course evaluations, NCLEX and ATI data, Level I and II faculty evaluations, agency and employer evaluations, and review of BRN and CCNE requirements:

- Pre-nursing core changes for the BSN:
 - Added HD 101 to replace PSYCH 210 and SOC 204 to provide a broad foundation for educating nurses on human development across the lifespan; eliminated Soc. 303: Families and Intimate Relations and added NURS 480: Family Nursing which is more closely aligned to student need in caring for families;

- Added introductory pharmacology to complement fundamentals of nursing courses and to assist in understanding the administration of medications to patients in clinical courses;
- Changes to the Accelerated BSN:
 - Separated the combined maternal child courses to provide alignment with the BSN program requirements and to achieve comprehensive coverage in these areas.
- Course—level changes:
 - Technology: Improved use of technology in the classroom and clinical settings (e.g., online exams, increased use of simulation);
 - Performance plan for student deficiencies: Designed to identify limitations in clinical behaviors and provide remediation needs to enable students to accept responsibility for their developing nursing actions;
 - Course assignments: Journal assignments in courses that require students to examine their personal thoughts, reactions, and feelings to interactions with patients, families, and staff;
 - Evaluation: Traditional testing of individual skills replaced by cluster testing in fundamentals and medical-surgical courses; and
 - A grid added to pre-lab medical-surgical course simulations that explains the role of primary care and charge nurses.
- Administrative changes:
 - Monthly meetings between Extended Learning and the SoN to discuss processes and pass along student feedback;
 - Added staff to assist with clinical placements and program evaluation;
 - Added ITTS technical support for the Temecula site to deal with technical problems;
 - Added skills lab assistant for campus and Temecula sites with greater open lab access; and
 - Developed policy for assignment of clinical placements.

Additional School of Nursing B.S. Program Strengths and Accomplishments in Support of Achieving Educational Outcomes

- A. The **Program Self Study** noted the following additional SoN strengths and program accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:
1. Program Vision Statement that is aligned with University and SoN Mission Statements with regard to: 1) collaboration between faculty and students in the teaching and learning process; 2) strong foundation in liberal arts and sciences and preparation for

interaction with a culturally diverse regional community; and 3) establishment of partnerships based on community needs. Themes that are consistent with the University Mission Statement include: 1) preparation of students in specialized programs of study that are consistent with community needs; 2) respect for and attention to diversity; 3) active involvement in community service; and 4) a strong foundation in liberal arts.

2. Unique activities of the BSN program include: completing a research project; presenting a leadership change project to the community; literature reviews and application of research to care planning; and providing nursing care to the community in public health agencies, community clinics, school districts, faith-based programs, free clinics, and global communities;
3. Community-oriented curriculum is highly valued by agencies that are eager to hire graduates of the program;
4. Wide ranging campus-wide contributions such as campus programs, events, collaborative international work; faculty contribute to student and faculty research symposia as well as College and University-wide committees;
5. Professional development that includes self-assessment of personal values, ethics, capabilities, and limitations;
6. Curriculum with degrees designed to meet the needs of students with varied backgrounds in nursing: BSN for students with no nursing background or Bachelor's degree; Accelerated BSN for students with a Bachelor's degree in another field; and LVN-BSN and RN-BSN degrees for LVNs and RNs who wish a B.S. degree in nursing;
7. Curriculum designed to increase student access through delivery in diverse formats and locations, e.g., state (BSN, LVN-BSN) and self support in Temecula (RN-BSN and Accelerated BSN) as well as in class (BSN, LVN-BSN) and online (Accelerated BSN) formats;
8. Coherent curriculum with Orem's model for nursing care and the nursing process applied in all courses and clinical labs which are for person, environment, health nursing, and nursing education;
9. Dedication to health promotion and disease prevention throughout the curriculum as well as the inclusion of courses—NURS 370: Health Promotion and Patient Strategies and NURS 442: Case Management of Vulnerable Populations—that are unique features of the program; and
10. Core themes integrated throughout the program, including: theory and clinical courses that focus on the nursing process, technical skills, evidence-based practice and nursing roles within the health-care team as well as caring for patients with diverse cultural backgrounds;

B. The **external reviewers** (CCNE and BRN review teams) noted the following program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. Preparation for accreditation by the CCNE began in 2006, and CCNE accreditation was achieved in 2009 for five years, the maximum review interval for new programs, with no recommendations for improvement;
2. The BRN review of the BSN/ABSN programs found the program to be of high quality and “one of the best in the state.” In granting the maximum review interval of eight years, the BRN concluded that the SoN program offers a “well-constructed, prepared and conducted program” of pre-licensure nursing education. The BRN report noted the following program strengths:
 - Program is in compliance with BRN curriculum, preceptorship, unit requirements, and licensing examination pass rate standards; added a pharmacology course in 1st semester and increased content of existing Pathophysiology and Pharmacology of Nursing Practice course in response to student and faculty feedback;
 - Re-sequenced pediatrics and obstetrics courses to allow greater access to clinical facility placements;
 - International community health experiences as elective opportunities and work to establish similar experiences in the local community;
 - Summer internships for students offer highly valued experiences;
 - Simulation is used in a well-informed manner and faculty have high levels of certification in this area;
 - Positive community partnerships and working to develop a partnership with Donovan Prison for online VN to BSN program;
 - NCLEX pass rates for first-time test taker pass rates 80% and above;
 - Graduates are well-respected by area’s clinical facilities; high post-grad employment rates (almost 75% within first 6 months and 100% within one year);
 - Retention: Low attrition rates;
 - Assessments: In compliance with BRN program evaluation requirements;
 - Written exams, observation, and lab practicums are used for student evaluation with clinical performance evaluation tool elements that are aligned with course objectives;
 - Strong, collaborative leadership and faculty who operate with strong sense of teamwork, ownership, and review of curriculum;
 - Director and Assistant Director who meet BRN qualifications; and
 - Students who are committed to contributing to program improvement and felt their input regarding program delivery and curriculum was attended to and acted upon.

C. The **Dean of the College of Education, Health, and Human Services** noted the following program strengths and accomplishments in support of achieving educational outcomes:

1. Program that is innovative and responsive to students and the community;
2. Graduates who are well respected by area clinical leaders;

3. Graduates are 75% employed within six months of graduation and 100% employed within 12 months;
4. Strong leadership, teamwork, and creativity are keys to the program's success;
5. Strong relations with clinical partners; and
6. Simulation provides central component of hands-on approach to nursing preparation.

School of Nursing B.S. Program Challenges to Achieving Educational Outcomes

A. **External Reviewers** cited the following challenges to achieving educational outcomes:

1. The BSN noted these areas of needed improvements:

- More consistent data collection and analysis, identification of areas needing improvement, and development of a plan for continuous improvement; and
- Limitations placed on students regarding the clinical skills that can be practiced.

2. Changes to the SoN Program in Response to the BSN Accreditation Review:

- Plans for continuous improvement in assessment including: time line for data collection, an enhanced plan with oversight of program evaluation; and
- Work to enhance clinical placements.

II. Developing and Applying Resources

School of Nursing B.S. Program Strengths and Accomplishments

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:

1. Fiscal support: While state support is small in comparison to other programs, resources provided from grants, donations from partners, and programs offered through Extended Learning are adequate for faculty lines, labs, equipment, and supplies;
2. Space: The SoN currently has sufficient space to meet its needs. However, additional space will be needed to accommodate plans for growth and the move to campus that is anticipated in 2015;
3. Clinical Placements: While competitive, clinical placements have been found for SoN students, due, in part, to partnerships that have been established, and these are adequate;

4. Faculty Resources: Despite the fact that the new programs have been added, existing programs have grown, and the number of tenure-track faculty has remained the same over the past several years, faculty resources are adequate due to the number of doctorally prepared faculty, including lecturers;
5. Administrative staff: The numbers of administrative staff (advisors, operations coordinator/budget analyst, administrative specialists, etc.) are adequate;
6. Library: The numbers of journals and books, as well as access to websites and databases, are adequate. The librarian assigned to this area supports student success; and
7. Technology: The on-campus program has outstanding infrastructure and support from Cougar Courses and for online teaching.

B. The **external reviewers** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:

1. Staff support services that provide guidance and support;
2. Qualified faculty in each of the five major content areas for implementation of BRN approved program;
3. Current space is modern and of sufficient size with additional space to be provided for relocation to the main campus;
4. In compliance with BRN program clinical facilities requirements;
5. Well-equipped offices, classrooms, and other student services spaces; and
6. Modern technology to meet the needs for library resources, software access, instruction, and utilization of distance learning.

C. The **Library Dean** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding developing and applying resources:

1. BSN themes of evidence-based learning are well represented in Library collections;
2. Faculty are proactive in working with Library staff; and
3. Since 2006, the Nursing Librarian has provided over 19 hours of in-class information literacy instruction to 484 students.

D. The **Dean of IITS** noted the following program strengths and accomplishments related to developing and applying resources:

1. Since 2004, IITS has worked with Nursing and Extended Learning to provide required infrastructure on the Temecula campus that is similar to what is available at the San Marcos campus; and
2. Increased hours for technical support is being provided to the Temecula campus, and there have been fewer problems reported in 2012-2013, with remaining problems to be resolved by replacement of unstable equipment in the near future.

School of Nursing B.S. Program Weaknesses and Challenges Regarding Developing and Applying Resources

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following weaknesses and challenges regarding developing and applying resources:

1. Tenure-track Faculty: Due to the loss of tenure track faculty through retirements and resignations, the SoN has only five of the nine tenure lines that were projected for this point in its development. Additional tenure-track faculty are needed for specialties in maternal and child health, pediatrics, and nursing education where there are currently no tenure-track faculty. Additional tenure track faculty are also needed in medical-surgical and community health specialties to teach in both the graduate and undergraduate programs;
2. Technology: Future needs with the move to the main campus by January 2015 include: simulation equipment, electronic medical record software for simulation and skills lab education, and N-track software for tracking clinical experiences for the nurse practitioner programs. As it expands in the areas of online teaching and simulation, needs for technology and video support will increase. With the Affordable Care Act of 2011, needs will increase for health related technology such as EMR and simulation. The Temecula campus needs ongoing technology infrastructure enhancements for internet and distance learning capabilities that are equivalent to the San Marcos campus in order for students to prepare for the licensure exams; and
3. Space: To maintain accreditation and quality of the program, space is essential for clinical labs and a simulation center in the renovated University Hall where the program anticipates it will be located with the move to the main campus.

B. The BRN **external reviewers** noted the following weaknesses and challenges regarding developing and applying resources:

1. Lack of sufficient practice sites, especially in pediatrics; and
2. Self-study cites need for more staff to allow additional attention to program capture/analysis/action and improved distance learning methodologies and technology applications.

C. **The Library Dean** noted the following weaknesses and challenges regarding developing and applying resources:

1. Despite efforts to develop and deliver information literacy, some students still have not had any instruction on library research; and
2. No library access to the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews constitutes a significant gap in the Library collections in support of SoN.

D. The **Dean of IITS** noted the following weaknesses and challenges regarding developing and applying resources:

1. The Temecula campus lacks internet speed that is equivalent to the San Marcos campus.

III. School of Nursing B.S. Program Strengths and Accomplishments Related to Additional Themes/Special Issues

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding additional themes/special issues:

1. Faculty research, clinical practice, community service, and partnerships for international study that are vital to keeping programs current, safe, and innovative;
2. Student participation in faculty research and faculty work in various facilities (e.g., a nurse-led clinic for the homeless) that enhance student placements for internships, clinical placements, and service-learning opportunities internationally;
3. Pedagogy that reflects current trends in practice (including online teaching and simulation), meets the needs of diverse students, and enhances partnerships by assisting hospitals to keep their skills current;
4. The program is unique in requiring faculty to keep their clinical practice current through employment in their areas of specialization which also cultivates clinical partnerships and placements, optimizes student clinical experiences, and helps to recruit the best lecturer faculty;
5. Early adoption of pedagogies (e.g., case studies, poster sessions, professional speaking, collaborative and community projects, hybrid courses) and technologies (e.g., discussion boards in Cougar Courses, Camtasia, etc.) to accommodate students' diverse learning styles;
6. Quality assurance for multiple courses in various locations through a team approach to teaching and decision making that includes: coordination of curriculum by tenure-track leads in each area, meetings among faculty at both campuses and team meetings among faculty in specialties, tenure-track faculty teaching (including team teaching) at both locations, mentoring new faculty to promote consistency, and meetings with Extended Learning staff;
7. Extracurricular and Co-curricular activities: development of the Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society Chapter that enables students to become involved in professional practice, research, and community service with participation from two-thirds of each class in the last two years in the Chapter activities; development of the Student Nurses Association that encourages community service; faculty work closely with the Career Center, Extended Learning, and community partners in a Career Fair; annual Leadership, Graduate, and Research Open House that includes partner facilities families, and the University community for presentation of quality improvement program changes in hospitals, health policy work, and research presentations; active participation in international service programs in Mexico, Africa, and Belize; and a PPH

residency program in which students work with a preceptor in a clinical setting and attend classes to enhance their transition as staff nurses with a residency program with Tri-City hospital under discussion.

B. The **External Reviewers** noted the following strengths and program accomplishments regarding additional themes/special issues:

1. In compliance with BRN previous education credit requirements; and
2. In compliance with BRN student participation requirements.

School of Nursing B.S. Program Challenges Related To Additional Themes/Special Issues

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following program challenges regarding additional themes/special issues:

1. Lack of stability among lecturer faculty in the areas of pediatrics and material child health.

V. School of Nursing B.S. Program Future Plans and Recommendations

A. The Program **Self Study** noted the following future plans and recommendations:

1. Curriculum: Combining the community health nursing and case management clinical courses in the BSN to improve the clinical experience;
2. Tenure-track positions: Currently, tenure track faculty are spread over three undergraduate programs including the BSN, ABSN and RN-BSN, the graduate program, and the Assoc. Director position. Additional tenure track positions are needed in the specialty areas of Pediatrics, Women/Maternal and Child Health, Nursing Education/Simulation, and Medical-Surgical nursing to maintain accreditation, educational strength and continuity, and research as well as to broaden community partnerships and create relationships with facilities that will attract additional faculty;
3. Faculty development support: Continue research assistance to tenure-track faculty to meet tenure requirements;
4. Space and facilities: Facility renovation for the SoN in University Hall to be of the same quality as the current facility with a simulation center, labs, computer classrooms, distance learning, and increased space for anticipated future needs;
5. Staff: Full-time technology support to meet facility needs;

6. Community partnerships: Continued efforts to build robust local, regional, and global community partnerships; and
7. Assessment/evaluation: Enhanced collection and analysis of evaluation data to identify areas of needed program change.

B. The BRN **external reviewers** noted the following future plans and recommendations:

1. Further develop the plan for evaluation of the program to improve regular collection, analysis, and utilization of data to identify problems and their solutions;
2. Increase number of admits to VN to BSN program to meet community needs; and
3. Explore opportunities to increase practice experiences at existing clinical sites, especially in pediatrics, and secure an additional clinical facility site to ensure a full scope of student direct patient care experiences.

C. **Dean of the Library** Future Plans and Recommendations:

1. Identify where in the curriculum to provide an introductory session in information literacy to all students and insure that faculty teaching NURS 350/1 and the research methods course are aware that students need in-class tie with the Nursing Librarian; as students move forward in the curriculum, provide more advanced, assignment-specific instruction in information literacy;
2. Allocation of resources is needed for access to the Cochrane Database; and
3. Funds to update the monograph collections will be an ongoing need for SoN, as information in these fields updates often.

D. The **Dean of IITS** recommends the following future plans:

1. Discussion of funding for increased internet speed at the Temecula campus with Extended Learning.

E. The **Dean of the College of Education, Health, and Human Services** recommended the following future plans:

1. New facilities as the key to future success; and
2. Develop technological initiatives as pathways to the future.

VI. The PAC School of Nursing B.S. Program Review Conclusions and Recommendations

The Program Assessment Committee (PAC) thanks the faculty of the School of Nursing B.S. program for the completion of their Program Review, and especially for its very thorough discussion of its curriculum, SLO assessment process, resources, and future plans for achieving educational outcomes. It is clear from this review that faculty work extremely

hard and are diligent in their efforts to educate health care professionals who are recognized for their outstanding contributions to the community. The PAC acknowledges that the SoN faculty, like those in schools and departments across the campus, are realizing these accomplishments despite a severe shortage of faculty resources.

Contributors to this program review have offered thoughtful observations on the current state of the program as well as a rich array of suggestions for future planning for the SoN B.S. program. In what follows, PAC draws upon the program Self Study, as well as recommendations from others who have responded to this review, to offer its recommendations for consideration by the SoN faculty and those who will participate in the MOU process:

A. The PAC makes the following recommendations to the SoN:

1. Substitution of Accreditation Team Report: The Program Review Policy and Guidelines allow for accredited programs to substitute the accrediting team's report for the Program Review Self Study and external reviewer's site visit. But this is allowed only if: 1) annual assessment plans and reports have been completed; and 2) the accreditation report includes a discussion of assessment and SLOs. Neither of these conditions was met for the SoN Program Review, although the SoN substituted CCNE and BRN accreditation reports for the external reviewers report.

Recommendation: The PAC recognizes that accredited programs like those offered by the SoN undergo numerous reviews, and it is understandable that there may be a tendency for ongoing assessment to be weighted toward accreditation reviews that have such significant consequences for the future of the program. The PAC also recognizes that there has been some misunderstanding regarding the requirements for substitution of the accreditation reports for the external reviewer's report between the PAC, administrators, and the SoN for which the SoN is not responsible. However, in future Program Reviews, these conditions should be met if the SoN wishes to substitute the accreditation report(s) for the Program Review Self Study and/or the external reviewer's visit.

2. Annual Assessment of SLOs: While the Self-study discusses the SoN faculty's active engagement in SLO assessment, the SoN has not submitted University assessment plans and reports each year. Most importantly, there were no Annual Assessment reports submitted from AY 2006-2009. In addition, while assessment tools and the evaluation process are described (e.g., attrition rate, NCLEX pass rates, employer surveys, Theory/clinical course pass data, course evaluations, program/graduation survey, clinical faculty Level I and II evaluations, and the ATI) in the program's Self Study, exactly what SLOs each of these tools measures, and how they enable faculty to determine particular SLO mastery, is sometimes unclear. Moreover, there is little in depth discussion of assessment data or how results are utilized to implement program change.

Recommendation: The PAC strongly encourages the SoN faculty to: 1) submit annual assessment plans and reports; 2) further develop data collection processes and discuss how assessment tools measure mastery of specific SLOs (i.e., what a student knows and/or is able to do); 3) provide more in depth discussion of SLO data; 4) show how appropriate long-term, program-level change is being developed and implemented based on annual assessment results; and 5) use assessment not only to show program effectiveness but also to broaden the ways of assessing SLOs.

- 3. Curriculum and Program Approval Process:** The SoN program was initially designed and approved with the generic and RN-to-BSN options. The RN-to-BSN option was moved to self-support shortly after it was first implemented. An ABSN option, offered through self-support, has been approved and is currently being offered through Extended Learning. It appears that a curriculum similar to that of the RN-to-BSN option is being offered as a state support program under the title of an "LVN-to-BSN" option. But, the RN-to-BSN has been reported to the Chancellor's Office as being offered through self support, and there may also be differences between the RN-to-BSN and the LVN-to-BSN curricula.

Recommendation: The LVN-to-BSN option needs to be submitted and approved through the University curriculum review and approval process.

- 4. Pre-nursing:** The Self Study is silent about pre-nursing student issues. Yet, a large number of students come to the campus with the intent to pursue a nursing degree who do not get into the program. The PAC wonders what plans the program has to address the high number of pre-nursing students who do not get into the program. The PAC also wonders if students who take difficult lower division courses simultaneously at CSUSM may be at some disadvantage (regarding GPA), compared to community college students, in the admissions process.

Recommendations: SoN faculty should give careful consideration to: 1) Whether or not the large number of students who cannot get into the program should continue to be admitted to the campus as pre-nursing students; 2) a Nursing advisor should help to plan the academic careers in other majors for students who are not admitted to the major; 3) re-evaluate the selection criteria for admission to the program to reduce the possible competitive advantage of community college students over those who complete their lower division coursework at CSUSM.

- 5. Units in the major:** In January 2013, the CSU Board of Trustees approved changes to Title V that prohibit Bachelor of Science degrees from requiring more than 120 units. The Chancellor's Office has developed an implementation timeline that will require the SoN by January 2014 either to report how it plans to reduce unit requirements or to request an exemption from this Title V requirement.

Recommendation: The SoN faculty should examine the curriculum within the SoN to see if it can be reduced to 120 units without jeopardizing the quality of the program. In addition, the faculty should consult with their counterparts on other CSU campuses to

see what strategies are being used by other Nursing programs to comply with this new requirement.

- 6. Pace and direction of program growth:** The vision, energy, commitment, hard work, and enthusiasm of the SoN faculty and staff are exemplary! But, with its several programmatic offerings and the pace with which it has added them--which now include the BSN, ABSN, RN-BSN, LVN-BSN, MSN, and certificates--the PAC is concerned that the SoN may be attempting to accomplish more, given its resources, than is feasible to maintain programmatic quality.

Recommendation: Thoughtfully consider the pace and direction of the program to match its growth to available resources. Prioritize and make choices about what to do, but also what not to do, in considering additional growth.

- 7. Purpose and uses of Program Review:** The PAC recognizes the distinctive audiences and purposes of accreditation reviews and how these factors shape both the items reviewed and the emphasis in these reviews on program strengths. In contrast, the campus Program Review is intended to be a “safe place” in which it is also important to identify and reflect upon challenges and how they may be addressed to strengthen the program.

Recommendation: In addition to discussing program strengths, utilize the Program Review to discuss challenges and utilize it as an outlet to reflect upon and receive feedback on areas of needed improvement, particularly in the area of educational effectiveness.

B. The PAC makes the following recommendations to the University:

- 1. Technology Infrastructure at the Temecula Campus:** The Temecula campus needs technology infrastructure enhancements for internet and distance learning capabilities that are equivalent to the San Marcos campus.

Recommendation: The University should work with Extended Learning to fulfill the technology needs at the Temecula campus.

- 2. Faculty Positions:** The SoN needs tenure-track positions in material and child health, pediatrics, and nursing education as well as medical-surgical and community health specialties for both the undergraduate and graduate programs.

Recommendation: The PAC encourages coordination between the University administration and Extended Learning to provide needed tenure-track positions.

- 3. Library Resources:** SoN students currently lack access to the Cochrane Database.

Recommendation: Allocate resources to acquire the Cochrane Database.

4. **Space:** Additional space will be needed to accommodate plans for growth and the move to the main campus.

Recommendation: The PAC recognizes that there are some unresolved issues concerning how space is allocated on the campus. Yet, as those responding to this Program Review have noted, the University must find a way to provide sufficient space and facilities to enable the program to continue.

Finally, PAC's overall assessment of the SoN B.S. degree is for **Continuation of a Program of Quality and Promise** that includes a **five-year review cycle**. In the absence of a previous MOU, PAC bases this recommendation on the following criteria contained in the Program Review Guidelines:

- the degree to which the annual assessments have generated useful data and whether assessment results have been used to make appropriate changes;
- the degree to which the five-year plan explicitly and appropriately addresses program challenges and enhances or preserves program strengths; and
- the strengths and challenges identified by the review of educational effectiveness and capacity.

Based on these criteria and its review of all Program Review material received, the PAC emphasizes the urgent need for the SoN program to conduct annual assessments of its SLOs that reflect enhanced data gathering and analysis as well as application of assessment results to program-level change. In order to encourage this process, and to provide helpful feedback regarding annual assessments of SLOs prior to the next Program Review, the PAC recommends an **interim report in three years in which the SoN faculty reflect on their assessment efforts and how they are using assessment data to make long-term program-level changes**.

The PAC congratulates the School of Nursing on its completion of this Program Review. In particular, PAC thanks the faculty for its hard work, excellent program, and for their ongoing commitment to student achievement while responding to significant challenges. PAC wishes the School of Nursing faculty success in their continuing efforts to meet these challenges and in realizing its plans for the future development of its program.

cc: Jackie Trishman, Chair, Academic Senate
Marcia Woolf, Coordinator, Academic Senate
Graham Oberem, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Janet Powell, Dean, College of Education, Health, and Human Services
Program Assessment Committee