

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING
Wednesday, September 9, 2015
1 – 2:50 p.m.
Kellogg Library Reading Room – KEL 5400

- I. Group Photo of Senators and Staff
- II. Approval of Agenda
- III. Chair's report: [Deborah Kristan](#)
 - Referrals to Committees (attached) **Page 2**
- IV. Vice Chair's Report – [Michael McDuffie](#)
- V. Secretary's Report – [Laurie Stowell](#) Status of AY 14/15 Senate items (attached) **Page 4**
- VI. [President's](#) Report: Karen Haynes (not able to attend)
- VII. Provost's Report: [Graham Oberem](#) (Not able to attend. Report provided by Kamel Haddad)
- VIII. [ASCSU](#) Report: [David Barsky/Glen Brodowsky](#)
- IX. [CFA](#) Report: [Darel Engen](#)
- X. [ASI](#) Report: [Tiffaney Boyd](#)
- XI. Standing Committee Chair Introductions
- XII. Consent Calendar* (attached) **Page 6**
 - NEAC Recommendations
 - UCC Course & Program Change Proposals
- XIII. Action Items *Scheduled for a vote, including second reading items.* (None)
- XIV. Discussion Items *Scheduled for discussion, including first reading items.*
 - A. FAC: Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students* (attached) **Page 8**
- XV. Presentations
 - A. LAMP Charge and Report, [Kamel Haddad](#), (Report attached; link to report and all related appendices: <http://www.csusm.edu/LAMP/index1.html>) **Page 16** **Time Certain 1:30 PM**
 - B. Safety Update, Including Shelter-in-Place Review – [Robert Williams](#), Emergency Manager, **Time Certain 1:45 PM**
 - C. Community Engagement/Internships – [Patricia Prado-Olmos](#), [Cynthia Chavez-Metoyer](#) **Time Certain 2:00 PM**
 - D. CSUSM Sustainability – [Regina Frasca](#), Director, Safety, Risk & Sustainability Services, and [Juliana Goodlaw-Morris](#), Sustainability Manager **Time Certain 2:15 PM**
- XVI. Standing Committee Reports (2 min. oral)
- XVII. Student Grade Appeal Committee (SGAC) Report, [Karno Ng](#) (attached) **Page 22**
- XVIII. Senators' Concerns and Announcements

Next meeting: October 7, 2015, 1:00 PM to 2:50 PM, Kellogg Reading Room – KEL 5400

***Pending EC Approval**

2015/16 Referrals to the Academic Senate Standing Committees

Referral Topic & Committee Name

APC

1. Continue revision of the On-line Instruction Policy.
2. Clarify distinction between the two meanings of GVAR (including review of the All-University Writing Requirement and the question of whether it is an “all-university” requirement, or only an undergraduate requirement).
3. Review and revise the Academic Program Discontinuance Policy in light of experience gained through the first applications of this policy.
4. Revise the Credit Certificate Policy to make it easier for departments to use.
5. Review and update Extended Learning’s Roles and Responsibilities Policy.
6. Follow-up study to determine how the Maximum Number of Units During Winter Intersession Policy is working.
7. Create academic calendars for the next four years.
8. Graduate Student Probation Policy
9. Curriculum Proposer Policy

BLP

1. Moving Self-support to State-support Policy

FAC

2. Change name of Faculty Awards Policy to Brakebill Award Policy; Review Brakebill Policy re: criteria/eligibility rules in regard to Unit 3 employees (inconsistency)
3. Update the Faculty Awards Document, “I. Faculty Awards Selection: Committee”.
4. Awaiting Response to FAC Feedback: Department of Economics RTP Standards.
5. Review Sabbatical Policy
6. Review Department RTP Documents: Biology
7. Review Department RTP Documents: Chemistry
8. Review Department RTP Documents: Computer Science and Information System
9. Review Department RTP Documents: Math
10. Review Department RTP Documents: Liberal Studies
11. Consider conflict of interest for evaluators of RTP files (per PTC)
12. Consider drafting Visiting Professor Guidelines/Policy
13. Further Discussion: 1) RTP Documents (see year-end report). Detailed and inclusive conversation needed.
14. Sabbatical Leave Policy: role of senate office since application are now electronic
15. University RTP Document: address two comments from Provost from policy approved in Summer 2015
16. Evaluation for Athletic Coaches Policy
17. Policy for 'Assigned Time for Exceptional Service'

GEC

1. Begin process of GE assessment.
2. Begin review of upper division GE curriculum (w/new forms).
3. Update draft of revision of lower division GE form to be used in recertification process; consider EC feedback/concerns from 14/15.
4. Determine if there is a possibility of making C-minus the minimum grade in area B4.
5. Further consider implications/changes re: diversity mapping report.

NEAC

1. Policy regarding long-term vacant seats on Senate committees.
2. Spring 2015 Referendum (uncoupling Vice-Chair and Chair seats; changing terms of Senate officer seats).
3. Votes required to pass referendums: majority of voters versus majority of eligible faculty

SAC

1. Work with Director of University Office of Internships to complete University Internship Policy.
2. Continue work on Engaged Education Definitions

TPAC

1. Conduct faculty survey regarding online and hybrid courses and provide results to APC in AY 15-16 and coordinate with APC to develop the policy.
2. Determine next steps of online quality teaching in terms of guidelines, policy and/or procedures about faculty preparation/training to teach online courses.
3. Incorporate EC comments and update the draft of the Open Access Policy.

UCC

1. Work with Dean of Academic Programs and IITS (Jeff Henson) to recruit faculty members to pilot electronic C form in Fall 2015.

Secretary's Report: Academic Senate Topics – AY 14/15

The Following items were approved by the Academic Senate. Dates of implementation are provided for Policies/Procedures (President and Provost approval/signatures). The list also contains acknowledged resolutions and other Senate approved/endorsed items, as stated.

- APC: Curriculum Proposers Policy (referred back to APC Fall 2015)
- FAC: Applicability of Department RTP Standards (Added to University RTP Document)
- FAC: Guidelines for Department RTP Standards (8/27/15)
- UCC: Resolution on Revision to Routine Curricular Flow for the Academic Senate of CSUSM (acknowledged 6/19/15)
- SAC: Student Grade Appeals Policy Revision (To be referred back to SAC Fall 2015 for editing.)
- BLP/UCC: Certificate of Advanced Study in Leadership in Middle Level Education
- Univ. Assessment Council: Undergraduate Learning Outcomes
- BLP/UCC: BA in Music
- BLP/UCC: Global Business Management Option
- BLP: Criminology & Justice Studies: Expansion to Temecula (Self-Support)
- Student Access Initiative – Senate endorsement (Implementation in Fall 2016)
- UCC/ BLP: Program Suspension of P.E. Option in Kinesiology
- UCC/BLP: Certificate in Applied Geographic Information Systems (GIS) (CHABSS)
- UCC/BLP: Certificate of Specialized Study in Military Science (MILS)
- FAC: History Department RTP Standards (8/20/15)
- UCC/BLP: Masters in Public Health (CEHHS-SoN)
- UCC/BLP: Professional Certificate in Specialized Study in Cultural Competency in Healthcare (CHABSS)
- BLP: Moving Self-Support Academic Programs to State Support Policy (Referred back to BLP)
- APC: Academic Freedom Policy (Awaiting Approval/Signature from Provost and President Haynes)

FAC: Emeritus Policy (9/1/15)

UCC/BLP: Health Information Management MS (CoBA)

UCC/BLP: Master of Science in Kinesiology

FAC: RTP Standards for the Department of Social Work (8/25/15)

UCC/BLP: Cybersecurity Master of Science

UCC/BLP: Certificate of Advanced Study in Professional Accounting

FAC: Coach Evaluation Forms (Approved; accompanying policy referred to FAC Fall '15)

UCC/BLP: Electronics Minor

FAC: Wang Family Excellence Award Policy (7/31/15)

APC: Syllabi Policy (8/20/15)

FAC: Department of Communication RTP (8/20/15)

FAC: School of Nursing RTP (8/25/15)

Defeated via Senate vote:

FAC: Changing from Paper to All-Online Student Evaluations of Instruction

CONSENT CALENDAR

NEAC RECOMMENDATIONS

<i>Committee (or Senate Seat)</i>	<i>Seat and Term</i>	<i>Name</i>
Senator	CEHHS 15-17	Elizabeth Bigham
Senator	CEHHS 15-17	Blake Beecher
Senator	CHABSS 15/16 (one year)	Reuben Mekenye
Senator	CHABSS 15-17	Scott Greenwood
Senator	CHABSS 15-17	Allison Merrick
Faculty Affairs Committee (FA C)	CHABSS At-large 15-17	Mayra Besosa
Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)	Lecturer 15/16 (one year)	John Drewe
Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)	CEHHS At-large 15-17	Sean Newcomer
General Education Committee (GEC)	CSM (other than Biology)	Andre Kundgen
Program Assessment Committee (PAC)	CSM 15/16 (one year)	David Chien
Faculty Awards Selection Committee (FASC)	Library 15/16 (one year)	Torie Quiñonez
Professional Leave Committee (PLC)	CHABSS-BSS 15-17	Marisol Clark-Ibanez
Faculty Grants Committee	CEHHS At-large 15/16 (one year)	Brian Lawler
Faculty Grants Committee	CHABSS-HA 15/16 (one year)	Reuben Mekenye
Student Grade Appeals Committee	Faculty At-large 15/17	Reuben Mekenye
Student Grievance Committee	CEHHS 15-17	Blake Beecher
Student Grievance Committee	Faculty At-large 15-17	William Kristan
University Intellectual Property Committee	Faculty At-large 15/16 (one year)	James Jancovich
Disability Access & Compliance Committee (DACC)	Faculty At-large 15-17	Robin Marion
Disability Access & Compliance Committee (DACC)	SAC Member 15-17	Tricia Lantzy
North County Higher Education Alliance (NCHEA)	Faculty At-large 15/17	Suzanne Hizer

Programs/Courses Approved at UCC

SUBJ	No	New No.	Course/Program Title	Form Type	Originator	To UCC	UCC Action
MATH	142		Basic Statistics	C	Olaf Hansen	5/11/15	8/31/15

Program/Course Changes Approved at the College

SUBJ	No	New No.	Course/Program Title	Form Type	Originator	Reviewed by Dean of AP/Chair of UCC
AH	111		The Human Experience	C-2	Rebecca Lush	8/31/15
CHAD	P-2		CHAD Major	P-2	Sharon Hamill	8/31/15
CHEM	P-2		Chemistry Educ. Option	P-2	Paul Jasien	8/31/15
EDUC	P-2		Single Subject Credential Program	P-2	Pat Stall	8/31/15
EDSS	531		The Reflective Practitioner	C-2	Pat Stall	8/31/15

EDSS	572		Clin. Prac. in Sec. Schools	C-2	Pat Stall	8/31/15
PSCI	415		State Politics	C-2	Cyrus Masroori	8/31/15
PSYC	P-2		Minor in Psychology	P-2	Sharon Hamill	8/31/15
PSYC	210		Child Growth/Develop.	C-2	M. Fitzpatrick	8/31/15
PSYC	215		Child, Family, Community	C-2	M. Fitzpatrick	8/31/15
PSYC	P-2		B.A. in Psychology	P-2	Sharon Hamill	8/31/15
PSYC	356		Develop. Psychology	C-2	M. Fitzpatrick	8/31/15

1 **FAC Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students**

2 **For the First Reading in the Senate Sept 9, 2015, carry over from previous year.**

3 *Rationale*

4 *This policy is being created to comply with a new provision in the Collective Bargaining*
5 *Agreement, Section 20.37, which provides CSUSM with approximately \$18,000 in funds this year as well*
6 *as for the next 2 years to fund assigned time for exceptional service performed by any faculty unit*
7 *employee.*

8 *This matter is time-sensitive because the first cycle is supposed to be completed before the end of this*
9 *semester (retroactive for this AY). Thus, the policy must be created, approved and implemented in a very*
10 *condensed timeline.*

11 *The CBA charges campus Senates to develop criteria and procedures for the use of the funds. The*
12 *following policy does so. Please note:*

- 13 ○ *Language that is verbatim from the contract is temporarily **highlighted** for easy identification.*
- 14 ○ *Relevant sections of the CBA are also included below in the rationale section for ready reference*
15 *(CBA 20.37; 20.3 b, c)*

16 *This document was reviewed by the Executive Committee and the Academic Senate on March 4. FAC*
17 *gathered feedback received on March 4, and worked with the Senate office to share the working draft*
18 *with senators.*

19 **Questions Raised at the Senate First Reading 3/3/15 (or since):**

- 20 ○ *FAC and Executive Committee agree that we are setting aside the matter of the time line until*
21 *after the document is approved. Then the Senate officers will work with the office of the VPAA*
22 *to create a timeline that is fair and reasonable, depending on when the document is approved by*
23 *the President.*
 - 24 ○ *Would these awards impact lecturer entitlements?*
 - 25 ○ *Per AVP Hunt, these awards will not affect lecturer entitlements. That would be unfair*
26 *and contrary to the purpose of the program and the CBA.*
 - 27 ○ *What about the case where it is a department chair self-nominating for the award for exceptional*
28 *service – who signs off?*
 - 29 ○ *The chair still signs off (this is a common practice on campus).*
 - 30 ○ *A suggestion was made to add instructions about how the award would be reported in the FAR.*
 - 31 ○ *I understand and appreciate concern about not double-dipping with items that are claimed on*
32 *FARs, but if this is going to be written as a hard and fast rule, it needs to be done carefully since*
33 *(for the current year) faculty who are doing exceptional service may have decided to declare only*
34 *the “top of the list” activities in their FARs... and these are exactly the items that would form the*
35 *basis of one of the retroactive/bankable awards for 2014-15.*
 - 36 ○ *This issue will have to be addressed by the committee reviewing applications.*
- 37

38 *Relevant CBA Language*

39 *CBA 20.37 Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students*

40 *For each fiscal year 2014/15, 2015/16, and 2016/17, the CSU will provide a pool of \$1.3 million,*
41 *allocated based on campus full-time equivalent students (FTES), to provide assigned time to faculty*
42 *employees who are engaged in exceptional levels of service that support the CSU's priorities, but who are*
43 *not otherwise receiving an adjustment in workload to reflect their effort.*

44 *Assigned time from this pool may be awarded for student mentoring, advising, and outreach, especially*
45 *as these activities support underserved, first- - generation, and/or underrepresented students; the*
46 *development and implementation of high- - impact educational practices; curricular redesign intended to*
47 *improve student access and success; service to the department, college, university, or community that*
48 *goes significantly beyond the normal expectations of all faculty; assignment to courses where increases to*
49 *enrollment have demonstrably increased workload; and other extraordinary forms of service to students.*

50 *Such adjustments shall be in addition to any adjustments already in place on a campus. Faculty members*
51 *already receiving assigned time for the same general category of activity (e.g. assigned time for excess*
52 *enrollments, assigned time for committee service) shall not be eligible for support from this pool for the*
53 *same activities.*

54 *In 2014/15, assigned time under this program shall be awarded in the spring and be based on work*
55 *performed during the 2014/15 academic year. Awards shall consist of WTUs and may be banked for use*
56 *in the 2015/16 academic year. Campuses shall establish timelines for 2015/16 and 2016/17 so that*
57 *assigned time is taken during the academic year in which the activities occurred. All faculty unit*
58 *employees are eligible to apply.*

59 *Academic Senates on each campus shall develop criteria and procedures for the use of the funds.*
60 *Applications shall be evaluated by the appropriate faculty committee(s), which shall make*
61 *recommendations to the appropriate administrator. Consideration shall be given to the items listed in*
62 *20.3 (b) and (c). Priority shall be given to applications which demonstrate that the quality of students'*
63 *educational experience could not have been maintained without an increase in the faculty member's*
64 *workload.*

65 *Denials shall specify the reasons. Appeals shall be heard by a faculty committee designated for the*
66 *purpose. Decisions of the appeals committees shall be final and binding and not subject to Article 10 of*
67 *this Agreement. Awards granted after appeal in 2014/15 and 2015/16 shall be funded from the pool*
68 *allocated for this program in the subsequent fiscal year and shall not exceed 10% of the annual pool. Any*
69 *unused funds from this program in 2014/15 or 2015/16 shall roll over for use in the following Academic*
70 *Year. Appeals in 2016/17 must be funded from the available funds for 2016/17, including any rollover*
71 *from previous years.*

72 *Campuses shall expend all funds allocated to them under this program. Each campus shall provide an*
73 *accounting of expenditures for this program for the prior fiscal year by no later than November 1 of the*
74 *subsequent year. For accounting purposes, costs of assigned time shall be calculated based on the*
75 *minimum salary for assistant professor.*

76 CBA 20.3 b & c

77 | *b. In the assignment of workload, consideration shall be given at least to the following factors: graduate*
78 *instruction; online instruction; activity classes; laboratory courses; supervision; distance learning;*
79 *sports; and directed study. Consideration for adjustments in workload shall be given to at least the*
80 *following: class size/number of students; course and curricular redesign; preparation for substantive*
81 *changes in instructional methods, including development of online and hybrid courses; research,*
82 *scholarly, and creative activities; advising; student teacher supervision; thesis supervision; supervision*
83 *of fieldwork; service learning; student success initiatives; assessment and accreditation activities; and*
84 *service on department, college, or University committees.*

85 *c. In determining what is ""excessive"" or ""unreasonable"" under this section, the items listed under*
86 *20.3(b), as well as the number of students seeking to take courses in the academic area, the distribution of*
87 *student enrollment, the level of support provided the program, and the effects of the introduction of new*
88 *instructional technologies, and the prior practices of the University shall be among the primary elements*
89 *to be considered. The parties agree that consideration of the prior practices of the University shall*
90 *include the calculation of Weighted Teaching Units in prior years.*

91

Faculty Affairs Committee

Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students

ASSIGNED TIME FOR EXCEPTIONAL LEVELS OF SERVICE TO STUDENTS

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to provide assigned time to faculty employees who are engaged in exceptional levels of service that support the CSU's priorities, but who are not otherwise receiving an adjustment in workload to reflect their effort to write proposals and compete for assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students that supports the priorities of the California State University (CSU) system and the mission of California State University San Marcos (CSUSM) pursuant to Article 20, Section 20.37 of the 2014-2017 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between CSU and the faculty.

II. EXCEPTIONAL ASSIGNED TIME COMMITTEE (EATC)

A. Membership

Membership of EATC shall be composed of:

1. One faculty member from each college, appointed by the Academic Senate.
2. One faculty member to represent the Library/Athletics/Counselling/Extended Learning constituency, appointed by the Academic Senate.
3. A student appointed by the Associated Student, Inc.
4. The Provost or their designee will serve as a non-voting *ex officio* member.
5. Each member serves a one-year term.

B. Functions

1. To evaluate faculty applications for assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students
2. To make recommendations based on those evaluations to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs (VPAA).
3. To periodically review and, if needed, make recommendations for changes in this policy to the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

III. ASSIGNED TIME BUDGET AND REPORTING

Pursuant to the above-referenced article of the CBA, the CSU has agreed to provide resources to each campus for assigned time for exceptional service to students based on the number of full-time equivalent students at that campus.

A. Accountability and Expenditures

1. CSUSM shall expend all funds allocated to them under this program. CSUSM shall provide an accounting of expenditures for this program for the prior fiscal year by no later than November 1 of the subsequent year to the EATC, the Academic Senate, and the CSU.

2. In academic years 2014/15 and 2015/16, any unused funds shall roll over for use in the following academic year. All funds must be expended in the 2016/2017 academic year.
3. For accounting purposes, costs of assigned time shall be calculated based on the minimum salary for assistant professor.
4. Awards from appeals shall not exceed 10% of the annual budget for assigned time and shall be funded in the subsequent academic year. During the last year of the agreement, appeals must be funded from the funds for that year, including any rollover from previous years.

IV. ELIGIBILITY & RESTRICTIONS

A. Eligibility

1. All Unit 3 faculty employees are eligible to submit a proposal to request assigned time for exceptional levels of service to students.
2. Faculty who have previously received assigned time under this program and have not filed a final report on their activities are not eligible to apply again until their final report has been received.
3. Faculty members already receiving assigned time for the same general category of activity (e.g. assigned time for excess enrollments, assigned time for committee service) shall not be eligible for support from this program.

B. Restrictions

1. Assigned time can only be utilized during the academic year (August – May) during which the activity is performed with the exception of assigned time granted in the 2014/ 2015 academic year which may be utilized in the 2015/2016 academic year.

V. TIMELINE

- A. For activities in the 2014/2015 academic year and activities planned for the 2015/2016 academic year, applications will be due (TBD).
- B. For 2016/2017 academic years applications will be due (TBD).

VI. APPLICATION MATERIALS

An application for assigned time to support exceptional levels of service to students shall consist of:

- A. A narrative proposal, not to exceed two pages
 - The narrative shall “demonstrate that the quality of students’ educational experience could not have been maintained without an increase in the faculty member’s workload.” (CBA 20.37)
 - The narrative shall clarify that the service referenced in the application is not being compensated in any other form;
 - The narrative shall provide signature lines for the department chair (or equivalent) and dean.
- B. A current curriculum vitae (CV), limited to two pages;
- C. A letter from a CSUSM employee, not the proposer, who can speak to the credibility of the project, not the proposer, in support of the application.
- D. The narrative shall be reviewed and signed by the department chair (or equivalent) and the dean signifying that they are aware of the proposal and are not currently providing assigned time for the same general activity to the faculty member.

a letter indicating that the department chair and dean are aware of the proposal and are not currently providing assigned time for the same general activity (see section 4.1.3).
D-E. Incomplete applications will not be reviewed.

VII. SUPPORTED ACTIVITIES AND REVIEW CRITERIA

A. The following activities may be supported

1. Student mentoring, advising, and outreach, especially as these activities support underserved, first-generation, and/or underrepresented students
2. The development and implementation of high-impact educational practices; curricular redesign intended to improve student access and success
3. Service to the department, college, university, or community that goes significantly beyond the normal expectations of all faculty
4. Assignment to courses where increases to enrollment have demonstrably increased workload
5. Other extraordinary forms of service to students

B. Review Criteria

1. Demonstrated or hypothesized impact on student success and/or educational experience; impact includes the quality of the activity as well as the number of students served. (40%)
2. Demonstration that the impact on and/or quality of student experience could not be maintained without an increase in workload and that it is above and beyond the faculty member's work assignment/regular duties (30%)
3. Demonstrated impact on historically underserved populations (20%)
4. Quality of the letter of support (10%)

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The EATC shall assign each proposal in rank order.

B. The EATC evaluation will recommend the amount of the award, but the final decision will be made by the VPAA.

~~A. The EATC shall assign each proposal one of four ratings:~~

- ~~1. High Priority~~
- ~~2. Medium Priority~~
- ~~3. Low Priority~~
- ~~4. Not Recommended~~

A-C. The EATC shall submit its evaluations and the application materials to the VPAA who in consultation with the appropriate administrator responsible for assigning workload (e.g., Dean or Vice-President of Student Affairs), shall make the final determination regarding the approval or denial of assigned time. In addition to the recommendation of the EATC and input obtained via the consultation process, the VPAA may consider equity across constituencies in his/her decision.

208 **IX. INFORMATION PROVIDED TO APPLICANTS**

209 Once a decision is reached by the VPAA, he/she will forward his/her approval or denial as well as
210 the evaluation of the EATC to the applicant.
211

212 **X. AWARDS**

213 A. A tenure track faculty member who receives exceptional assigned time from the committee would
214 report the WTUs awarded in his/her Faculty Activity Report (FAR). The equivalent funds would be
215 transferred to the college.

216 B. An adjunct faculty member who receives exceptional assigned time from the committee would receive
217 the award through the normal Payroll process. The exceptional assigned time awarded from the
218 committee does not affect the entitlements of the adjunct faculty member in their department(s).

219 **XI. APPEALS**

220 **A. Appeals Committee**

221 The Appeals Committee shall comprise one member of the EATC, two members of Academic
222 Senate Executive Committee, two members of the FAC, and the VPAA or designee who shall be a
223 non-voting *ex officio* member.
224
225

226 **B. Timeline and Notification of Decisions**

227 Appeals of the decision made by the VPAA shall be made, in writing, to the Chair of the Academic
228 Senate and shall be filed no more than ten working days after the date upon which the VPAA
229 notifies the applicants of his/her decision. The Chair of the Academic Senate will appoint the
230 Appeals Committee within ten working days of receiving the first appeal. The Appeals Committee
231 shall complete their review in no more than thirty working days after receipt of the appeal. The
232 Appeals Committee shall send the appellant notification of its decision.
233
234
235

236 **XII. CONDITIONS OF ASSIGNED TIME**

237 A faculty unit employee granted assigned time under this program shall provide a final report to the
238 EATC via the Faculty Affairs office no later than one semester following the award of assigned
239 time. The report shall provide evidence that the proposed activities were completed and that the
240 impact on the students was as claimed in the original application. Faculty are ineligible to receive
241 further assigned time from this program until their report is received.
242

243 **XIII. EFFECTIVE DATES**

244 The policies and procedures in this document are an implementation of Article 20, section 37 of the
245 2014-2017 CBA. The 2016/2017 academic year marks the end of this program and, barring action

Comment [c1]: Rick Fierro suggested this language and a new section. Let's discuss the idea and then if necessary we can wordsmith.

He also shared the following:

The current annual minimum salary rate of an Assistant Professor is \$51,492 (\$4,291 base pay per month). At that rate 1 WTU is worth \$51,492/30 WTUs = \$1,716 per WTU.

Here are my thoughts:

Suppose a TTF receives exceptional assigned time of 1.5 WTUs from the committee. Then that translates to 1.5 x \$1,716 = \$2,574. The 1.5 WTUs would be reported in the Faculty Activity report (FAR) of the TTF. But what happens to monetary equivalent of the 1.5 WTUs, that is, what happens to the \$2,574? In the edits, I wrote that the college would receive the \$2,574, but that is something for FAC to decide somehow.

Suppose a lecturer receives exceptional assigned time of 1.5 WTUs from the committee. Then that translates to 1.5 x \$1,716 = \$2,574. This amount would be paid to the lecturer through Payroll. Also, the exceptional assigned time of 1.5 WTUs would not affect the entitlements of the lecturer in his/her department, because the Chair of the department did not assign the 1.5 WTUs of work to the lecturer.

246 by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, this policy shall no longer be in effect on or after
247 September 1, 2017.

California State University, San Marcos
Long-range Academic Master Plan Task Force
Report AY 2014-15

I. Introduction

The Long-range Academic Master Plan (LAMP) Task Force was established by the Provost, in consultation with the Academic Senate, for the purpose of examining CSUSM's long-range academic master plan, and guide CSUSM's curricular and program development into the near future (the next three to five years), as well as over the longer term. The Task Force (see Appendix A for membership) received the following charge from the Provost on October 31, 2014:

2014/15 Charge from the Provost (see Appendix B for flowchart):

The Task Force was directed to use information from the University Academic Master Plan, the Colleges' strategic planning processes, unit three-year rolling plans, and regional economic and employment data, to examine and make recommendations about the prioritization of future degree programs, options, minors, and certificates, from across all of CSUSM's colleges.

Recommendations in the Task Force report are intended to be independent of resource implications. Although CSUSM's Budget and Long Range Planning Committee (BLP) and the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) might recommend the adoption of proposals for programs not considered by the Task Force, recommendations must be taken into account by BLP and UCC in the evaluation of new proposals.

In considering program proposals and making its recommendations, the Task Force was directed to take into account, among other things, the following considerations:

- CSUSM's mission, vision and values
- The University Academic Master Plan
- Three year-rolling plans and College strategic plans
- State and regional needs (including but not limited to economic trends)
- Likely student demand
- Collaborations among CSUSM's colleges
- Potential collaborations with community partners and other campuses

II. Charge Interpretation

The 2014-15 taskforce focused on available data pertaining to state and regional needs and economic trends as a way to inform colleges and units regarding the new programs they might want to consider proposing as well as existing programs they may want to modify, update, and/or enhance. Colleges and units may also consider the Task Force findings when adding to and modifying 3-year rolling plans as well as considering which of their new programs from the University Academic Master Plan (UAMP) should be prioritized. Some of the regional needs identified were already addressed by existing programs, or by programs that are already being proposed at CSUSM, and minor modifications may better align campus programs with regional workforce needs.

The Task Force did not interpret the directive “make recommendations about the prioritization of future degree programs, options, minors, and certificates, from across all of CSUSM's colleges” to mean that a prioritization including ALL degree programs appearing on the University Academic Master Plan (UAMP) or on College 3-year rolling plans is expected. The Task Force did not consider programs or majors already initiated programmatically on campus via a p-form. The Task Force report is intended to identify and prioritize those areas of employment or academic study that represents:

- Relevance to the local region
- Demand from students and community partners
- Consistency with CSUSM’s mission and values
- Need for foundational programs

The Task Force report identifies, in rank order, areas with high anticipated demand for skilled employees based on our analysis of workforce reports and economic trends in the region, along with examples of majors that would qualify students for jobs in these areas. The prioritization encompasses areas of industry sectors or academic study first, followed by illustrative examples of possible programs within each area, where appropriate. These programs can be majors, minors, options or certificates.

In addition to consideration of regional demand, we identified core (aka foundational) undergraduate programs that each CSU campus is encouraged by the CSU Trustees to develop that do not yet exist at CSUSM. Because the CSU wants these programs to be implemented. Regardless of regional demand or student interest, the Task Force did not prioritize them along with programs that were identified based on workforce demand, but instead we noted which of these programs are not yet on our campus.

It is important to note that future program proposals linked to employment areas on the prioritized list should not necessarily be considered or implemented before programs that do not appear on the list. Rather, it is the intention of the Task Force to communicate that Colleges are encouraged to use the list to guide development of programs that are either foundational or best align with regional needs. Given this interpretation of the “charge” relegated to the Task Force, it would be more appropriate to refer to the deliberations and rankings in this report as a Long-range Academic Prioritization, rather than a Long-range Academic Master Plan.

III. Process

The Task Force recommends that the long-range academic prioritization be revisited every 3 years. In years when the Task Force is not scheduled to revisit long-range academic prioritization, we suggest that the Provost, Vice Provost, Senate Chair, and BLP Chair meet to determine whether or not there are other issues that warrant convening the Task Force.

The Task Force met 11 times during the Academic year 2014-15. Minutes and agendas can be found on the website at: <http://www.csusm.edu/LAMP/Minutes%20and%20Agendas/index.html>. During this time, the Task Force reviewed best available data, from a variety of resources that was often reported in terms of projections or gathered from employer surveys. Proposers of new programs are encouraged to use these data sources to justify their programs, or other data sources as appropriate. For example, data on student demand was more difficult to obtain than data on workforce needs, but should be an important part of new program development.

The following resources, consisting of documents, guest speakers, conferences, and references, were considered by the Task Force in its deliberations:

- San Diego Workforce Conference (10/2/2014) (Appendix C)
- San Diego Workforce Partnership (www.workforce.org/industry-reports)
- 31st Annual San Diego County Economic Roundtable (1/16/2015) (Appendix D)
- North San Diego County Economic Summit (<http://sdnedc.org/>)
- Christina Vincent (Economic Development Manager, City of Carlsbad: Visit on 2/18/2015 (Appendix E)
- Marney Cox (Chief Economist, SANDAG): Visit on 3/5/2015
(http://sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1715_15318.pdf)
(http://sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_1364_8010.pdf)
- Related Articles:
 - 2010-2020 San Diego County Projection Highlights (Appendix F)
 - 2010-2020 Industry Employment Projections SD-Carlsbad-San Marcos Area (Appendix G)
 - Task Force Aim: Job Ready Students (Appendix H)
 - Idea Jam Explores Future Jobs of San Diego (Appendix I)
 - *Diverse Issues in Education: Job-Readiness of College Graduates* (Appendix J)
 - Speak Up STEM (Appendix K)
- H1B Visa data
(<http://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/USCIS/Resources/Reports%20and%20Studies/H-1B/h1b-fy-12-characteristics.pdf>)
- University Academic Master Plan (CSUSM)
http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/catalogcurricula/masterplan.html
- Basic (Core) Undergraduate Programs as reported in *CSU's Program Planning Resource Guide: Academic Programs and Faculty Development, Fall 2014* <http://www.calstate.edu/app/policies/program-plan-resource-guide.pdf>
- Programs at neighboring institutions (including 2-year colleges)
 - SDSU (Appendix L)
 - UCSD (Appendix M)

IV. Prioritized List

This prioritization encompasses industry sectors or areas of academic study first, with illustrative examples of possible programs within each area. These programs can be majors, minors, options or certificates. The examples of programs/majors are listed in alphabetical order and are not exhaustive or representative of Task Force preferences. The number in parentheses reflects the rank in the prioritization. The top three industry sectors/areas of academic study were ranked equally.

- (1) *Biomedical/Biotech*
 - Bioengineering
 - Bioinformatics
 - Biomedical Engineering
 - Medical Laboratory Technology
 - Regulatory Affairs
- (1) *Computer/Software Engineering*
 - Computer Engineering
 - Hardware Engineering

- Information/Cyber Security Analysis
- Software Engineering
- (1) *Environmental*
 - Clean Tech Construction Management
 - Environmental Policy and Analysis
 - Environmental Science
 - Green MBA
 - Renewable Energy, Sustainability (add emphasis to Business degree)
 - Solar Energy Systems Engineering
- (4) *Healthcare*
 - Health Informatics
 - Healthcare Social Work
 - Medical/Clinical Laboratory Technology
 - Physician's Assistant Program
- (5) *Engineering – Other*
 - Aerospace Engineering
 - Agricultural Engineering (including brewing)
 - Chemical Engineering
 - Civil Engineering
 - Construction Engineering Electrical Engineering
 - Engineering Management
 - Environmental Engineering
 - Industrial Engineering
 - Mechanical Engineering
 - Urban Studies – Urban Planning, Design and Management
- (6) *Action Sports*
 - Action Sports Engineering
 - Recreation and Tourism management (Recreation Systems Management)
 - Sports Marketing and Management
- (7) *Computer Related Certifications*, in areas such as
 - Advanced Geospatial Analysis (Geographic Information Systems)
 - Database Management Systems
 - Information Assurance and Security
 - Information Systems Management
 - Networking Technologies
 - Software Application Development
- (8) *Technical Writing*
 - Data Visualization
 - Scientific Illustration
 - Technical Writing as an option or emphasis in majors such as:
 - ◆ Writing
 - ◆ Journalism

- ◆ Communication
- ◆ Sciences

V. Foundational Undergraduate Programs

Several core undergraduate programs identified by the CSU Trustees as basic components of a University curriculum are not yet implemented at CSUSM. “In developing the original planning policies for the CSU, the Board of Trustees recognized that certain academic programs at the undergraduate level were so fundamental to the University they should not be required to meet the ‘need and demand’ criteria established as prerequisites for offering other programs” (*CSU’s Program Planning Resource Guide: Academic Programs and Faculty Development, Fall 2014*, p. 116) (Appendix O). The original (1963) list of basic (core) undergraduate programs was updated in 1980 and remains as the current list of programs that that should be evaluated using “qualitative criteria regarding program integrity” as preeminent to need and demand. Although rankings in the previous section were based on regional and workforce needs, four undergraduate programs from the basic program’s list are not currently offered at CSUSM. To that end, the taskforce recommends that Colleges also consider implementing the following majors (unranked, listed in alphabetical order):

- Geography
- Geology
- Philosophy
- Theatre Arts/Drama

VI. Additional Recommendation

“Soft skills” was a repeated topic in LAMP discussions. Task Force members attended numerous off campus meetings where the importance of skills such as interpersonal communication, writing, problem-solving, and organization were discussed. Employers who work with the Career Center indicate that CSUSM graduates are getting excellent academic preparation, but may lack the soft skills needed to be competitive in the job search process. While this is not a specific degree program recommendation, the Task Force determined that it warrants further campus discussion. For example, a cross-college conversation could be initiated to investigate integrating soft skills into academic curricula.

VII. Appendices

- A. Task Force Membership
- B. LAMP Flowchart
- C. San Diego Workforce Conference contains the Subject matter discussed
- D. San Diego Economic Roundtable Consists of six (6) reports from Economic Influences in San Diego
- E. Carlsbad Specific Reports
- F. 2010-2020 San Diego County Projections (Article)
- G. 2010-2020 Industry Employment Projections specific to North County as well as San Diego (article)
- H. Task Force Aim: Job Ready Students (Article)
- I. Idea Jam: Explores Future Jobs of san Diego (Article)
- J. Diverse Issues in Education: Job Readiness of College Grads (Article)
- K. Speak up STEM (Article)
- L. SDSU Majors offered

- M. UCSD Majors offered
- N. CSUSM Majors offered
- O. (CSU's Program Planning Resource Guide: Academic Programs and Faculty Development, Fall 2014, p. 116).



August 19, 2015

To: Dr. Karen Haynes, President
Dr. Deborah Kristan, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Dr. Karno Ng, Chair, Student Grade Appeals Committee

Re: **Student Grade Appeal Committee 2014/15 AY Annual Report**

The CSUSM Student Grades Appeals Policy states that “The SGAC Chair shall report to the President of Cal State San Marcos and Academic Senate by September 1 the number and disposition of cases heard the previous academic year. (See CSU Exec Order 792, p.10).” (approved 07/14/2009)

During the Academic Year 2014/15, the Academic Senate approved the updated Student Grades Appeal Committee (SGAC) policy that included the on-line case submission process via the secured SGAC Moodle container. SGAC has received and considered **eight** cases during the AY 14-15. All are considered now closed, as detailed below:

Case	Dated	Disposition
1	10/15/2014	The case was received by SGAC on 10/15/2014. SGAC reviewed the student’s grade appeal material and professor's reply. The unanimous decision of the SGAC was that the original grade should be re-evaluated. SGAC members asked that the instructor to reconsider his/her decision.
2	10/13/2014	This case was received by Academic Senate on 10/13/15 and received by SGAC on 11/13/2014. SGAC reviewed the student’s grade appeal material and professor's reply. The unanimous decision of the SGAC was that the original grade should be re-evaluated.
3	3/14/2015	The case was received by SGAC on 3/14/2015. Student filed a request to withdraw the case on 3/30/15. The case was closed per the student’s request.
4	3/13/2015	The case was received by SGAC on 3/18/2015. SGAC reviewed the student’s grade appeal material and professor's reply. The unanimous decision of the SGAC Committee was to ask the instructor to consider giving the student the opportunity to resubmit an assignment that was in question. The committee also recommend the instructor to re-evaluate the final course grade based on the resubmitted assignment.

5	3/12/2015	This case was received by Academic Senate on 3/12/2015 and received by SGAC on 3/23/2014. SGAC reviewed the student's grade appeal material and professor's reply. The unanimous decision of the SGAC was that the case falls outside the scope of the Committee's purview, including the request to expunge the grade for the course. Therefore, no request for reconsideration will be made by the Committee for this grade.
6	4/9/2015	This case received an extension from the provost office. SGAC received the case on 4/9/2015. Student filed a request to withdraw the case on 4/10/2015. The case was closed per the student's request.
7	4/9/2015	This case received an extension from the provost office. SGAC received the case on 4/9/2015. Student filed a request to withdraw the case on 4/10/2015. The case was closed per the student's request.
8	4/9/2015	This case received an extension from the provost office. SGAC received the case on 4/9/2015. Student filed a request to withdraw the case on 4/13/2015. The case was closed per the student's request.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee members for the care and effort in ensuring that our students receive fair and equitable treatment.

cc. Dr. Graham Oberem, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Tiffany Boyd, ASI President
Dilcie D. Perez, Dean of Students
Adrienne Durso, Coordinator, Academic Senate