

AGENDA
Executive Committee Meeting
CSUSM Academic Senate
Wednesday, March 25, 2015, 12:00 N – 1:50 PM
KEL 5207 – Provost's Conference Room

- I. **Approval of Agenda**
- II. **Approval of Minutes – 3/18/15**
- III. **Chair's Report, [Laurie Stowell](#)**
Referrals to Committee:
- IV. **Vice Chair's Report, [Debbie Kristan](#)**
- V. **Secretary's Report, [Vivienne Bennett](#)**
- VI. **Provost's Report, [Graham Oberem](#)**
- VII. **Vice Provost's Report, [Kamel Haddad](#)**
- VIII. **ASI Board Meeting Update, [Melanie Chu](#)**
- IX. **ASCSU Update, [David Barsky](#)**
- X. **Discussion Items**
 - A. **FAC: Final Review – Application for Salary Increases for Market or Equity Purposes** (attachment) **Page 2**
 - B. **Senate Officers: Draft Resolution in Support of AS-3197-14 – The need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom** (2 attachments)
 - ASCSU: The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom **Page 6**
 - Senate Officers: DRAFT Resolution in Support of AS-3197-14, The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom **Page 10**
 - C. **FAC: Emeritus Policy** (attachment) **Page 11**
 - D. **GEC: GE New Course Certification Request** (2 attachments)
 - Current GE New Course Certification Request **Page 21**
 - Updated GE New Course Certification Request **Page 24**
 - E. **Senate Chair: Diversity Mapping Actions Assigned to Senate** (President's Memo w/Diversity Mapping Action Matrix attached) **Page 28**
- XI. **EC Members Concerns & Announcements**

The Next EC Meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 8, 2015, 11:30 AM – 12:50 PM, COMMONS 206

1 **FAC**

2 **Revision to “Application For Salary Increase For Market ~~Or Equity~~ Purposes”**

3

4 Rationale:

5 *The document must be revised to cohere with the new CBA.*

6 *CBA Article 31.25 allows for market increases, as written by the policy. However, the inclusion*
7 *of the word “equity” is incorrect, as 31.25 is market based only. (Equity has to be raised by the*
8 *contract. For example, the new CBA provides for equity, and also, fortunately, allows for*
9 *campuses to address equity.) Therefore, all references to “equity” in the document have been*
10 *struck. This is the only change to the document.*

11

12 **Application For Salary Increase For Market ~~Or~~ Equity Purposes**

Definition:	The process for applying for market or equity -based salary increases shall be governed by the Application for Salary Increase for Market or Equity Purposes.
Authority:	The collective bargaining agreement between the California State University and the California Faculty Association
Scope:	Faculty unit employees of CSU San Marcos
Responsible Division:	Academic Affairs
Approval Date:	06/18/2002
Implementation Date:	07/01/1997
Originally Implemented:	07/01/1997
Signature Page/PDF:	View Signatures for Application For Salary Increase For Market Or Equity Purposes Policy

13

14 **Procedure**

15 **APPLICATION FOR SALARY INCREASE FOR MARKET ~~OR~~ EQUITY PURPOSES**

16 NAME: _____ DATE: _____

17 PROGRAM/COLLEGE: _____ Check one: TENURED
18 _____ PROBATIONARY _____

19 YEAR HIRED: _____

20 RANK AT WHICH HIRED: _____

21 CURRENT RANK: _____

22 Is this a MARKET REQUEST _____ OR EQUITY REQUEST _____ (Check one)

23 JUSTIFICATION FOR REQUEST

24

25 ~~For a market request, please attach appropriate documentation supporting the market-~~
26 ~~based salary lag or a bona fide offer of employment. For an equity request, supporting~~
27 ~~documentation is strongly encouraged.~~

28 Decision needed by (Market application only): _____

These procedures implement the Market/~~Equity~~ policies established in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between The Board of Trustees of The California State University and The California Faculty Association Unit 3 - Faculty, within Articles **31.25 and 31.26**. The key elements of this article are:

The President may grant a salary increase to a probationary or tenured faculty unit employee to address market ~~or equity~~ considerations. Such increases shall not be bound by the eight (8) service increases **referenced in provision 31.18**. Applications for market-based increases shall normally be accompanied by documentation supporting the market-based salary lag or a bona-fide offer of employment **from another college or University**. The decision to grant an exceptional market ~~or equity~~ adjustment and the amount of the increase to be granted shall not be subject to grievance procedure. **CBA 31.25**

PROCEDURES FOR MARKET/~~EQUITY~~ SALARY INCREASE APPLICATIONS

Academic units with a department structure:
Applications for market ~~or equity~~ adjustments shall be submitted by the faculty member to the department chair, with a copy to the President or designee, on forms provided by the President or designee. It is the responsibility of the department chair to route the application through the appropriate review process.

Applications shall be reviewed separately by a department committee of tenured faculty **and the department chair**, ~~elected by the tenure-line faculty of the department. The department chair shall also review the application, and~~ **with the department chair forwarding both recommendations** ~~shall forward both recommendations~~ to the President or designee.

Academic units without a department structure:
Applications for market ~~or equity~~ adjustments shall be submitted by the faculty member to the Dean/Senior Director of the College/Library/Unit, with a copy to the President or designee, on forms provided by the President or designee. It is the responsibility of the Dean/Senior Director of the College/Library/Unit to route the application through the appropriate review process. Applications shall be reviewed separately by a unit committee of tenured faculty elected by the tenure-line faculty of the unit. The committee shall forward its recommendation directly to the President or designee.

The president or designee may request a recommendation from the Dean/Senior Director of the College/Library/Unit.

All recommendations to the President or designee shall be written, and copies shall be provided to the applicant.

Upon written request by the CFA campus Chapter President to the President at a campus, the President or designee shall provide a list once each year to the CFA of the faculty members on each campus who have received a market adjustment, and the amount of increase granted.

67 **CAMPUS CALENDAR**

68 Applications for ~~an~~ a market increase must be submitted no later than March 15. To be
69 considered outside this calendar, applications must be accompanied by a bona fide offer of
70 employment. Decisions regarding application for market adjustment (accompanied by a
71 bona fide offer) will be made in a timely manner.

72 ~~Applications for an equity increase must be submitted no later than March 15.~~
73 Recommendations from the tenured faculty committee and the department chair (or
74 equivalent) are due to the President or designee no later than April 15.

75 The decision of the President or designee will be made no later than the last day of the
76 semester.

77

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-3197-14/FA (Rev)
November 5-6, 2014

**THE NEED FOR A COMPREHENSIVE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY POLICY ON
ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its constitutional responsibility “to advance the principles of academic freedom and freedom of inquiry...,”¹; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Trustees to draft a comprehensive California State University (CSU) policy on academic freedom in collaboration with ASCSU faculty representatives; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge that this new policy explicitly and directly address all three main principles of the 1940 AAUP statement on Academic Freedom and its 1970 interpretation²; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge that this comprehensive policy consider both past omissions and contemporary issues related to academic freedom³, including but not limited to the right of faculty to:
- a) teach; conduct research; explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression; reach conclusions according to one's scholarly discernment; and publish free of institutional restraint and external constraints other than those normally implied by the scholarly standards of a discipline.
 - b) freely conduct extramural activities beyond the classroom in service to their scholarly discipline, students, university community, and society at large.
 - c) freely exchange ideas and research findings in different formats, including electronic communications, without fear of violation of their privacy⁴.
 - d) freely express their views on public matters (for example, via social media) as public intellectuals without fear of retaliation from the university administration.

¹ASCSU Constitution
http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/About_the_Senate/documents/ASCSU_Constitution_2013_Revision.pdf

²<http://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure>

³We recognize that academic freedom is directly related to membership in the academic profession, which carries with it special responsibilities. See: AAUP “Statement on Professional Ethics.” <http://www.aaup.org/report/statement-professional-ethics> and AAUP statement on “Civility” <http://www.aaup.org/issues/civility>

⁴See AAUP statement on “Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications.” <http://www.aaup.org/report/academic-freedom-and-electronic-communications>

And University of California, Los Angeles, Faculty Resource Guide for California Public Records Requests
<https://www.apo.ucla.edu/resources/recordrequest>

- e) address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance⁵.
- f) ensure the full protections of the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of California, and the CSU mission; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Chancellor, CSU campus Presidents, CSU campus Senate Chairs, CSU Provosts/Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, California Faculty Association, CSU Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association, California State Student Association, American Association of University Professors.

RATIONALE: *The last formal statement on academic freedom for the California State University, formulated in 1971, reads:*

“a. The teacher is entitled to full freedom in teaching and in the publication of the results, subject to adequate performance of other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution.

b. The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing any subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject.”

Apart from the datedness of the masculine pronoun, the 1971 policy demands rethinking in light of the many developments over the last 40 years that have both broadened the scope of academic work and responsibilities and redefined the public expectations of what a university is and does. It also warrants rethinking in terms of the challenges to academic freedom faced by the CSU and its faculty.

Some of the developments that have broadened the scope of academic work and responsibilities include:

- *the global expansion of higher education;*
- *developments in communication technology that enable, and in fact encourage, scholars and students to function within global professional, research, and civic networks;*
- *the broader expectations attendant on academic scholars in their role as “public intellectuals” (with accompanying pressures that bear on their behavior and pronouncements inside as well as, and especially, outside of the classroom); and*

⁵AAUP statement: “Protecting an Independent Faculty Voice: Academic Freedom after Garcetti v. Ceballos”
<http://www.aaup.org/report/protecting-independent-faculty-voice-academic-freedom-after-garcetti-v-ceballos>
University of Oregon <http://policies.uoregon.edu/node/218>
University of Wisconsin <http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/2010/0301/2186.pdf>
University of Minnesota http://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/policies/Academic_Freedom.pdf
University of California <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/aar/jule.pdf>

- *the expansion of international programs and scholarly and student exchanges, with the concomitant potential for geopolitical pressures on universities and faculty.*

In addition, public expectations regarding the nature and role of the university itself have evolved significantly over the last 40 years. The expansion of expectations of a large public university such as the CSU--from a community of teachers and students to a complex institution functioning at the intersection of diverse worlds, interests, and investments (intellectual, economic, social, political, as well as local, regional, national, and global in scope)--opens the university as well as its faculty to intensified scrutiny and potential interference from a wide variety of quarters and in pursuit of a variety of agendas.

The 1940 AAUP policy, reaffirmed in 1970, includes three components, the first two are reflected directly in the CSU policy, but the following component is not explicitly addressed:

College and university teachers are citizens, members of a learned profession, and officers of an educational institution. When they speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.⁶

The 1971 CSU policy is too limited in scope to deal with potential challenges presented by activities such as faculty's participation in extramural pursuits beyond the classroom, faculty's use of electronic communications, faculty's public expressions via social media, faculty's role in shared governance, or external requests for access to faculty electronic communications. The lack of a clear policy has the dangerous potential of faculty self-censorship. The lack of a comprehensive policy on academic freedom has left CSU faculty at the mercy of different interpretations and implementations of the principles of academic freedom.

The CSU cannot afford to have a policy on Academic Freedom that is insufficient for the 21st century. The mission of the institutions of higher education is serving society by discovering, investigating, communicating, and preserving knowledge by educating students and the larger society. This mission cannot be fulfilled without freedom of teaching, research, and communication inside and outside of the classroom.

In summary, the wording and content of the policy is outdated and insufficient, as the nature of academic activity has changed. Our policy should be regularly reviewed and,

⁶<http://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure>

if needed, revised to reflect such changes, as is done by other major universities⁷. We want to be proactive, updating the policy to reflect best practices and address components of academia in the 21st century. As the largest public university system in the United States, the CSU is often a leader in higher education, but our current policy is behind the times, as it does not fully reflect the content of the 1940 AAUP statement nor advancements in area of academic freedom since then.

Approved – January 23, 2015

⁷Some examples of best practices could be found at:

University of Oregon <http://policies.uoregon.edu/node/218>

University of Wisconsin <http://www.secfac.wisc.edu/senate/2010/0301/2186.pdf>

University of Minnesota http://regents.umn.edu/sites/regents.umn.edu/files/policies/Academic_Freedom.pdf

University of California <http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/aar/jule.pdf>

DRAFT Resolution in Support of AS-3197-14
The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy
On Academic Freedom

WHEREAS: The last formal statement on academic freedom for the California State University was formulated in 1971, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of California State University San Marcos endorse AS 3197-14, "The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom," which was passed by the Academic Senate of the California State University on January 23 2015; and be it finally

RESOLVED: That this resolution be forwarded to the CSU Board of Trustees, Chancellor White, the CSU Academic Senate, the CSU San Marcos President Haynes and each CSU Campus Academic Senate.

Faculty Affairs Committee
Faculty Emeritus Policy

Executive Committee:

Please note that the marginal comments are for EC's reference only and would be deleted in the version for the Senate. Please read them carefully-- FAC wrote them for you!

Rationale:

FAC was charged with a revision of the Faculty Emeritus Policy to clarify eligibility, criteria and suggest a time line. Informal review of other CSU practices revealed eligibility criteria of 10 years minimum service (15 of 22 campuses responded). Criteria for tenure or rank, lecturer, distinguished records, active FERPer all ranged widely at the different campuses. Procedures for documentation and review committees also varied across campuses.

FAC conducted a survey of all CSUSM TT and lecturer faculty (October 2014) on whether the emeritus award should be based on distinguished record (competitive) or non-competitive. The 120 responses were evenly divided.

- 63 (52.5%) criteria for recommendations should be competitive*
- 57 (47.5%) criteria for recommendation should not be competitive*

FAC was guided by faculty comments and suggestions in the survey in this proposed revision.

- Faculty wanted clear and transparent criteria that was inclusive, not setting a bar that was exceptionally high but one where faculty clearly had contributed to the University over time.*
- Faculty wanted established campus-wide procedures for nomination and recommendation and that nominations could come from outside the department.*
- Faculty wanted the review to be based on the established record of the nominee as well as the nomination letter. There should be no limit to the number of emeritus titles in any given year.*

Of those preferring a noncompetitive approach, comments noted that all who receive tenure and have more than 10 years on the campus are deserving of the title and that some campuses routinely bestow emeritus on retiring faculty. One concern was expressed where a review committee did not agree with nominators. Concern was expressed about repercussion between the retiree and the university for those denied emeritus status.

FAC was also informed by the resolution of the CSU Academic Senate (January 23, 2014). This resolution, which was passed unanimously, expressed support for the inclusion of criteria for lecturers in all campus faculty emeritus policies
<http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2013-2014/documents/3157.shtml>

As a result of careful deliberation on the survey results and emeritus policies from other CSU campuses¹, FAC believes that it has found a balanced way to refine the criteria for this award (the title of emeritus is an honor, not a contractual entitlement).

This policy clarifies that the emeritus award may be granted to any Unit 3 faculty member regardless of classification, as long as they have served the campus with distinction for 10 years or

Comment [c1]: How to handle the xls in the senate agenda?

¹ This is provided for Senator's information.

more within the terms of their job classification. The emeritus review committee within the discipline, department, or program is in the best position to review the record of the nominee on the distinguished professional record for his or her job.

Also:

- Hunt reported on 1/16/15 that the Provost would like the rule to be that faculty have only one year following retirement to be nominated. On 2/9/15, FAC discussed the matter, and found that this would be too restrictive. FAC created language that attempts to strike a balance.
- FAC clarifies that this document only addresses faculty emerita/emeritus status; it does not address administrator emeritus status.
- As a result of its deliberation on this policy, FAC recommends that all retired faculty be given the opportunity to continue their campus email account.

Summary of Major Changes:

- Created a review cycle that occurs once per Academic Year. FAC has modified the document to specify that the review cycle for emeritus status takes place only once each AY. This is a significant change, and is necessary as the university grows and more Unit 3 employees are likely to be nominated for emeritus status. FAC's revisions to the document clarify the process at every level and sees this streamlining of the process as beneficial to all involved. FAC is fully aware that this once-a-year cycle means that most faculty members will receive emeritus status in the year after they retire. FAC has written into the document that "Normally, the nomination for emerita/emeritus status occurs within one year of retirement."
- Added a separate category for coaches, for clarity. Coaches are Unit 3 employees.
- Added Eligibility for Part time Unit 3 faculty. This change allows eligibility for non-tenure track librarians and SSP-ARs. This is a substantive change, and is in line with the principle of including all unit 3 employees.
- Separated the "Procedures" section into "Nominations Procedures" and "Selection Procedures." The nomination process and the selection process are explained more fully.
- Criteria were updated. The award of emeritus status is not automatic; the standard of distinguished service allows flexibility depending on the nominee's job category and individual career accomplishment.

The criteria in the current document reads as follows:

When formally recommending a faculty member for emeritus status, the representative committee of the relevant academic unit must demonstrate that the candidate has achieved excellence in the performance of his or her appropriate professional duties in all of the areas of normal review.

FAC has deleted this and replaced it with a more full explanation of criteria. Further, FAC notes that:

Comment [c2]: Moineau asked: What happens in the year waiting period? Can the faculty member be granted access to the library, etc., or is there always a one year period where they may have to wait if the paperwork is not filed in time?

An innovation in this revised document is to standardize the process for all involved, so that it cycles once per year, and not on demand.

Yes, the result is that if one missed the deadline, one would have to wait. However, please note FAC's recommendation that email access continue after retirement, upon request.

Also please FAC's approach in response to the provost's request (line 40). FAC writes: Normally, the nomination for emerita/emeritus status occurs within one year of retirement.

Comment [c3]: Someone in EC commented that coaches were ineligible before but now they are. That is not correct. The current document would allow coaches, but it did not do so explicitly. FAC added the explicit language.

87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

- *FAC did not change the two phrases from the preamble: “distinguished service to the academic community” or “served the University with distinction.”*
- *FAC did modify the phrase “contributed continuously” to “sustained contributions throughout their career and have a distinguished professional record.” We did this because the current policy allows temporary Unit 3 faculty to be eligible if they have served for at least 10 years in full-time or have accumulated part-time service equivalent to 10 years of full-time service to CSUSM.” Thus, we realized that the term “continuously” was inaccurate. Note that FAC proposes to extend the same eligibility to part-time Unit 3 employees.*

101

Definition:	This policy describes eligibility, procedure, privileges, and criteria for awarding emeritus status to permanently retired faculty.
Authority:	The President of the University
Scope:	CSUSM Faculty.

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

Karen S. Haynes, President

Approval Date

110

111

112

113

114

Graham Oberem, Provost

Approval Date

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

First Revision:

129

Implemented: April 17, 2000

130

131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172

I. Preamble

~~Faculty Emerita~~/Emeritus status is an honorary title awarded for distinguished service to the academic community. The President (or designee) shall bestow the title ~~on a of Full Professor Emeritus, Associate Professor Emeritus, Lecturer Emeritus, Full Librarian Emeritus, Associate Librarian Emeritus, Counselor Emeritus, or Coach Emeritus upon a Unit 3 faculty employee who is entering retirement~~ retired from CSUSM and who has served the University with distinction. It is expected that ~~emerita/emeritus~~ status will be granted to faculty members who have ~~made contributed continuously sustained~~ contributions throughout their career, ~~and~~ have a distinguished professional record, ~~and have a desire and expectation to continue their association with the University in retirement.~~

Comment [c4]: FAC is spelling out how the different Unit 3 faculty ranks would read with emeritus added.

Comment [c5]: FAC has added this as a fundamental criterion.

Normally, the nomination for emerita/emeritus status occurs within one year of retirement.

II. Eligibility

~~Faculty are eligible for Normally, emerita/emeritus status, if they are is limited to those individuals who:~~

Comment [c6]: FAC has removed the criterion that the Unit 3 faculty be at the top rank.

- 1) ~~for~~ tenure-track instructional faculty, ~~hold the rank of full professor with tenure~~ and have at least 10 years of active Unit-3 faculty service to CSUSM, or
- 2) ~~for~~ librarians, ~~hold the rank of full librarian with tenure~~ and have at least 10 years of active Unit-3 faculty service to CSUSM, or
- 3) ~~for~~ SSP-ARs, ~~hold the rank of SSP-AR III with tenure~~ and have at least 10 years of active Unit-3 faculty service ~~to CSUSM, or have accumulated part-time service equivalent of 10 years of full-time service to CSUSM, or~~
- 4) ~~coaches~~ have at least 10 years of active unit 3 faculty service at CSUSM, and have served for at least 10 years in full-time ~~Unit 3 employment~~ faculty service or have accumulated part-time service equivalent to 10 years of full-time service to CSUSM, or
- 5) ~~for~~ temporary or part-time Unit 3 instructional faculty, who have served for at least 10 years in full-time ~~employment~~ or have accumulated part-time service equivalent to 10 years of full-time service to CSUSM.

Comment [c7]: Some on EC continue to voice concern about the difference between the expectations tenure-line and non-tenure faculty have to address in the evaluation process, and then how this document does not differentiate.

Several asked again for specific criteria for each of the five categories.

FAC believes removing the requirement for top rank substantially addresses this concern.

173 Exceptional cases where faculty do not fall within the eligibility criteria may be
174 considered by the Provost and President. Emerita/Emeritus status may be bestowed
175 posthumously.

Comment [c8]: FAC added this for clarification (it is not a substantive change).

176
177 These eligibility criteria may be waived in exceptional cases.

178 179 III. Nomination Procedures

- 181 A. Deans shall inform their colleges in the fall a timely manner of the retirement of each
182 employee who is eligible for emerita/emertus status faculty member in the previous
183 year.
- 184 B. Any member of the campus community may nominate a faculty member for emeritus
185 status. Self-nominations are also appropriate.
- 186 C. The nominating faculty member shall inquire if the eligible retired faculty member
187 will accept the nomination. If so, the nominating faculty shall request a comprehensive
188 curriculum vita from the nominee.
- 189 D. A nomination shall consist of (1) a nomination letter (500-1000 words) in which the
190 nominator argues that the nominee meets the criteria specified below, and (2) the
191 nominee's CV. The nomination shall be submitted to the nominee's Dean (or program
192 director).
- 193 a. If the nomination includes an exception to the eligibility criteria, this shall be
194 clearly stated and explained;
- 195 b. The nomination letter shall clearly but briefly explain the nominee's job
196 responsibilities.
- 197 E. Each nomination shall be presented to the appropriate department chair, Dean, or
198 program director, who shall then
- 199 a. Inform the eligible faculty member of their nomination, if the nomination is
200 accepted, requests a current curriculum vitae from the Candidate, request that
201 the faculty member communication that they accept the nomination and
202 provide a current curriculum vitae.
- 203 b. Write a separate letter indicating support, or not, for the nominee's application;
- 204 e. Provide the Faculty Awards Committee with the nomination letter, the
205 nominee's CV, and the Dean's letter. a representative committee of the
206 nominee's academic unit, and

Comment [c9]: FAC added this to assure EC that each nominee is evaluated with respect to their job category and not with respect to nominees in other Unit 3 job categories.

Comment [c10]: In response to concerns expressed in EC about risks involved in having the committee be local to the nominees, FAC changed the committee to a university-level committee – the Faculty Awards Committee. This change would mean that the Faculty Awards Committee would recommend the Brakebill nominee, the Wang nominee(s), and also emeritus nominees.

Comment [c11]: Note how much FAC has elaborated on the process, which provides MUCH more guidance than the current document.

208 A nomination shall consist of a nomination letter, in which the nominator argues that the
209 nominee meets the criteria specified in section IV below.

210 211 212 IV. Selection Procedures

- 213
214 A. The Dean (or program director) evaluates the nomination materials (nomination
215 letter and CV) based on the criteria stated in section V, and writes a letter shall

- determine whether to recommending the candidate for emerita/emeritus status (or not).
- B. ~~This~~ The Faculty Awards Committee shall evaluate the candidate's nomination materials curriculum vitae (nomination letter, CV, and Dean's letter) based on the criteria stated in section V, and shall determine whether to recommend the candidate for emerita/emeritus status.
- C. ~~The committee shall send a letter to the Dean, clearly indicating its recommendation. If the recommendation is positive, the committee shall explain why the nominee should be granted emerita/emeritus status based on the criteria. The CV shall accompany the letter.~~
- If the committee makes a positive decision, it shall forward the candidate's curriculum vitae and a recommendation letter to the Dean outlining why the candidate should be granted emerita/emeritus status based on the recommendation criteria.
- D. The Dean shall review the recommendation and state in writing whether s/he~~they~~ concurs with the recommendation.
- D.E. ~~The Faculty Awards Committee shall Both recommendations, and the nominee's CV, shall then be forwarded to the Provost the nomination materials (nomination letter, CV, Dean's letter, and committee letter), the Dean's letter, the nomination letter, and the nominee's CV. The Provost who shall make his/her their~~ recommendation.
- E.F. The President (or designee) shall make a final determination based on his/her their review of the recommendations application materials.
- G. ~~Emerita/Emeritus status may be bestowed posthumously.~~
- F.H. The President (or designee) shall announce the names of faculty awarded emeritus status from that academic year at spring commencement. Convocation.
- G. The President (or designee) will notify faculty of their award and privileges and how to activate them.

V. Criteria for Recommendation

The nomination letter must demonstrate how the nominee has served the University with distinction within the particular Unit 3 job category (see II. Eligibility). The nominee is expected to have made sustained contributions throughout their career, have a distinguished professional record, and have a desire and expectation to continue their

Comment [c12]: FAC has reworked the criteria section again, based on EC questions.

FAC declines to break out the five different eligible job categories, but instead has approved a revised, single set of criteria. This criteria section is more than sufficient for the Faculty Awards Committee to use, as they assess each nominee with respect to their Unit 3 job category.

This criteria section represents the best sense of FAC in accommodating the range of feedback received.

association with the University in retirement. The nominee must have met a combination of the criteria below over their CSUSM career, as appropriate to the nominee's job category. It is understood that at different points in a faculty member's career the elements of teaching or professional performance, research/creative activities, and service may have been emphasized.

All nominees must have contributed over time, and significantly, to the mission of the University. Depending upon the job category, distinguished service to the university may be evidenced by:

- A record of excellence in performance of professional duties [appropriate to the nominee's job category] including:
 - Teaching
 - Other instructional activities, or
 - Professional performance;
- Meaningful contributions to the curriculum or program;
- A record of sustained research/creative activity that has contributed to the profession;
- Commitment to and participation in shared governance and service to the University, and/or,
- Additional areas of excellence specific to the nominee's job category.

IV. Recognition and Privileges

A. Emeriti faculty are considered an important and integral part of the university community. Emeritus faculty are welcome to participate in the academic life of their department or the library, consult on policy, procedures and curriculum planning, and continue their research/creative activities.

B. Emeriti faculty shall be recognized through:

- An invitation from the president to attend the Convocation where their name will appear in the program.
- Listing of the names of emeriti faculty in the campus commencement annual Convocation program after the award of emeritus status at the time of retirement
- ~~Issuing a~~ A permanent ID card indicating status as an emerita/emertus member of the faculty listing of name and title of all emeriti faculty in all university catalogues
- Listing of name and title in the CSUSM phone directory.²

Comment [c13]: From SFSU
<http://senate.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.senate/files/EmeritusPolicyRevision.pdf>

Comment [c14]: Per request by provost and president.

Comment [c15]: Requested by the provost and president.

² At the request of the emerita/emertus faculty, he or she will be listed in the CSUSM phone directory.

C. Upon ~~commencement of retirement and the~~ approval of emeritus status by the President (or designee), the following privileges shall become available:³

- Eligibility to cite CSU affiliation in publications, proposing propose research projects/creative endeavors, compete for and administer grants from agencies outside the CSU system,
- Free parking ~~privileges,~~
- same library privileges as other faculty, emeritus level library and technology privileges (to be determined by LATAC in consultation with the Library and ITS, and to be reviewed annually),
- Same campus network and email privileges as other faculty.
- Use of University recreational facilities
- Free admission to University athletic and cultural events |
- ~~invited~~ Participation in ~~selected~~ department, school/college and university functions, such as Convocation, commencement.
- Attendance at public university functions and celebrations affirming the academic mission of the university
- Invitations to participate in seminars, lectures, and scholarly meetings and ceremonies both as contributors and attendees.

Comment [c16]: Added publications

Comment [c17]: FAC recently added these.

~~V. — Criteria for Recommendation~~

~~When formally recommending a faculty member for emeritus status, the representative committee of the relevant academic unit must demonstrate that the candidate has achieved excellence in the performance of his or her appropriate professional duties in all of the areas of normal review.~~

³ For faculty opting into the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP), ~~emerita/emeritus~~ privileges listed in Section IV.3 will become available upon completion of FERP.

327 VII. Deadlines (The review cycle for emeritus status takes place only once each AY)
 328
 329 Before the end of ~~September~~ October:
 330 Deans informs their colleges of each faculty member who retired in the previous
 331 academic year and solicit nominations for emerita/emeritus status.
 332
 333 Before the end of November:
 334 Nominations due to the Dean.
 335
 336 Before the end of December:
 337 Dean's letter due
 338
 339 Before end of February 15:
 340 Committee meets and makes recommendation to ~~Dean~~.
 341
 342 Before end of April 15:
 343 ~~Dean~~ Provost makes recommendation to the ~~Provost~~ President.
 344
 345 Before the end of ~~March~~ May
 346 The President (or designee) makes a final determination
 347
 348 ~~April/May~~ June/July
 349 Emeritus faculty are informed of the title and benefits.
 350 President invites emeritus awardees to the ~~Commencement~~ Convocation
 351
 352 Beginning of Fall semester
 353 President announces emeritus faculty at Convocation.
 354

Comment [c18]: The provost asked for more time for emeritus review, assuming the announcements are made in the fall Convocation rather than the spring commencement.

This is provisional, waiting for the timeline he recommends.

ABSTRACT

Course Abbreviation and Number:	Course Title:	
Number of Units: _____		
College or Program: <input type="checkbox"/> CHABSS <input type="checkbox"/> CSM <input type="checkbox"/> CEHHS <input type="checkbox"/> COBA <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	Desired term of implementation: <input type="checkbox"/> Fall <input type="checkbox"/> Spring <input type="checkbox"/> Summer Year: _____	Mode of Delivery: <input type="checkbox"/> face to face <input type="checkbox"/> hybrid <input type="checkbox"/> fully on-line
Course Proposer (please print):	Email:	Submission Date:

1. Course Catalog Description:

2. GE Syllabus Checklist: The syllabi for all courses certified for GE credit must contain the following:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Course description, course title and course number
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student learning outcomes for General Education Area and student learning objectives specific to your course, linked to how students will meet these objectives through course activities/experiences
<input type="checkbox"/>	Topics or subjects covered in the course
<input type="checkbox"/>	Registration conditions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Specifics relating to how assignments meet the writing requirement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tentative course schedule including readings
<input type="checkbox"/>	Grading components including relative weight of assignments

SIGNATURES

Course Proposer	Date	Department Chair	date	
<i>Please note that the department will be required to report assessment data to the GEC annually.</i>				_____ <i>DC Initial</i>
	Support	Do not support*		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Library Faculty	Date	Impacted Discipline Chair	Date	
	Support	Do not Support*		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Impacted Discipline Chair	Date	GEC Chair	Date	
	Support	Do not Support*		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Approve	Do not Approve		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

*** If the proposal is not supported, a memo describing the nature of the objection must be provided.**

Course Coordinator: Phone Email:

Part A: B/B3 Physical Science with Lab General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) related to course content. [Please type responses into the tables.]

Physical Science w/ Lab GELOs this course will address:	Course content that addresses each GELO.	How will these GELOs be assessed?
B1.1 Students will explain accepted modern physical or chemical principles and theories, their areas of application, and their limitations.		
B1.2 Students will apply the discipline's customary methods to solve problems through data collection, critical evaluation of evidence, the application of quantitatively rich models, and /or employment of mathematical and computer analysis.		
B1.3 Students will be able to articulate what makes a good scientific theory, incorporating values of parsimony, agreement with experimental or observational evidence, and coherence with other mathematical or physical theories.		
B1.4 Students will be able to identify areas in which ethics either (1) directs or limits physical science research or (2) is informed by the products of this research		
B3.1 Students will demonstrate that they can conduct experiments, make observations, or run simulations using protocols and methods common in the scientific discipline in which the course is offered.		
B3.2 Students will be able to interpret the results of experiments, observations or simulations, understanding random and systematic errors associated with those activities, and making appropriate conclusions based on theories or models of the scientific discipline in which the course is offered.		

Part B: General Education Learning Outcomes required of all GE courses related to course content:

GE Outcomes required of <u>all</u> Courses	Course content that addresses each GE outcome?	How will these GELOs be assessed?
Students will communicate effectively in writing to various audiences. (writing)		
Students will think critically and analytically about an issue, idea or problem. (critical thinking)		
Students will find, evaluate and use information appropriate to the course and discipline. (Faculty are strongly encouraged to collaborate with their library faculty.)		

Part C: GE Programmatic Goals: *The GE program aligns with CSUSM specific and LEAP Goals. All B1/B3 courses must meet at least one of the LEAP Goals.*

GE Programmatic Goals	Course addresses this LEAP Goal:
LEAP 1: Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
LEAP 2: Intellectual and Practical Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
LEAP 3: Personal and Social Responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
LEAP 4: Integrative Learning	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
CSUSM Specific Programmatic Goals	Course content that addresses the following CSUSM goals. Please explain, if applicable.
CSUSM 1: Exposure to and critical thinking about issues of diversity.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (please describe):
CSUSM 2: Exposure to and critical thinking about the interrelatedness of peoples in local, national, and global contexts.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (please describe):

Part D: Course requirements to be met by the instructor.

Course Requirements:	How will this requirement be met by the instructor?
Course meets the All-University Writing requirement: A minimum of 2500 words of writing shall be required in 3+ unit courses.	
Courses shall include an evaluation of written work which assesses both content and writing proficiency, using a writing style and use of language that is appropriate for the sciences.	
Courses should demonstrate to students that the applications of physical science principles and theories can lead to lifelong learning in science and to productive and satisfying life choices.	
Courses should demonstrate to students the ways in which science influences and is influenced by societies in both the past and the present.	
Courses should empower students to communicate effectively to others about scientific principles and their application to real-world problems.	
Courses shall build the students' information literacy in a way that is appropriate to the field and level of the course.	
Courses shall require students to think critically so that they are able to distinguish scientific arguments from pseudo-scientific myths or opinions.	

GEC

General Education New Course Certification Request

Attached is an updated document. The changes are quite substantial from the current form. In summary they are:

1. Part A: removal of right column on how assessment will be done.
2. Part B is totally new: GE program Los
3. CSUSM specific goal section greatly reduced.

The plan would be to revise the others but they would be similar to this.

ABSTRACT

Course Abbreviation and Number:	Course Title:	
Number of Units: _____		
College or Program: <input type="checkbox"/> CHABSS <input type="checkbox"/> CSM <input type="checkbox"/> CEHHS <input type="checkbox"/> COBA <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	Desired term of implementation: <input type="checkbox"/> Fall <input type="checkbox"/> Spring <input type="checkbox"/> Summer Year: _____	Mode of Delivery: <input type="checkbox"/> face to face <input type="checkbox"/> hybrid <input type="checkbox"/> fully on-line
Course Proposer (please print):	Email:	Submission Date:

1. Course Catalog Description:

2. GE Syllabus Checklist: The syllabi for all courses certified for GE credit must contain the following:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Course description, course title and course number
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student learning outcomes for General Education Area and student learning objectives specific to your course, linked to how students will meet these objectives through course activities/experiences
<input type="checkbox"/>	Topics or subjects covered in the course
<input type="checkbox"/>	Registration conditions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Specifics relating to how assignments meet the writing requirement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tentative course schedule including readings
<input type="checkbox"/>	Grading components including relative weight of assignments

SIGNATURES

Course Proposer	Date	Department Chair	date	
<i>Please note that the department will be required to report assessment data to the GEC annually.</i>				_____ <i>DC Initial</i>
	Support	Do not support*		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Library Faculty	Date	Impacted Discipline Chair	Date	
	Support	Do not Support*		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Impacted Discipline Chair	Date	GEC Chair	Date	
	Support	Do not Support*		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Approve	Do not Approve		
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

*** If the proposal is not supported, a memo describing the nature of the objection must be provided.**

Course Coordinator: Phone Email:

Part A: B/B3 Physical Science with Lab General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) related to course content. [Please type responses into the tables.]

Physical Science w/ Lab GELOs this course will address:	Course content that addresses each GELO.	How will these GELOs be assessed?
B1.1 Students will explain accepted modern physical or chemical principles and theories, their areas of application, and their limitations.		
B1.2 Students will apply the discipline's customary methods to solve problems through data collection, critical evaluation of evidence, the application of quantitatively rich models, and /or employment of mathematical and computer analysis.		
B1.3 Students will be able to articulate what makes a good scientific theory, incorporating values of parsimony, agreement with experimental or observational evidence, and coherence with other mathematical or physical theories.		
B1.4 Students will be able to identify areas in which ethics either (1) directs or limits physical science research or (2) is informed by the products of this research		
B3.1 Students will demonstrate that they can conduct experiments, make observations, or run simulations using protocols and methods common in the scientific discipline in which the course is offered.		
B3.2 Students will be able to interpret the results of experiments, observations or simulations, understanding random and systematic errors associated with those activities, and making appropriate conclusions based on theories or models of the scientific discipline in which the course is offered.		

Part B: General Education Learning Outcomes required of all GE courses related to course content:

GE Outcomes required of <u>all</u> Courses	Course content that addresses each GE outcome?	How will these GELOs be assessed?
Students will communicate effectively in writing to various audiences. (writing)		
Students will think critically and analytically about an issue, idea or problem. (critical thinking)		
Students will find, evaluate and use information appropriate to the course and discipline. (Faculty are strongly encouraged to collaborate with their library faculty.)		

Part C: GE Programmatic Goals: *The GE program aligns with CSUSM specific and LEAP Goals. All B1/B3 courses must meet at least one of the LEAP Goals.*

GE Programmatic Goals	Course addresses this LEAP Goal:
LEAP 1: Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
LEAP 2: Intellectual and Practical Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
LEAP 3: Personal and Social Responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
LEAP 4: Integrative Learning	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes
CSUSM Specific Programmatic Goals	Course content that addresses the following CSUSM goals. Please explain, if applicable.
CSUSM 1: Exposure to and critical thinking about issues of diversity.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (please describe):
CSUSM 2: Exposure to and critical thinking about the interrelatedness of peoples in local, national, and global contexts.	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (please describe):

Part D: Course requirements to be met by the instructor.

Course Requirements:	How will this requirement be met by the instructor?
Course meets the All-University Writing requirement: A minimum of 2500 words of writing shall be required in 3+ unit courses.	
Courses shall include an evaluation of written work which assesses both content and writing proficiency, using a writing style and use of language that is appropriate for the sciences.	
Courses should demonstrate to students that the applications of physical science principles and theories can lead to lifelong learning in science and to productive and satisfying life choices.	
Courses should demonstrate to students the ways in which science influences and is influenced by societies in both the past and the present.	
Courses should empower students to communicate effectively to others about scientific principles and their application to real-world problems.	
Courses shall build the students' information literacy in a way that is appropriate to the field and level of the course.	
Courses shall require students to think critically so that they are able to distinguish scientific arguments from pseudo-scientific myths or opinions.	



MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 6, 2015

TO: Graham Oberem, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs
Lorena Meza, Vice President, Student Affairs
Matthew Ceppi, Chief of Staff, President's Office
Kamel Haddad, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
Travis Gregory, Associate Vice President, Human Resources & Payroll Services
Michelle Hunt, Associate Vice President, Faculty Affairs
Patricia Reily, Veterans Director, Student Affairs
Wesley Schultz, Interim Dean, Graduate Studies and Research
Laurie Stowell, Chair, Academic Senate
Veronica Anover, Professor, Modern Language Studies
Marie Thomas, Professor, Psychology
Robert Carolin, Associate Dean, Extended Learning
Dawn Formo, Dean, Undergraduate Studies
Dilcie Perez, Dean, Student Affairs

FROM: Karen S. Haynes
President

SUBJECT: Tasks and timelines for next steps in Diversity Mapping Project

As you are aware following the quantitative and qualitative diversity mapping that Halualani and Associates (H&A) completed and the multiple forums held on campus during the week of February 16, Arturo Ocampo, AVP for Diversity, Educational Equity, Inclusion and Ombuds synthesized comments from those forums and surveys and provided to me. These were informative and, as they relate to specific recommendations, will be shared with the appropriate groups. 40 people who attended forums completed the surveys. Consensus across constituent groups who completed survey and Diversity Mapping Steering Committee and the Ad Hoc Leadership team were on recruiting and retaining diverse faculty and staff and strengthening diversity content in the curriculum.

We agreed at the beginning that this was not simply an exercise in collecting data, but to inform our next step in moving our campus forward in strategic ways to improve practices.

Further, it is clear that these next actions need to be led by individuals on campus with positional authority and responsibility to oversee the forward progress of these recommendations. The Diversity Mapping Steering Committee has completed its work of overseeing the mapping process, and its role has now ended. It is now up to the individuals who have been identified to move the campus forward with implementing the recommendations of H & A.

Attached you will find the final matrix of primary responsibilities of the recommendations and where your responsibility for convening and/or collaboration has been assigned. For all background information, the diversity website can be found at:
<http://www.csusm.edu/equity/diversitymapping/index.html>

On this website you will find:

- Recommendations and an action matrix
- H & A slidecast overview
- H & A mapping informational slidecast
- H & A ebook of data – still waiting to receive; will be uploaded upon receipt

To each of the conveners, I am requesting the following be submitted by May 1, 2015 to Arturo Ocampo. He will provide a brief progress report that includes the data you have provided to me. Do not take action until these hand-offs and early tasks have been discussed and approved by the Executive Council.

1. Confirm that you have convened the people needed to work on the recommendations assigned to you.
2. Provide an initial assessment and review of the recommendations you have been assigned.
3. Identify, as possible, individuals within your units/departments/organizations (or in the case of Academic Senate, committees) to whom you are handing off responsibility for portions of those recommendations.
4. Identify any "low hanging fruit" that might be prioritized for early/quick action in the summer or fall.
5. Identify any urgent needs among the recommendations assigned to you, even if they are not necessarily "low hanging fruit".
6. Identify whether funding is needed for any of the above actions. I have decided that funding for 2015/16 activities will be one time funding; and any ongoing or additional funding will be included in the University Budget Committee process for 2016/17.

In order to ensure that this work proceeds in a timely fashion, and that "high order" tasks move forward in the planning stage, the following will also be assigned:

- AVP Ocampo will draft a revised and updated Diversity Strategic Plan.

- AVP Ocampo will work on this over the summer, present to Executive Council, and have ready for campus conversation and input in early Fall 2015.
- AVP Ocampo will build on the work accomplished over the past 3 years and take into account recommendations that have not yet been met as well as the recommendations from H & A.
- CSUSM Executive Council will work on redefining the structure and scope of the Office of Diversity, Educational Equity and Inclusion after receiving progress reports and discussions with AVP Ocampo about revisions to the Diversity Strategic Plan.
 - A draft document regarding changes to the structure and scope of the office, which, with the suggested revisions of the strategic plan, will be ready for campus conversation and input in early Fall 2015.
- These two might be the major focus of an early campus conversation in fall 2015.

Proceeding forward, it seems prudent and necessary for bi-annual progress reports to be submitted to AVP Ocampo. The Executive Council will review progress reports twice a year at the end of each academic semester. In the comments synthesized by AVP Ocampo, it is also apparent that we need to develop a communication plan to assure we are working collaboratively and without overlapping or competing initiatives.

c: Executive Council

Adam Shapiro, Dean, College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences

Mike Schroder, Dean, Extended Learning

Bridget Blanshan, Associate Vice President, Student Affairs

Scott Hagg, Associate Vice President, Enrollment Management Services

Arturo Ocampo, Associate Vice President, Diversity, Educational, Equity & Inclusion

Diversity Mapping Action Matrix

1.0	Institutional Practices	Responsible:	Convenor:
1.1	Re-define the structure and scope of the Office of Diversity, Educational Equity & Inclusion	Executive Council	Graham Oberem
1.2	Create a new Diversity Master Plan with clear vision, goals and framework	President/AVP DEEI	Arturo Ocampo
1.3	Foster positive relationships among faculty and staff	Executive Council	President Haynes
1.4	Establish ongoing Town Hall Forums on Diversity per suggested issues	AVP DEEI	Arturo Ocampo
1.5	Confirm collaborations across Academic Affairs, Student Affairs the other divisions	Executive Council	Lorena Meza
1.6	Develop an assessment framework for diversity	AVP IPA/AVP DEEI	Matt Ceppi
1.7	Strengthen the role of Faculty/Staff Associations	AVP DEEI	Arturo Ocampo
1.8	Align activities and appropriate actions that prioritize Hispanic student success and excellence	VPSA/AVP DEEI/Dean of UGS	Lorena Meza
1.9	Include additional diversity items in next Campus Climate Survey	AVP IPA	Matt Ceppi
1.10	Create opportunities targeted for staff	AVP DEEI / AVP HR	Travis Gregory
1.11	Microaggressions - training/professional development for faculty and staff	Provost/AVP HREO	Travis Gregory
1.12	Recruit and Retain diverse faculty and staff	AVP HREO/AVP Faculty Affairs	Michelle Hunt
2.0	Curricular	Responsible:	Convenor:
2.1	Fortify the plans for Native American Studies & clarify its Curricular Scope	Provost/Native Studies Task Force	Graham Oberem
2.2	Engage Active Duty/Veterans in curricula and co-curricula activities	Academic Senate/Vet Center Director	Patricia Reily
2.3	Incorporate diversity into graduate courses and seminars	Dean GSR	Wes Schultz

Diversity Mapping Action Matrix

2.4	Review diversity related undergraduate course offerings and scheduling	Vice Provost/Academic Deans	Kamel Haddad
2.5	Implement 2 general education diversity areas - Domestic and International/Global Diversity Issues & Multiculturalism	Academic Senate	Laurie Stowell
2.6	Elevate and fortify plans for Ethnic Studies, and Women's Studies	Academic Senate	Laurie Stowell
2.7	Integrate diversity content across core subject and disciplinary matter	Academic Senate	Laurie Stowell
2.8	Discuss how to integrate diversity student learning outcomes and competencies across the curriculum	Academic Senate	Laurie Stowell
2.9	Confirm diversity and inclusion as an institutional learning outcome	Academic Senate	Laurie Stowell
2.10	Expand and deepen issues of power when focusing on international/global in undergraduate and graduate courses	Academic Senate	Laurie Stowell
2.11	Create faculty learning/research communities around core diversity courses	Faculty Center	Veronica Anover & Marie Thomas
2.12	Conduct assessment in study abroad and cultural exchange programs	AVP International Programs	Robert Carolin
2.13	Student retention & graduation	Dean UGS/GISC	Dawn Formo
3.0	Co-Curricular / Student Engagement	Responsible:	Convenor:
3.1	Create opportunities targeted for graduate students	Dean Graduate Studies / Dean of Students	Wes Schultz
3.2	Create opportunities for specific groups of students	Dean of Students / AVP DEEI	Dilcie Perez
3.3	Expand efforts to be inclusive of disabilities, generation, socioeconomic status, religion, gender, with focus on intersectionalities	AVP DEEI / Student Affairs	Arturo Ocampo
3.4	Create conditions for students to access DELTA Level 5 throughout their time at CSUSM	VP SA	Lorena Meza