

**AGENDA**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**CSUSM Academic Senate**  
Wednesday ~ December 3, 2014 ~ 11:30 – 12:50 pm  
McMahan House

- I. **Approval of Agenda**
- II. **Approval of Minutes – 11/19/14**
- III. **Chair’s Report, [Laurie Stowell](#)**  
*NOTE: Today’s EC meeting will end at 12:50 PM.*  
  
**Referrals to Committee:**  
FAC: Social Work RTP Document
- IV. **Vice Chair’s Report, [Debbie Kristan](#)**
- V. **Provost’s Report, [Graham Oberem](#)**
- VI. **Vice Provost’s Report, [Kamel Haddad](#)**
- VII. **Consent Calendar (attached to Agenda)**
  - NEAC Recommendations
  - UCC Course/Program Change Proposals & Reconciliation
- VIII. **Presentations (none)**
- IX. **Discussion Items**
  - A. **Senate Officers: Resolution Honoring Marcia Woolf (attachment)**
  - B. **BLP/UCC: Global Business Management (GBM) (3 attachments)**
    - BLP Report on GBM
    - Catalog Copy for the Information Systems Track within GBM
    - UCC Report on the Information Systems Track within GBM
  - C. **BLP: Criminology & Justice Studies Expansion from Stateside to Self-Support (attachment)**
  - D. **FAC: Changing from Paper to All-Online Student Evaluations of Instruction**
- X. **Information Items**
  - A. **BLP: A-form Report – Computer Engineering, Software Engineering, Electrical Engineering Programs**
- XI. **EC Members Concerns & Announcements**

## REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

Committee	Description
FAC	Faculty Awards Policy (To update Harry E. Brakebill Distinguished Professor Award and Create new policy for Wang Family Excellence Award)
FAC	Professional Leave Policy (Update)
FAC	University Joint Hire Policy Guidelines (For preliminary discussion)
FAC	Social Work RTP Document

## CONSENT CALENDAR

### NEAC Recommendations

Committee	Seat & Term	Name(s)
Academic Senate	Part-time Lecturer 14-16	Nina Woodard
Academic Senate	Part-time Lecturer 14-16	Laura Mackey
Academic Senate	Part-time Lecturer 14-16	Dan Pynn
Academic Senate	Part-time Lecturer 14-16	Erica Duran
Student Affairs Committee	CSM 14-15	Najid Majd
Faculty Scholarship Committee	CEHHS-SHSHS 14-15	Deborah Morton
Graduation Steering Committee	Faculty At-large	Terry Metzger
Long-Range Academic Master Plan Taskforce	CHABSS 14-15	Kimberly Knowles-Yánez
Student Grade Appeals Committee (Alternate)	Faculty At-large 14-16	Richelle Swan

**UCC Course/Program Change Proposals & Reconciliation**

**Undergraduate**

SUBJ	No	New No.	Course/Program Title	Form Type	Originator	To UCC	UCC Action
BIOT	340		Biotechnology Basics	C	Daun Stansfield	10/20/14	11/5/14
BIOT	388		Topics in Biotechnology	C	Matt Escobar	10/20/14	11/5/14
FMST	P-2		Minor in Film Studies	P-2	Rebecca Lush	10/23/14	11/19/14
LTWR	P-2		Literature & Writing Studies Minor	P-2	Heidi Breuer	5/5/14	11/5/14
MATH	200		Mathematical Statistics for Nursing	C-2	Olaf Hansen	10/2/14	11/5/14
MATH	242		Introduction to Statistics	C-2	Olaf Hansen	10/2/14	11/5/14
MATH	314		Workshop: Math Education	C-2	Shahed Sharif	10/20/14	11/12/14
MLAN	350		Animation Film & Comp Global Imagination	C	Marion Geiger	10/23/14	11/19/14
VSAR	329		Documentary Production	C	Jonathan Berman	11/27/13	11/12/14

**Graduate**

SUBJ	No	New No.	Course/Program Title	Form Type	Originator	To UCC	UCC Action
NURS	532A		Adv Practice Mgmt in Mental Health Clients	C-2	Amy Carney	2/20/14	11/12/14
SLP	641A		Supervised Off-Campus Clinical Exp (2 units)	C	Sue Moineau	4/16/14	11/12/14
SLP	641B		Supervised Campus-based Clinical Exp (2 units)	C	Sue Moineau	4/16/14	11/12/14
SLP	642A		Supervised Off-Campus Clinical Exp (4 units)	C	Sue Moineau	4/16/14	11/12/14
SLP	642B		Supervised Campus-based Clinical Exp (4 units)	C	Sue Moineau	4/16/14	11/12/14

**RESOLUTION HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF OUR DISTINGUISHED COLLEAGUE  
MARCIA WOOLF**

WHEREAS, Marcia Woolf began her career with the California State University at the Office of the Chancellor in 1981; and

WHEREAS, Marcia Woolf joined the founding faculty and staff to launch the CSU's twenty-first campus, California State University San Marcos (CSUSM), on August 21, 1989 as Administrative Aide to Executive Vice President Richard Rush; and

WHEREAS, Marcia co-coordinated the ceremony in which Governor Deukmejian and Chancellor Reynolds signed the documents establishing CSUSM just ten days after her first day of work; and

WHEREAS, Among myriad tasks during her early days at Cal State Jerome's, Marcia helped organize CSUSM's burgeoning library collection; and

WHEREAS, Marcia employed her managerial acumen and administrative skills to establish policies and procedures as a Grants and Contracts Specialist at the CSUSM Foundation, where she provided exceptional support for faculty grant recipients for ten years; and

WHEREAS, Marcia's organizational talents plus her calm and patient demeanor were the perfect qualifications for taking on the challenging role of Academic Senate Coordinator in 2001; and

WHEREAS, Marcia improved the operations of the Academic Senate Office by developing procedures for her position, managing complex email distribution lists, recording meetings to back up her amazing memory and shorthand skills, developing an electronic filing system to archive and retrieve Senate business, designing and re-designing the Senate website, running elections in a fair and timely manner, and coordinating with other campus units and the CSU systemwide Academic Senate; and

WHEREAS, For 13 years, Marcia employed her considerable experience in cat-herding to corral and guide in the right direction a total of 39 Senate officers, 112 standing committee chairs, 793 committee members, 713 senators, and 4 parliamentarians; and

WHEREAS, Marcia organized, publicized, and attended every Executive Committee and Senate meeting, served as an essential member of the Senate's leadership team, became the go-to person for all matters related to university-level shared governance, and was the only non-senator allowed to remain in Senate meetings when the body went into Executive Session in confidential or crisis situations; and

WHEREAS, Marcia added a humorous spin to her interactions with faculty by spicing up the Executive Committee and Academic Senate agendas with hilarious *New Yorker* cartoons, thereby assuring that the agendas would at least be skimmed by their recipients; and

WHEREAS, Marcia could always be counted on to remain calm and efficient in the midst of chaos and looming deadlines; and

WHEREAS, Marcia's technical prowess spans more than two decades of technological advances, from bitnet meetings to clickers, from Doodle polls to Moodle folders, and from email lists to online elections; and

WHEREAS, Marcia boxed up and successfully moved the Senate office enough times to get into the *Guinness Book of World Records*; and

WHEREAS, Marcia actually ran the Academic Senate meetings with a system of looks, head nods, hand signals, and mouthed-but-unspoken words that every Senate chair committed to memory—or else read from the “What To Say, When” script that Marcia presented to each new chair; and

WHEREAS, Senate chairs learned to rely on “The Marcia Test” when confronted with especially controversial or sticky situations—if Marcia said, “That doesn't sound right,” the correct path was to find out more and re-think the Senate's next steps; and

WHEREAS, Marcia managed to keep the Senate office running like a well-oiled machine while simultaneously earning a B.A. in Literature and Writing Studies; and

WHEREAS, Marcia entered every Literature and Writing Studies classroom with a fierce desire to know—sharing with wit and generosity her insights, and never seeing her own perceptiveness and eloquence; and

WHEREAS, In her lucky-thirteenth year as Senate Coordinator, Marcia presided over the inaugural 'To Tell the Truthiness' game show at the Academic Assembly in January 2014; and

WHEREAS, Marcia used her incredible quilting skills to mend senators' broken hearts as well the holes in their brains; and

WHEREAS, Marcia always downplayed her own trials and tribulations while spear-heading support efforts for colleagues and friends in need; and

WHEREAS, It is difficult to imagine someone more in tune with the professional and personal needs of her colleagues than Marcia; and

WHEREAS, Marcia is the embodiment of an exemplary colleague—a responsive, caring, and dedicated professional; a classy individual with a wonderful spirit; and a model for us all; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That Marcia Woolf now and forever be considered Queen Extraordinaire of the Senate and Queen of Truthiness; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate of CSUSM thank her for her efforts towards the process of building this university from the ground up; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate recognize her faithful dedication and considerable contributions to shared governance at CSUSM; and be it further

RESOLVED, That her friends and colleagues from the Academic Senate and the entire CSUSM community, in which she has played such an integral role for 25 years, wish her the very best health, happiness, and peace in her retirement and in the many new adventures yet to be stitched into the magnificent quilt that is her life.

**Report from BLP**  
**Global Business Management**

Nov. 18, 2014

The Global Business Management Program in the College of Business Administration is an Option that is designed to equip students with skills and information to work with information systems and international and global environments. This is a repackaging of existing courses to address the growing trend of global business needs. Since the program consists of existing courses, which are covered in existing programs by existing faculty, there are not any new resources needs.

BLP recommends approval of the Global Business Management Program.

1 For the complete proposal, visit the Curriculum Review website, line 9:  
2

3 [http://www.csusm.edu/academic\\_programs/catalogcurricula/2014-15\\_curriculum\\_coba.html](http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/catalogcurricula/2014-15_curriculum_coba.html)  
4  
5  
6

## 7 Proposed Catalog Language for the 8 Global Business Management Option 9

### 10 11 *Global Business Management Option - Information Systems Track*

12 (51 units)

13 The IS track in the GBM Option is designed to equip students who are interested in helping  
14 firms manage their information systems while working in an international or global  
15 environment. An increasing number of firms, both small and large are operating in foreign  
16 countries in various capacities: direct sales, sourcing of supplies, working through distributors,  
17 entering into joint ventures, performing market research, coordinating subsidiary units for more  
18 efficient operations, and so on. The significant demands on firms to manage their information  
19 systems in this increasingly complex and interesting global environment requires students who  
20 understand both information systems and global business demands. The IS track within the  
21 GBM Option will prepare students to perform well in this kind of an environment.  
22

### 23 Foundations of Business Courses

24 (14 units)  
25

26	BUS 302	2
27	BUS 322	2
28	FIN 302*	2
29	OM 302*	2
30	MGMT 302*	2
31	MIS 302**	2
32	MKTG 302*	2

33  
34 \* Equivalent 4-unit courses can be substituted for these 2-unit courses. However, the excess  
35 units cannot count towards GBM electives.

36 \*\* MIS 304 can be substituted for MIS 302. The two excess units may be used for electives.  
37

### 38 GBM Core (16 units)

39	GBM 425	4
40	GBM 426	2
41	GBM 427	2
42	MGMT 461	4
43	MKTG 448	4

- 46 Electives (14 units)
- 47 MIS 308 Enterprise Systems (4 units)
- 48 MIS 408 Business Intelligence Systems (4 units)
- 49 MIS 411 Database Management (4 units)
- 50 MIS 425 Business Systems Development(4 units)
- 51 MIS 320 MIS Executive Seminar (2 units)
- 52 MIS 427 Multimedia in Business (4 units)
- 53 MIS 440 Electronic Commerce (4 units)
- 54 MIS 498 Independent Study (1-4 units)
- 55 MIS 481-5 Selected topics (1-4 units)
- 56
- 57 Capstone (4 units)
- 58 BUS 444 4
- 59
- 60 Senior Experience (3 units)
- 61 BUS 495 3
- 62
- 63 or Global Management Experience (3 units)
- 64 GBM 497 3
- 65
- 66 ***Foreign Language Proficiency Exam***
- 67 Students will be required to demonstrate proficiency at the advanced level in at least one
- 68 foreign language. For details, see [www.csusm.edu/gbm](http://www.csusm.edu/gbm)
- 69
- 70

### **Report from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), GBM**

In Oct. 2014, UCC reviewed a P-form to create a new Information Systems Track within the Global Business Management Option of the BS in Business Administration in order to provide GBM students with expertise in systems integration and business intelligence, which are two areas of great demand at this time. The total units required for the IS track is 14 and can be selected from a number of upper division MIS options. No new courses have been developed at this time as the IS track will run with existing courses. There was therefore no new curriculum to review with this P form proposal. UCC worked with the proposer to complete minor revisions and the proposal was passed unanimously by the UCC.

1 **Report from BLP**

2 **P-form: B.A. Criminology and Justice Studies: Expansion from Stateside Support to Self-Support**

3  
4 **November 18, 2014**

5  
6 The budget and Long Range Planning Committee (BLP) has reviewed the proposed expansion of the  
7 state supported B.A. in Criminology and Justice Studies to self-support at the CSUSM Temecula campus.  
8 We thank program spokes-person Kristin Bates for her input and assistance as we reviewed the program  
9 expansion's resource implications.

10  
11 **Program Demand:**

12 The existing state supported program recently received an "excellent" rating from campus and external  
13 reviewers. It has grown from a small cluster of students to 800 majors in 2014. Surveys conducted at the  
14 local community college, Mt. San Jacinto, indicate strong support for a program offering this degree in  
15 Temecula during the week. The survey also indicated students' preference for face to face and hybrid  
16 courses, along with a desire to stay in their community. The recent review highlighted the program's  
17 emphasis on critical thinking and awareness of community inequalities and experiences with law  
18 enforcement institutions. Graduates of the state supported program have been hired in various  
19 positions in Southwest Riverside County, the result being specific requests for CSUSM graduates to fill  
20 other positions.

21  
22 **Resource Implications:**

23 *Faculty:*

24 The Self Support budget includes 2 new faculty hires and funds for additional lecturers. New hires and  
25 current tenure track faculty will also teach in the Temecula program to ensure students receive a  
26 program from diverse faculty.

27  
28 *Space and Equipment:*

29 There is sufficient space and equipment in the existing CSUSM sites in Temecula for the expansion of  
30 this program.

31  
32 *IITS:*

33 IITS reports that there would be no measurable impact on IITS support. Currently one person staffs  
34 Temecula every day to address issues with smart classrooms. In the self-support budget, IITS receives  
35 the usual 1.5% of the revenue from self-support programs.

36  
37 *Staff:*

38 All staff advising and staff assistance for this program is funded by EL. Staff advising (including transcript  
39 reviews) will continue to be handled by EL staff; EL also provides additional staff for the Department on  
40 an as-needed basis.

41  
42 *Library:*

43 Having recently undergone four years of program review and two sub-change reviews by WASC,  
44 capacity questions have been thoroughly vetted in careful consultation with Allison Carr, the library  
45 faculty who supports the sociology department. There is a currently a book delivery process to the  
46 Temecula campus. Since this is an existing program, current subscriptions are sufficient. There is no  
47 money earmarked for the library in the budget. The addition of this program will add workload to some  
48 degree. The Library conducts yearly assessments to determine what, if any, additional Library

49 subscription and monograph needs require funding from EL. The assessment should also include  
50 workload implications.  
51  
52 BLP recommends approval of the program.

1 Faculty Affairs Committee  
2 Changing from Paper to All-Online Student Evaluations of Instruction  
3 December 3, 2014

---

4 **Overview**

5 The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) was asked to consider the plan of the Office of Institutional  
6 Planning and Assessment (IPA) to make all student evaluations of instruction online. FAC has  
7 investigated and discussed the matter over the last three semesters. FAC fully understands the  
8 significant role that student evaluations of instruction play in the professional development of  
9 all faculty and FAC's responsibility to represent faculty interests. After careful consideration,  
10 FAC has voted to recommend that the Academic Senate approve the change from paper to all-  
11 online student evaluations of instruction for all courses.

12  
13 FAC has noted the general trend in the CSU toward electronic documents. Recently, the CBA  
14 has moved in favor of the electronic storage of files related to faculty, and for example, the CBA  
15 now allows for the electronic storage of faculty Personnel Action Files (PAF). Regarding student  
16 evaluations of instruction, there appears to be significant movement in the CSU towards  
17 changing from paper to online systems. In 2010, San Francisco State University (SFSU)  
18 conducted an informal survey: of the twenty-two CSU campuses other than SFSU, sixteen  
19 responded about the using an online delivery method of course evaluations. Thirteen of sixteen  
20 (81.25%) responding CSU campuses are using or piloting online course evaluation tools.  
21 ([http://senate.sfsu.edu/committee/online-eval/OCE06\\_scan](http://senate.sfsu.edu/committee/online-eval/OCE06_scan)). Notably, in Fall 2013, SFSU  
22 launched its online evaluation initiative with an impressive 79.23% response rate for 130,697  
23 surveys.

24 **Pilot Project (Office Institutional Planning and Assessment)**

25 FAC was referred this matter in fall 2013 and began consulting with the Office of Institutional  
26 Planning and Assessment, which manages student evaluations of instruction on our campus.  
27 Working with Matthew Ceppi, FAC gathered information about IPA's goal of changing to all  
28 online student evaluations. FAC requested that IPA run a pilot program, which they did in Fall  
29 2013. The pilot included faculty who volunteered to participate. The following table reports the  
30 results.

31

	<b>Enrollment</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Response Rate</b>	<b>Comment Responses</b>	<b>Comment Rate</b>
<b>Fall 2013 (Online)</b>	1027	435	42.4%	318	73.1%
<b>Fall 2012 (Paper)</b>	586	385	65.7%	231	60.0%

32  
33 The sample was not large, thus the results cannot be considered conclusive. Also, the method  
34 piloted was not the exact method that is envisioned for the future (that method was not yet

35 developed and so could not be tested). FAC's discussion went beyond the results of the pilot to  
36 discuss three principal issues in the scholarly literature/research comparing online and paper  
37 student evaluations of instruction: response rates, quantity of student comments, and the  
38 intensity of positive and negative responses.

### 39 Pro and Con List

40 As a way to capture the input of FAC members and the committee's efforts to gather and  
41 process information, the committee developed a list of arguments supporting the change to all-  
42 online evaluations and arguments against the change to all-online evaluations.

#### 43 *PRO*

- 44 1. Flexible time for students rather than specific class time: Online evaluations offer  
45 students a convenient window of time to complete the form. Students can choose  
46 when to complete the evaluation.  
47
- 48 2. Less cost relative to paper evaluations: Online evaluations may save as much as 50  
49 percent (staff time, printing, distributing, scanning, filing, archiving, etc.).  
50
- 51 3. Eco-Friendly relative to paper evaluations: Changing to an all-online system would  
52 save paper, which would be consistent with the institution's "green" initiatives.  
53
- 54 4. The sample is closer to the entire population of a class, given that students who do  
55 not attend may complete the online evaluation.  
56
- 57 5. Possibly more written feedback compared to paper evaluations: Completing the  
58 evaluations online could encourage more written feedback because students would  
59 be able to type their comments.  
60
- 61 6. Good response rates can result if advertisement of the evaluation is done well: With  
62 careful planning and management, the decline in response rates associated with the  
63 transition to online evaluations may be mitigated.  
64
- 65 7. Likely faster process relative to paper evaluations: The process of administering  
66 paper-based evaluations is lengthy and time consuming, from administering the  
67 forms to collecting, scanning, and analyzing the results, to distributing reports.  
68
- 69 8. Higher quality of data relative to paper evaluations: Online evaluations provide more  
70 anonymity than paper evaluation forms. Students may worry that instructors can  
71 trace the feedback to them and so they may be less open and honest in their  
72 assessments. Online evaluations also can allow students more time to reflect and  
73 compose their feedback.

74 **CON**

- 75 1. Response rates may decline, especially at first. Various studies show that, for a  
76 variety of reasons, the rate of participation in online evaluations can be significantly  
77 lower than in-class paper evaluations.  
78
- 79 2. Instructor’s role changes. With the current system, the instructor decides on the  
80 most appropriate time to administer the paper evaluations within the university-  
81 scheduled period for evaluation. In the new system of all on-line evaluations, the  
82 instructor may not have much or any discretion about when the evaluation would be  
83 completed because the process would be administered centrally.  
84
- 85 3. The evaluation sample will be different. With paper evaluations, the sample is  
86 comprised of students attending class.  
87
- 88 4. Despite built-in safeguards in the electronic evaluation program, someone other  
89 than the student could complete the form, or students could work together on the  
90 form.  
91
- 92 5. Even small mistakes or errors may invalidate the entire course evaluation poll. For  
93 example, the evaluations would be invalidated if the poll mistakenly remains open  
94 after advertised date.  
95
- 96 6. Online evaluations may be perceived as less adequate (less accurate) by faculty who  
97 are unfamiliar with online methods and who prefer the traditional in-class paper  
98 version.  
99
- 100 7. Low response rates may negatively affect lecturer faculty, for whom student  
101 evaluations of instruction are typically a significant factor used to evaluate their  
102 performance.

103 **Summary Charts**

104 The two charts below report various details about the paper and all-online systems compare.

105

	<b>Current Paper System</b>	<b>All-Online System</b>
Modality	In class	Online, custom Cougar Courses environment
Software	“Class Climate” scantron license; scanners	“Class Climate” online license
Cost	Paper, envelopes, staff time	Annual hard cost savings: \$17,400 (not including staff)
Response rate per semester Fall 2013 Pilot/Fall 2012 comparison group	(Real) 65.7% (586 students/paper)	(Projected) 42.4% (1027 students/electronic)

106  
107

	<b>Current Paper System</b>	<b>All Online System</b>
Distribution	IPA generates packets for each course	IPA collaborates with IITS to maintain online system
Evaluation of Online courses	Evaluated using standard questions but in a separate online system	All-online courses would be evaluated using the same system as all other courses.
Questions—standardized; optional custom	Standard questions, approved by the Academic Senate. Faculty have opportunity to add customized questions to the standard list.	Same standardized questions. Faculty still have opportunity to add customized questions to the standard list.
Administration of evaluation	Faculty member selects date to administer paper evaluations in the time between when they receive the evaluation packets and the last day of class	Students receive notification through campus email (not Cougar Courses because not all classes regularly use Cougar Courses) to access evaluation in separate secure Cougar Courses server. Measures to increase response rate are currently in development.
	Student proctors administer evaluation and return packet to drop box	In order to assure the integrity of the process, IPA will solely be responsible for communication with students.
	Faculty receive summary data for each class and comparative data in separate PDFs. Faculty <u>do not</u> receive completed evaluation forms; comments are scanned, collated and provided to faculty.	Faculty receive summary data for each class and comparative data in separate PDFs. Faculty will receive a digital file for each class containing all data for each evaluation, with comments appearing in connection to the other data (not separated).

108  
109

## Additional Recommendations to Improve the Evaluation Instrument and Process

- FAC recommends to IPA that the process where faculty have the option to add customized questions be improved to make it more convenient, efficient, and reliable for faculty. All faculty must be notified of the deadline to submitting customized questions, and must be provided with a reasonable amount of time before the deadline. The portal for providing customized questions must be user-friendly, the customized questions must be correctly presented and fully integrated into the evaluation instrument. And of course it is fundamental that any customized question data be accurately recorded. IPA could collaborate with the Faculty Center to hold regular workshops to encourage faculty to learn how to use the new system and customize the student evaluations in ways that inform faculty professional development and the continuous improvement of courses.
- FAC recommends to IPA that as a part of the change to a new all-online evaluation system, IPA provide faculty with a digital file for each class, including individual evaluations completed, with both the data and any written comments. Currently, faculty receive a compilation of hand written comments, excised from the rest of the forms and compiled together. The fact that the comment data are separated from the other data provided on the form significantly reduces the value of the written comments for faculty who strive to identify strengths in their courses and also aspects that could be improved.
- FAC recommends that the Academic Senate create a special committee to review and assess the first two semesters of online evaluations, and report its findings to the Senate.
- FAC recommends that the Academic Senate conduct a thorough assessment of the existing evaluation instrument. It has been several years since the last revision of the instrument and new modalities of course delivery, including completely on-line courses and flipped classrooms, should prompt faculty to think critically about the possible need to revise the evaluation instrument so that it reflects new technology and the pedagogies associated with them.
- FAC encourages all faculty to go beyond the university student evaluation of instruction and conduct their own, separate classroom assessment techniques such as customized mid semester evaluations or end-of-semester reflection. The university evaluations are necessary, but faculty at all career stages can benefit from experimenting with other ways to gather data about how to improve student learning.

150 **Conclusion**

151

152 The Faculty Affairs Committee thanks the Office of Institutional Planning and Assessment for  
153 their collaboration as FAC has deliberated on this matter. FAC welcomes faculty consideration  
154 of the issues that are related to the transition to all online evaluations, but we encourage  
155 faculty to focus on the benefits and opportunities, which we believe will be evident in the short  
156 term.

157 FAC encourages senators to approve the motion below:

158 *The Academic Senate endorses the adoption of single online system for student*  
159 *evaluations of instruction for all courses (online, face-to-face, flipped, hybrid, etc.). The*  
160 *Academic Senate will continue to collaborate actively with the Office of Institutional*  
161 *Planning and Assessment as this system is implemented and assessed over time.*

1  
2 **Report**

3 **A-Form Report: Computer Engineering, Software Engineering, Electrical Engineering Programs**

4  
5 **Context**

6 The purpose of these A-forms is to propose the addition of 3 new baccalaureate degree programs – Computer  
7 Engineering, Software Engineering, and Electrical Engineering -- to the University Academic Master Plan (UAMP). Over  
8 the past 25 years, CSUSM has often been approached about the possibility of offering engineering program. Recently,  
9 developments in North County, notably an RFP from the city of Carlsbad and a U.S. Department of Labor grant awarded  
10 to Mira Costa College, indicate growing interest and opportunity for CSUSM to explore the feasibility of establishing  
11 engineering programs. Business and local economic development groups have indicated verbally and in writing that if  
12 CSUSM places pertinent engineering programs on its master plan, these groups will partner financially with the  
13 university to support the feasibility studies needed to ultimately determine what CSUSM might be able to offer and how  
14 such programs could be funded and sustained. Although the College of Science and Mathematics initially intended to  
15 propose a more general program with possible options, the Chancellor’s Office requested that specific programs be  
16 proposed; therefore, there are three A-forms and each program will be named on the UAMP. It should be noted that  
17 the proposed programs build upon existing elements of current programmatic offerings in Physics and Computer  
18 Science.

19  
20 Pursuant to the outcomes of the feasibility report, and as an act of good faith that with appropriate start-up funding and  
21 reasonable resources to sustain the programs, they would be considered as possible additions to the university’s  
22 academic offerings, these A-forms are being submitted to place the programs on the UAMP. This does not mean that  
23 they will automatically be invited to submit P-forms. As a reminder, the UAMP must be approved by the Chancellor’s  
24 office. Any resultant P-forms must be approved by college and university committees, as well as the academic senate.

25  
26 Depending on the outcome of the feasibility report and the availability of funding, the three programs may have  
27 different launch dates; however, for purpose of review, the three programs are being considered as a package. Electrical  
28 engineers research, design, develop, test, or supervise the manufacturing and installation of electrical equipment,  
29 components, or systems for commercial industrial, military, or scientific use. Software engineers apply engineering  
30 principles to the design, development, and implementation, integration and maintenance of large software systems.  
31 Computer Engineering, itself, is a blend of computer science and electrical engineering that focuses on the integration of  
32 software and hardware. In other words, while there are specialists in each area, the three programs are intertwined and  
33 interconnected in ways that necessitate their consideration as a “package.”

34  
35 **Demand**

36  
37 CSUSM’s service area and region has a high concentration of technology-based firms. Projections for regional and state  
38 growth, as well as national trends, indicate a need for an additional one million STEM degrees in the next decade  
39 (*Engage to Excel National Report*). The Bureau of Labor and Statistics projects a 22% growth outlook for software  
40 engineers and a 7% growth for computer engineers from 2012-2020. The Bureau of Labor and Statistics also reports that  
41 California is the state with the highest employment level in electrical engineering in the nation, based on employment  
42 per thousand jobs. However, California is far below the national average in awarding recent bachelor degrees in science  
43 or engineering.

44  
45 **Resources**

46  
47 The resources for the Engineering Programs, including faculty, support staff, equipment, and laboratory space, will be  
48 carefully explored in a feasibility study that would be commissioned upon approval of the A-form, which places the  
49 programs on the UAMP. The cost of the study would be funded by external sources, such as donors and industry  
50 partners. Further, each program A-form indicates that, “The funding for faculty, staff, infrastructure, equipment and  
51 supplies, laboratory space, and all other related resources will be funded entirely by a combination of federal grants and  
52 donations from industry as well as private foundations for the first five years of the degree. It is expected that the

53 program will be supported by student enrollment growth from Year 5 and beyond and that the program will continue to  
54 seek external resources. Any P-form that results will reaffirm these two premises.”

55  
56 Preliminary cost and revenue projections for software and computer engineering indicate that it could be self-sustaining  
57 after the first five years. Electrical engineering program would likely need continued support from outside resources to  
58 be sustainable.

59  
60 BLP recommends that these programs be approved for placement on the UAMP.

61  
62