

**AGENDA**  
**CSUSM ACADEMIC SENATE MEETING**  
Wednesday, May 4, 2016, 1:00 – 2:50 p.m.  
Reading Room – KEL 5400

- I. **Approval of Agenda**
- II. **Approval of Minutes** – AS 4/20/16 Meeting
- III. **Chair’s Report**, [Deborah Kristan](#) (Referrals – attached) **Page 3**
- IV. **Secretary’s Report**, Laurie Stowell (attached) **Page 3**
- V. **Vice Chair’s Report**, [Michael McDuffie](#)
- VI. **President’s Report**, Karen Haynes
- VII. **Provost’s Report**, Graham Oberem
- VIII. **ASCSU Report**, [David Barsky](#) / [Glen Brodowsky](#) (no updates to report)
- IX. **CFA Report**, Darel Engen
- X. **ASI Report**, Jamaela Johnson
- XI. **Consent Calendar \*** (attached) **Page 3**
  - NEAC Recommendations
  - UCC Course & Program Change Proposals
- XII. **Action Items** *(Items scheduled for a vote, including second reading items.)*
  - A. FAC: Visiting Professor Policy and Procedure (attachment) **Page 5**
  - B. UCC: Program Changes – Human Development (2 attachments)
    - Human Development P-2 Form **Page 8**
    - Human Development Catalog Copy **Page 10**
  - C. UCC and BLP: Certificate of Specialized Study in Water Management and Leadership – Intermediate Level (WTMI) (3 attachments)
    - UCC Report: Certificate of Specialized Study in Water Management and Leadership – Intermediate Level (WTMI) **Page 17**
    - UCC: WTMI Proposed Catalog Copy **Page 19**
    - BLP Report: Certificate of Specialized Study in Water Management and Leadership – Intermediate Level (WTMI) **Page 21**
- XIII. **Discussion Items** *(Items scheduled for discussion, including first reading items.)*
  - A. Senate Officers: DRAFT Resolution Honoring Mark DuBois, Proprietor of Café Catering (attachment) **Page 22**
  - B. NEAC: New Process for Calls to Fill Vacant Senate and Committee Seats (attachment) **Page 24**
  - C. Faculty Grants Committee: Year-end Report to Academic Senate, Kimber Quinney (attachment) **Page 25**
  - D. Grace McField: Arts and Lectures Series Funding

**XIV. Presentations**

- A. WASC Update, [Regina Eisenbach](#) (<http://www.csusm.edu/wasc/>)
- B. University Assessment Council's Activities and Accomplishments AY 15/16, [Regina Eisenbach](#), [Linda Shaw](#) (10 min)

**XV. Standing Committees – Year-end Reports** (2 min. oral and written, as attached)

-APC      -GEC      -SAC

-BLP      -NEAC      -TPAC

-FAC      -PAC      -UCC

**XVI. Senators' Concerns and Announcements**

- A. Senate Officers: Recognition; Passing of the Gavel

## SENATE CHAIR'S REFERRALS

- FAC: CSM Policy on Election of Peer Review Committee

## SECRETARY'S REPORT

The following Senate-approved documents have been forwarded for administrative review and approval:

- Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) Standards – Liberal Studies Policy (FAC 718-15)
- Student Course Grade Appeals Policy (SAC 216-02)
- Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement – Graduate Level Policy (APC 321-07)
- All University Writing Requirement Policy (GEC 392-12)
- Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement – Undergraduate Level Policy (APC 719-15)
- Grant Proposal Seed Money Policy (FAC 214-01)
- Graduate Probation Disqualification Reinstatement Policy (APC 237-02)
- Moving Self-Support Academic Programs to State Supported Funding Policy & Procedure (BLP 705-14)

## CONSENT CALENDAR\*

### NEAC Recommendations

NEAC approves the following faculty members to fill vacancies on Senate and Committees on which faculty serve, with service beginning in the Fall semester:

Name	Committee/Senate	Seat/Term
Robert Sheath	Nominations, Elections and Appointments Committee	CSM 16-18
Richelle Swan	Professional Leave Committee	Faculty At-Large 16/17
Ibrahim Al-Marashi	General Education Committee	CHABSS-HA 16-18
Kristine Diekman	Senator	CHABSS 16-18
Lucy HG Solomon	Senator	CHABSS 16/17
Richard Hwang	University Global Affairs Committee	CoBA 16/17
Sandra Doller	Arts & Lectures Committee	CHABSS-Non VPA 16/17
Palash Deb	Student Affairs Committee	CoBA 16/17
Elizabeth Bigham	University Global Affairs Committee	CEHHS 16/17
Greig Guthey	University Curriculum Committee	Faculty At-large 16-18
Soheila Jorjani	Faculty Affairs Committee	CoBA 16/17

## UCC Course & Program Change Proposals

### Programs/Courses Approved at UCC

SUBJ	No	New No.	Course/Program Title	Form Type	Originator	To UCC	UCC Action
EDST	P-2		Computer Concepts/Applications	P-2	Sinem Siyahhan	3/30/16	4/25/16
EDST	P-2		Certificate Video Production	P-2	Sinem Siyahhan	3/30/16	4/25/16
EDST	638		Using Virtual Literacy to Improve Learning	D	Sinem Siyahhan	3/30/16	4/25/16
EDST	640		Using Web 2.0 Tools Audio/Video	D	Sinem Siyahhan	3/30/16	4/25/16
EDST	641		Using Mobile Tech for Teaching/Learning	D	Sinem Siyahhan	3/30/16	4/25/16
EDST	646		Digital Citizenship in the Classroom	D	Sinem Siyahhan	3/30/16	4/25/16

\*Pending EC Approval

EDST	647		Adventures in Geocaching	D	Sinem Siyahhan	3/30/16	4/25/16
EDST	648		Cloud Computing for Education	D	Sinem Siyahhan	3/30/16	4/25/16
EDST	649		Implementing Adaptive Technology	D	Sinem Siyahhan	3/30/16	4/25/16
NURS	P-2		MSN Advanced Practice Nurse in the FNP Track	P-2	Amy Carney	3/29/16	5/2/16
NURS	531		Advanced Practice Nursing Skills Lab	C	Amy Carney	3/29/16	5/2/16
NURS	P-2		MSN Advanced Practice Nurse PSYC Track	P-2	Nancy Romig	3/28/16	5/2/16
NURS	532B		Advanced Mental Health Mgmt of Individuals	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/28/16	5/2/16
NURS	533C		Advanced Field Study: Mgmt of Individuals	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/28/16	5/2/16
NURS	534B		Advanced Mental Health Mgmt of Groups/Families	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/28/16	5/2/16
NURS	535C		Advanced Field Study: Mgmt of Groups/Families	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/28/16	5/2/16
NURS	538		Advanced Mental Health Mgmt of Vulnerable Groups	C	Nancy Romig	3/28/16	5/2/16
NURS	539C		Advanced Field Study: Mgmt of Vulnerable Groups	C-2	Nancy Romig	3/28/16	5/2/16
VSAR	350		Advanced Painting	C	Judit Hersko	3/30/16	5/2/16

\*Pending EC Approval

## FAC: VISITING FACULTY POLICY AND PROCEDURE

FAC was requested by EC to develop a policy and procedures for the appointment of visiting faculty. The questions we were to consider were the following:

- What resources should be provided to a visiting faculty? For example, office space? Computer? Phone? Parking pass?
- Who is responsible for providing the resources? The university? College? Department? Which unit? Need to explicitly state university obligations versus obligations of other units on campus.
- What is the process of the written contract when the person is permitted to come to campus and what does the contract contain? Who agrees to the contract and who enforces the contract?
- Can the contract note an explicit date for the end of the appointment and who ensures that the visiting professor clears the office etc. by this date?

For visiting faculty, the key instrument is CBA Article 12.32, which addresses the visiting faculty designation. It reads:

*Visiting Faculty appointments are full-time appointments for up to one (1) academic year. Individuals appointed into this classification shall not be eligible for a subsequent appointment in this classification for the duration of this Agreement. Pursuant to 12.1, faculty shall be involved in the recruitment and hiring process. The hiring of Visiting Faculty shall not result in the displacement or time base reduction of an incumbent Temporary Faculty Unit Employee as reflected in the order of work in provision 12.29. Effective with Academic Year 2006/2007, the number of employees in the Visiting Faculty classification code shall not exceed one hundred twenty-five (125) full time equivalent faculty (FTEF) systemwide. The use of the Visiting Faculty class code shall expire at the end this Agreement, which includes any extensions agreed to by the parties, and shall be subject to re-negotiation during negotiations for a successor agreement.*

A review of other CSU policies showed that some campuses simply refer to the CBA and state that the procedure for appointing visiting faculty is the same as for any temporary faculty. This proposed CSUSM policy is based on more detailed documents from CSU San Bernardino and CSU Channel Islands. We have incorporated feedback from EC and the college Deans. Aside from the two edits suggested at the first reading (which FAC accepted), FAC has not received additional comments.

**Definition:** The process and procedures to be used for the appointment of visiting faculty within the Division of Academic Affairs

**Authority:** President of the University.

**Scope:**

---

Karen S. Haynes, President

---

Approval Date

---

Graham Oberem, Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs

---

Approval Date

## I. Introduction/Definitions

The appointment of visiting faculty is for the purpose of bringing to the campus individuals of special scholarly and/or professional interest and merit.

### A. Who is eligible to be a visiting faculty member?

Generally, individuals under consideration for visiting appointments have earned terminal degrees in their fields of expertise or are recognized nationally for outstanding achievement in their fields. Visiting faculty are individuals who are typically employed elsewhere, [possess a particular expertise](#), and/or are engaged in high-level research or other scholarly or creative work, or are in public service. Consequently, because of their stature, ~~or position~~, [or expertise](#), they provide our faculty and students with unusual opportunities for expanding their intellectual, artistic or scientific experiences or for pursuing research and scholarship.

### B. What can visiting faculty members do on campus?

Visiting faculty may teach, [conduct research](#), advise and/or supervise students, assist in enhancing existing curriculum or in developing new courses, attend/host program meetings, attend and offer colloquia, and engage in other University or public service activities consistent with their appointments and with the mission of the University. Visiting faculty members are sometimes chosen to fill temporarily a vacancy in a tenure track faculty line.

### C. Visiting faculty member titles

Based on the judgment of the host program and the college Dean, visiting faculty members may receive working titles of Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, or Visiting Assistant Professor to reflect their qualifications and professional experiences and to acknowledge the level of accomplishment achieved by the individual being considered for visiting faculty status.

## II. Review and appointment process and responsibilities

### A. Candidate review

1. The current curriculum vita or resume of the individual nominated for a visiting faculty position will be provided to and reviewed by the proposed host department faculty and Chair. With the concurrence of the host program, the appropriate Dean will recommend appointment to the Provost (or his/her designee).
2. The following information must be included in the Dean's recommendation submitted to the Provost for review and approval:
  - An indication of the individual's willingness to accept the visiting faculty appointment;

- A statement about the individual's past involvement with the program (if any), and a description of the nature of the individual's future involvement with the department as a visiting faculty member;
- The benefits to the University that are anticipated or expected as a result of the proposed visiting faculty appointment;
- How the proposed visiting faculty appointment will be paid for by the department and/or college;
- The working title to be conferred on the individual;
- The appointment beginning and ending dates;
- The desired perquisites to be offered to the individual and who is responsible for providing them;
- The current curriculum vita or resume of the individual.

B. Appointment

1. When the review process is complete, and with the approval of the Provost, the individual will be appointed as a visiting faculty member with the appropriate working title and invited to assume the duties and responsibilities of the position. Only upon formal written appointment by the University may the individual use the designated working title.
2. Visiting faculty appointments will be full-time appointments for up to one academic year. Individuals appointed into this classification shall not be eligible for a subsequent appointment in this classification.
3. The hiring of visiting faculty shall not result in the displacement or time-base reduction of an incumbent Temporary Faculty Unit Employee (CBA 12).
4. Should there be a greater number of candidates proposed in a given year than the campus is allowed, the Provost will make the final decisions about visiting faculty appointments.

C. Resources and responsibilities

To the extent possible, visiting faculty will be given access to University resources similar to those offered and provided to tenure-track faculty and full-time lecturers. Such resources may include, but are not limited to, library privileges, access to administrative and other related assistance, mail delivery, and a campus e-mail account. When a visiting faculty member teaches, space for office hours will be provided. The extent of the resources offered to a visiting faculty member is at the discretion of the Dean, and such perquisites will be identified in the appointment letter to the individual.

## **Report from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), Human Development (HD)**

In February 2016, UCC began review of a P-2 proposal form to substantively change the Human Development major. The core proposed changes included: 1) revamping the concentrations from four options (adult, children, counseling, health) to two options (counseling, health); 2) building 21 units of core curriculum internal to HD that lays a foundation of theory and research central to the discipline (HD 102, 220, 230, 231, 302, 303, and 304) ; and 3) adding 15 additional units of upper division coursework internal to HD that provides greater depth and breadth of study within the concentrations (HD 351, 382, 383, 384, and 385).

As noted in the P form, the HD program has been undergoing self-study and revision since 2013 to align their PSLOs with the curriculum and with course SLOs, and to reflect on their concentrations and offerings. Prior to submitting the P-2 form, the proposer (Dr. Quiocho) and the HD faculty (Drs. Beaulieu, Hernandez, Soriano, and Toyokawa) engaged in a careful analysis and evaluation of prior program reviews, and in consultation with administration, proposed a reduction of the four concentrations to two, with a focusing of the curriculum internal to the major. This resulted in a proposal for 'discontinuation of concentrations', which was administrated through the Discontinuation Policy procedure and was approved by President Haynes in January 2016.

UCC's review process centered on the academic soundness and quality of the proposed curriculum to meet the aims described. The major was significantly revamped to provide students with 12 units of lower-division HD coursework in preparation for the major, 25 units of upper-division core HD coursework, 12 units of specialized upper division study (two concentration options or the general option), and 9 units of selective electives within HD and Biology. The proposal came to UCC with the intent to design and deliver a curriculum from the unique perspective of faculty within Human Development. Along with the P-2 came 12 C forms and 12 C-2 forms to create new coursework for the major and replace prerequisite psychology coursework with HD prerequisites for existing courses.

Below is a list of the departments impacted by the curriculum changes along with their noted position on this proposal.

- 1) Anthropology - support
- 2) Biology - support
- 3) Psychology – support with concerns regarding overlap of five courses with PSYC and CHAD
- 4) Sociology - support

The program proposal along with the curriculum underwent further revisions as a part of UCCs review. The proposers worked extensively and collaboratively with the Chair of UCC to implement the requested revisions. These included adding curriculum to each of the concentrations to develop more robust areas of study, and changes/additions to course assignments to increase rigor.

The P-2 proposal came to UCC approved by CEHHS's CAPC, and supported by CEHHS's Associate Dean, Dr. Denise Garcia.

UCC carefully considered the proposal in light of the stated objective to refine and refocus the program on promoting a holistic understanding of the lifespan. UCC also considered the feedback provided by Psychology. The proposed curriculum was deemed to be sound and consistent with the major focus of a



degree in human development. UCC voted to recommend the HD P-2 form and all associated C and C-2 forms for Senate approval. UCC also voted to bring the P-2 form as a discussion item due to the substantive nature of the changes.

New courses include:

- HD 102: PREP SKILLS FOR HD MAJORS
- HD 220: STATISTICS IN HD
- HD 230 RESEARCH METHODS IN HD
- HD 231- ACTION RESEARCH IN HD
- HD 302- HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN CHILDHOOD
- HD 303- HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN ADOLESCENCE
- HD 304 – HUMAN DEVELOPMENT IN ADULTHOOD
- HD 351 – HEALTH DISPARITIES IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
- HD 382- PROMOTING MULTICULTURALISM/SOCIAL JUSTICE
- HD 383-ID UNDERSTANDING CHILDREN/YOUTH/FAMILIES
- HD 384-SOCIAL AND PUBLIC POLICY IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
- HD 385-ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

For the complete proposal, visit the Curriculum Review website, line 7-31:  
[http://www.csusm.edu/academic\\_programs/catalogcurricula/2015-16\\_curriculum\\_coehhs.html](http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/catalogcurricula/2015-16_curriculum_coehhs.html)

## BACHELOR OF ARTS IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

	Units
General Education*	51
Preparation for the Major*	15
Major Requirements	46

***Students must take a sufficient number of elective units to bring the total number of units to a minimum of 120***

### Preparation for the Major

Lower-division (15 units)	
<a href="#">ANTH 200*</a>	3
<a href="#">HD 101</a>	3
<a href="#">HD 102</a>	3
<a href="#">HD 220</a>	3
<a href="#">HD 230 or HD 231*</a>	3

• HD 230 is a traditional approach to research focusing on the various models to collect data. HD 231 is focused on developing interventions and delivery services that result from data gathering.

### Major Requirements

Upper-division (25 units)	
Core Courses	25

Three (3) units of Management and Administration	3
<a href="#">HD 300</a>	

Three (3) units of Theory	3
<a href="#">HD 301</a>	

Nine (9) units of Lifespan Studies	9
------------------------------------	---

Select nine (9) from the following choices:

<a href="#">HD 302</a>	(3 units)
<a href="#">HD 303</a>	(3 units)
<a href="#">HD 304</a>	(3 units)

Seven (7) units of Field Studies	7
----------------------------------	---

<a href="#">HD 495</a>	(3 units)
<a href="#">HD 497</a>	(4 units)

Three (3) units of Capstone	3
<a href="#">HD 490</a>	

Upper-division (9 units)	
Elective Courses	9

Select nine (9) units from the following options:

[BIOL 327](#)  
[BIOL 328](#)  
[BIOL 329](#)  
[HD 380](#)  
[HD 381](#)  
[HD 385](#)

For the complete proposal, visit the Curriculum Review website, line 7-31:

[http://www.csusm.edu/academic\\_programs/catalogcurricula/2015-16\\_curriculum\\_coehhs.html](http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/catalogcurricula/2015-16_curriculum_coehhs.html)

### **Counseling Services Option Requirements**

This concentration focuses on psychological well-being and distress throughout the human life span.

Twelve (12) units of upper-division requirements

<a href="#">HD 360</a>	3
<a href="#">HD 361</a>	3
<a href="#">HD 382</a>	3
<a href="#">HD 383</a>	3

### **Health Services Option Requirements**

This concentration focuses on physiological well-being and illness throughout the human life span.

Twelve (12) units of upper-division requirements

<a href="#">HD 350</a>	3
<a href="#">HD 351</a>	3
<a href="#">HD 384</a>	3
<a href="#">BIOL 321 or 323 or 325</a>	3

### **General Option Requirements**

This concentration focuses on psychological well-being and  
Allows for an individualized course of study in human development.

Six (6) of upper-division requirements from other  
options and six (6) Upper-Division HD Elective Courses  
(courses will NOT count twice to meet requirement).

## COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

### GRMN 312 (3)

#### German Composition and Advanced Oral Practice

Advanced-level practice of German through oral and written exercises. *Conducted in German. Enrollment Requirement: GRMN 202.*

### GRMN 314 (1-3)

#### Topics in German Culture

Selected topics of study drawn from German culture and civilization. Topics will vary according to the instructor, and the semester offered. Students should check the class schedule for listing of actual topics. *May be repeated for credit as topics change for a total of six (6) units. Conducted in German. Prerequisite: GRMN 201.*

### GRMN 315 (3)

#### Introduction to Literature in German

Designed to help students read, understand, and enjoy a representative selection of masterpieces of German literature. It will survey the development of German literature from the age of Enlightenment to the present. Readings in fiction, poetry, and drama will introduce the students to a critical approach to literature. *Conducted in German. Recommended Preparation: GRMN 311. Enrollment Requirement: GRMN 202.*

### GRMN 318 (3)

#### Business German

German language and culture within the context of German business and economics. Extensive reading, listening comprehension, and speaking exercise about up-to-date issues related to business and political matters. *Course conducted in German. Enrollment Requirement: GRMN 202.*

### GRMN 331 (3)

#### Introduction to German Linguistics

Introduction to the linguistic analysis and scientific study of the German language. Examines a number of topics in German linguistics, including historical development and the relationship of German to other Germanic languages, German phonetics and phonology, morphology and word formation, and syntax. Looks at German sociolinguistics and dialectology, as well as varieties of German spoken in Eastern Europe and the Americas. *Course is taught in German and English. Enrollment Requirement: GRMN 202.*

### GRMN 350 (3)

#### Civilization and Culture of German Speaking Countries

Study of the culture and civilization of the German people and the Germanic world. Analysis of literature, art, history, geography, and contemporary social structures. *Conducted in German. Enrollment Requirement: GRMN 202.*

### GRMN 380 (3)

#### German Culture Through Film

Study of important aspects of German-speaking cultures and history as they are represented in film. Elements of film analysis. Compositions and analysis of selected grammar topics. *Conducted in German. Enrollment Requirement: GRMN 202.*

### GRMN 395A (1) 395B (2) 395C (3)

#### Independent Study

Students will study their own field of interest within German, Austrian, and Swiss literature and culture. Readings, written papers, and oral discussions will be guided by the instructor. A minimum of three analytical papers will be required. *Students must meet weekly with the instructor. May be repeated for a total of nine (9) units. Conducted in German. Enrollment restricted to students who have obtained consent of instructor.*

### GRMN 410 (3)

#### Topics in German Literature

Selected topics of study drawn from German Literature. *Topics will vary according to the instructor, and the semester offered. Students should check the class schedule for listing of actual topics. May be repeated for credit as topics change for a total of six (6) units. Conducted in German. Prerequisite: GRMN 311 or 312.*

## HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (HD)

### College of Education, Health and Human Services

### HD 101 (3)

**Introduction to Human Development Across the Lifespan** Survey the concepts, theories, and research that make up lifespan development. Students will be introduced to concepts and applications in the four emphasis areas of the Human Development Program which include Counseling, Health, Children's Services, and Adult/Gerontology. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for ID 170-1.*

### HD 170 (1-3)

#### Topics in Human Development

Selected topics in Human Development. *May be repeated for a total of twelve (12) units as topics change. Credit may not be counted toward the Human Development major. Students should check the Class Schedule for the listing of actual topics. Enrollment restricted to students who have obtained consent of the instructor.*

### HD 300 (3)

#### Administration in Human Service Settings

Theory and research in the effective management and administration of human service organizations. Subject matter includes ethics, confidentiality, funding and grant-writing, licensure, decision making and leadership, personnel management, public relations, and program evaluation. *Enrollment restricted to Human Development majors with Junior or Senior standing. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC 220, and PSYC 230.*

# COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

## HD 301 (3)

### Theories of Human Development

Survey of theories in human development (drawn primarily from psychology, sociology, biology and anthropology) with a focus on their application in understanding social problems and issues, and their use in the development and delivery of human services. *Enrollment restricted to Human Development majors (and Liberal Studies majors with a declared Special Field in Child Development or Human Development) with Junior or Senior standing. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC220, and PSYC230.*

## HD 350 (3)

### Health and Human Development

Focuses on the intersection between health issues and human development across the lifespan. Explores health issues as they relate to points of human development, health policy, health promotion, prevention, wellness and disease across the lifespan. Includes a discussion of developmental, family and lifespan influences on health including health issues and explores culture as it relates to these topics. Gives students interested in health care careers essential knowledge to provide effective health services. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for HD 370-1. Enrollment restricted to Kinesiology majors in the Health Science Option, and Human Development majors with Junior or Senior standing. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC220, and PSYC230.*

## HD 360 (3)

**Effective Counseling Interventions Across the Lifespan** Provides a foundation in the theory of counseling and effective components of evidence-based interventions. Students will become familiar with empirically supported relationship variables that are critical to counseling interactions, evidence-based approaches to counseling across the lifespan, and specific strategies integral to these interventions. The impact of development and socio-cultural forces will be discussed. A scientific, theory-based approach to counseling, emphasizing the integration of research and clinical work, using a developmental framework, will be used. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for HD 370-2. Enrollment restricted to Human Development majors with Junior or Senior standing. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC220, and PSYC230.*

## HD 361 (3)

### Introduction to Interpersonal, Interviewing, and Interaction Skills

Provides basic training in the interpersonal and communication skills integral to counseling-related careers. Includes a focus on ethics, confidentiality, intercultural and gender issues. *Enrollment restricted to Human Development majors with Junior or Senior standing. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC220, and PSYC230.*

## HD 370 (1-3)

### Advanced Topics in Human Development

Selected topics in Human Development. *May be repeated for a total of twelve (12) units as topics change. Students should check the Class Schedule for the listing of actual topics. Enrollment restricted to students who have obtained consent of the instructor. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC220, and PSYC230.*

## HD 380 (3)

### Applications in Child and Youth Development

Considers the social, cultural, cognitive, emotional, linguistic, and behavioral development of children and adolescents from multidisciplinary, multicultural, and applied perspectives. Students will learn major theories of development in order to apply that knowledge to their work in evidence-based services and programs for children and youth. Includes a field experience component through which students will consider how their in-class learning is enacted in the lived experiences of children and youth. Special attention is given to identifying multicultural and socio-cultural influences on development. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for HD 370-3. Also offered as EDUC 380. Students may not receive credit for both. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC220, and PSYC230.*

## HD 490 (3)

### Human Development in Perspective

A seminar intended for students in their final year of undergraduate study. Drawing from theories and knowledge gained from previous courses, this capstone course helps students to experience the application of such knowledge within allied health and human services fields. *Enrollment restricted to Human Development majors with Senior standing. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC220, and PSYC230.*

## HD 495 (3)

### Field Experience in Human Development

Supervised experience providing service in health and human services setting. Students will spend approximately eight (8) hours per week, for a minimum of 90 hours during the semester, in a child, adolescent and/or adult human services organization. Students will participate in service delivery, conduct observations, attend weekly class meetings, read related material and prepare written reports. *May be repeated for a total of six (6) units, but no more than three (3) units of credit may be applied toward the major. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC 220, and PSYC230. Students must have completed a pre-course orientation offered the prior semester.*

## COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

### HD 497 (4)

#### Applied Research in Human Development

Reviews the importance of theory, research objectives and various quantitative and qualitative methods. Students will be expected to participate in the development and implementation of an applied research study that they either initiate or is part of an ongoing research study. Students will be involved in data collection, data coding, data analysis and manuscript preparation. *Three hours of lecture and two hours of laboratory. Enrollment restricted to Human Development majors with Junior or Senior standing. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC 220, and PSYC 230.*

### HD 499A (1) 499B (2) 499C (3)

#### Supervised Independent Study

Independent study deals with a special interest not covered in a regular course or with exploration in greater depth of a subject introduced in a regular course. Discussion in individual conferences. *May be repeated for a total of six (6) units of credit. Enrollment restricted to students who have obtained consent of instructor. Prerequisites: ANTH 200, HD 101, PSYC 100, PSYC 220, and PSYC 230.*

## HISTORY (HIST)

### College of Humanities, Arts, Behavioral and Social Sciences

### HIST 101 (3)

#### World Civilizations to 1500

Surveys the history of the world from the early river-valley civilizations to the year 1500. Emphasis upon Afro-Eurasia and the Americas. Subject matter includes politics, society, religion, and global interactions. *May not be taken for credit by students who received credit for HIST 201.*

### HIST 102 (3)

#### World Civilizations to Present

Surveys the history of the world from the 16th Century to the present. Examines transcultural interactions, colonialism, revolutions, industrialization, the world wars and the origins of the modern world.

### HIST 130 (3)

#### U.S. History 1500-1877

Survey of the development and changing historical interpretation of American institutions and society from the colonial period through Reconstruction. Special attention to the interplay of European, American Indian, and African cultures in this development. Themes include immigration, colonial formation, Indian-white contact, constitutional development, economic change, religion, slavery, race relations, status of women, westward expansion, reform, and political parties. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for HIST 230.*

### HIST 131 (3)

#### U.S. History 1877-Present

A survey of the development and the changing historical interpretation of institutions and society in the United States from the end of Reconstruction to the present. Special attention to the interplay between races and cultural diversity and conflict. Themes include immigration, constitutional development politics, economics, religion, reform, the growth of the U.S. as a world power, status of women, westward expansion, and urbanization. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for HIST 231.*

### HIST 300 (3)

#### Thematic Topics in History

Thematic topics in History. Topics may come from any world area or be comparative. *May be repeated for credit as topics change for a total of six (6) units. Students should check the Class Schedule for listing of actual topics.*

### HIST 301 (3)

#### Historical Methods and Writing

Offers an introduction to historical methodology and theory. Explores the various approaches historians take to their study and the variety of tools historians use, including digital history. Students will produce an original research project based on primary sources, in engagement with existing historical scholarship.

### HIST 305 (3)

#### Early Industrial Britain, 1688-1850

Charts the early economic transformation of Britain and its role in shaping issues of politics and constitutional forms; surrounding the developing of class, gender, and social relationships; framing questions of empire and imperial policy; and cultural and intellectual expression. Uses Britain's industrialization as a case study to isolate structural components of that process within the particular situation found in Britain from 1688-1850.

### HIST 306 (3)

#### History of Internationalism and Human Rights

A course in intellectual history that considers the history behind the idea of human rights in the modern world. Explores how historical ideas about universalism and human nature from the 18th century forward led to challenges to the nation-state system as the dominant model of international society. Subjects include abolitionist movements, anti-imperialism, self-determination, and humanitarian agencies, with special emphasis on the League of Nations, United Nations, and the challenges that human rights pose to questions of national sovereignty. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for HIST 300G.*







**Report from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), Water Management and Leadership – Intermediate Level (WTMI)**

In April 2016, UCC began review of a P form to develop a Certificate of Specialized Study in Water Management and Leadership – Intermediate Level. This 12-unit course of study aims to develop knowledge and leadership skills in the next generation of water industry managers. The certificate was designed to provide recognition and educational achievement for individuals with at least one of the following: 1) CA technical certification and at least 2 years of supervisory experience in the water industry; 2) an Associate's degree and at least 5 years of supervisory experience in the water industry; or 3) a Bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited college/university interested in entering the water industry.

The proposal was developed by Dr. Alan Styles in collaboration with a twelve member advisory board and in consultation with general managers in the local water industry. It is designed to meet the needs of the state and nation, as there is a projected large-scale requirement of professionals within the water industry. The specialized certificate was developed in the College of Business Administration and will be offered in collaboration with Extended Learning.

The proposal came with the development of five courses:

- WTRM 401: Survey of Water Management Fundamentals and Practices in California (2 units)
- WTRM 411: Leadership for Water Managers (2 units)
- WTRM 421: Environmental Issues, Policies & Regulations for Water Managers (3 units)
- WTRM 423: Finance and Professional Relations for Water Managers (3 units)
- WTRM 425: Core Concepts of Water Science, Engineering and Technology for Water Managers (2 units)

UCC's review process centered on the academic soundness and quality of the proposed curriculum to meet the aims described. The program proposal along with the curriculum underwent revisions as a part of UCCs review.

Below is a list of the departments impacted by the program proposal and their noted positions:

- 1) Liberal Studies – support
- 2) Political Science – support

UCC also requested review by Chemistry and Physics for WTRM 425. Their noted positions are below:

- 1) Chemistry – support
- 1)2) Physics – oppose as currently offered with indication of concern for the need of greater collaboration with physics and chemistry in offering this course. Support with the caveat to consult with proposer about WTRM 425 and the introduction of physical sciences.

The P form proposal came to UCC approved by Liberal Studies and Political Science, as impacted disciplines; and by all other levels of review. Chemistry has also supported the proposal as it relates to WTRM 425.

49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

UCC carefully considered the proposal in light of the stated objective, including the noted concerns of Physics over WTRM 425, and voted to recommend the WTMI P form and all associated WTRM C forms for Senate approval.

For the complete proposal, visit the Curriculum Review website, lines 10-15:  
[http://www.csusm.edu/academic\\_programs/catalogcurricula/2015-16\\_curriculum\\_coba.html](http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/catalogcurricula/2015-16_curriculum_coba.html)

## PROPOSED CATALOG LANGUAGE FOR THE CERTIFICATE OF SPECIALIZED STUDY IN WATER MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP - INTERMEDIATE LEVEL (WTMI) \*

The Certificate of Specialized Study in Water Management & Leadership – Intermediate Level aims to meet the need to recruit and educate the next generation of water industry managers and leaders. This certification will provide recognition of educational achievement. Many constituents of the water industry have expressed concern over the disproportionate numbers of water industry professionals retiring in the coming years. This “silver tsunami” is impacting the entire state and the nation. Water agencies, professionals and regulators across the region have expressed concern over the impact of the loss of knowledge and leadership with the large scale retirement of technical, managerial and executive personnel.

The Certificate of Specialized Study of Water Management and Leadership – Intermediate Level program requires successful completion of courses that combine into 12-semester unit Certificate. The classes have been developed and will be taught by water management faculty members on campus and practicing water management professionals in the region. Each class is designed to engage students by integrating theories and real world applications.

### Admission and Application Requirements

- At least one of the following:
  - Possession of a Grade II or higher water or wastewater related technical certification issued by the state of California plus at least two (2) years in a supervisory capacity at a retail, wholesale or regional water/wastewater utility or a related public-entity regulatory or planning agency; or,
  - An Associate’s degree from an accredited college plus at least five (5) years in a supervisory capacity at a retail or wholesale water/wastewater utility or a related public-entity regulatory or planning agency; or,
  - Bachelor’s degree from a regionally accredited college or university. (concern)
- Submission of the online WTRMI Program Application (<http://www.csusm.edu/el/WTRMI>)
- Submission of current resume
- Hard copy transcripts from all colleges and universities attended and mail them to:

California State University San Marcos  
Extended Learning  
Attn: Student Services/WTRMI Program  
333 S. Twin Oaks Valley Rd.  
San Marcos, CA 92096

### Courses:

WTRM 401	2
WTRM 411	2
WTRM 421	3
WTRM 423	3
WTRM 425	2

*\*The Certificate of Specialized Study in Water Management and Leadership is offered through Extended Learning.*

48	<b><u>New Courses Being Approved with this Certificate Program:</u></b>	
49	WTRM 401	Survey of California Water Management Fundamentals and Practice
50	WTRM 411	Leadership for Water Managers
51	WTRM 421	Environmental Issues, Policies & Regulations for Water Managers
52	WTRM 423	Finance and Professional Relations for Water Managers
53	WTRM 425	Core Concepts of Water Science, Engineering & Technology
54		
55		

**BLP Report: P-Form Water Resources Management Certificate  
April 12, 2016**

BLP met with Extended Learning (EL) representatives on April 5, 2016 and discussed the Extended Learning proposal for a Certificate on Water Management.

The discussion provided additional background information that helped BLP members understand the proposal – and its implications for the campus.

1. BLP members expressed concern over the EL “pricing model” and the ability to have the “fill-rates” that meet the EL cost structure.

EL noted that Industry saw the need for such a certificate – especially given the near-term turnover in middle/upper management due to retirements. They noted that:

- Industry leaders need a training pathway for its employees who want to step into these positions.
- Most water districts have development funding that employees can take advantage of.

This information allowed EL to define a curricular structure that could work within these constraints. The course price points roughly correspond to the employer provided training budget. The 3 semester program (1 calendar year) is designed to work over 2 discrete fiscal years – allowing water district employees to receive full reimbursement for the program costs. This should provide opportunity for continuous, robust enrollment. EL saw this as evidence that industry – at least over the early cycle of the certificate – would be able to fill enough seats to meet EL costs.

BLP recognized the EL has greater flexibility in its ability to suspend a certificate program (with a cohort or the program itself) if enrollment targets are not met – and EL cannot sustain the costs. These are built into all EL program models.

2. BLP members wondered about the portability of the certificate. For example, industry associations have training programs designed to address needed skill sets. BLP wondered how this certificate could “map” to these programs.

EL noted that industry was involved in the creation of course structure for the certificate. EL point out that Industry had identified this certificate as an ~~an~~ “intermediate-” level certificate that addressed the basic knowledge and skill needs of local industry. They also acknowledged, that IF the certificate is successful, other “stackable” certificate modules could be provided to address specific industry needs (a model used in other CSUSM EL certificate programs).

EL noted that they will be working with their partners to insure due diligence on the portability of the certificates.

**BLP voted to unanimously to approve this certificate.**

**DRAFT SENATE RESOLUTION: HONORING MARK DUBOIS, PROPRIETOR OF  
CAFÉ CATERING, HAVING SERVED OUR CAMPUS FOR NEARLY 20 YEARS**

**Whereas:** It is the practice of the CSUSM Academic Senate to take note of and publicly acknowledge individuals who have distinguished themselves through their exemplary accomplishments and purposeful lives of service to this campus community; and

**Whereas:** Mark DuBois, after graduating from CSUSM in 1996 with a BA in Spanish, saw a need for our young campus and opened the Power Surge Café in 1997, providing excellent food, beverage and atmosphere as the only nearby meeting place for our campus and local community; and

**Whereas:** By late 1998, Power Surge Café began catering on our campus, the success of which prompted Mark DuBois to close the Café after five years, in order to focus 100% of his talent on his catering business as Café Catering; and

**Whereas:** Café Catering gained a solid reputation among countless faculty, staff and students for its delicious and abundant food over nearly 20 years of service to our campus, catering nearly 6,000 events (sometimes up to eight events in one day), and providing ten years of sandwiches and salads for Campus Coffee at CSUSM's Founder's Plaza; and

**Whereas:** Among these many events were the Faculty Research Colloquia dinners, for which Mark DuBois frequently went 'off-menu' to provide the favorite cuisines of the faculty speakers, personalizing the evening and making each occasion even more memorable; and

**Whereas:** Mark DuBois and Café Catering upheld the highest standards of excellence in food quality, beautiful presentation, generous portions, and on-time delivery; employing professional, respectful and courteous staff; meeting special requests, while working within limited budgets; prioritizing service to campus events even during the very busy "wedding season"; while always showing an attention to detail and quality rarely seen in any business; and

**Whereas:** Alongside the sheer gustatory pleasures provided by Café Catering, it was always a personal pleasure to work with Mark Dubois; and

**Whereas:** Mark Dubois is most definitely missed by the campus community as both our caterer and friend; Now, therefore, be it

31 **Resolved:** That the Academic Senate of CSUSM recognize the stellar service that Mark Dubois  
32 has provided to our community: Mark's presence, contributions, and friendship have left a  
33 lasting mark on this campus, a legacy of dedication and high standards that will be hard for  
34 others to match; and be it further

35 **Resolved:** That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Mark DuBois, in unanimous heartfelt  
36 gratitude from this body, on behalf of the entire campus, for a job superlatively done: Thank  
37 you, we'll miss you, and we send you our very best wishes and hopes for the future.

DRAFT

1  
2       **Procedure for Initiating a Call for Filling Vacant Seats on Committees**  
3

4       NEAC would like to make a change to the way calls for filling vacant seats are  
5       initiated. The current practice is that NEAC issues a call to eligible faculty to  
6       either nominate someone or self-nominate themselves for consideration for  
7       filling the vacant seat(s). At the end of the call period, NEAC reviews the list  
8       of nominees for the seats and submits a recommendation to EC to place on  
9       the consent calendar for approval by the senate.

10  
11       NEAC recommends changing this to keeping an open call for all vacant seats  
12       so that eligible faculty may self-nominate for vacant seats as they become  
13       available. Adrienne (the senate office) will keep and maintain a posted list of  
14       the vacant seats on the senate website so that eligible faculty can go there  
15       any time to identify seats and self nominate. NEAC will send out monthly  
16       reminders for faculty to make nominations and NEAC still review the names  
17       of the nominees received by the last Thursday prior to the next senate  
18       meeting on a monthly basis and make the appropriate recommendation to EC  
19       and the senate. No such nominations will be accepted after the senate  
20       meeting in March each year to ensure that approved nominees have some  
21       significant participation on committee business for the year.

22  
23       This process is not contrary to the election rules and procedures, which state  
24       that

25  
26               *When vacancies arise on Standing Committees due to a faculty member*  
27               *being on leave or due to a faculty member's resignation, NEAC shall*  
28               *issue a call for a volunteer replacement to serve for the duration of that*  
29               *faculty member's absence.*  
30

31       What NEAC is asking is that we keep an open call for vacant seats until such  
32       seats are filled. This will make it easier for faculty to sign up rather wait for  
33       calls that have typically come out twice or three times a semester.  
34



## 2015-16 Faculty Grants Committee - Annual Report to Academic Senate

### Members

Wesley Schultz, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research (*ex-officio*)

Kimber Quinney, Lecturer (Chair) 15-17

Silvia Rolle-Rissetto, Faculty At-large 14-16

Rajnandini “Raj” Pillai, CoBA 15-17

Brian Lawler, CEHHS 15/16

Reuben Mekenye, CHABSS-HA 15/16

*Vacant*, CSM 15/16

*Vacant*, CHABSS-BSS 15-17

*Vacant*, Library 15-17

### Scope

The Committee prepares a call, leads a Graduate Studies-sponsored workshop, and reviews and recommends grant proposals for University Professional Development grants (UPD) and Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) grants. The proposal review process is administered and supported by the Office of Graduate Studies and Research (OGSR).

The committee meets twice in Fall to revise and send out the call for proposals, facilitates a faculty grant proposal workshop in early spring, and meets four times in spring to review and recommend proposal awards to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research.

### Accomplishments

#### *Faculty Grants Committee Charge*

At our first meeting in the Fall semester, the FGC reviewed and updated the committee’s charge as recommended by FAC. The updated description of the committee’s responsibilities is currently under review by Senate.

#### *Active Motif Funding Opportunity*

In December, the committee met to draft a call and requisite guidelines for an unexpected grant opportunity. This year, CSUSM received a special funding opportunity from a charitable gift to the campus by Active Motif.

The FGC issued a call for proposals on December 21; 12 faculty proposals were received by February 7. The committee met on February 23 to review the proposals, and identified three (3) for funding. Each of the selected proposals received \$20,000 in one-time special funding from University Advancement.

#### *UPD/RSCA Grants*

The AY2016-17 call and guidelines for the UPD/RSCA grants were updated in the Fall semester by the committee, in consultation with Dean Schultz.

The call went out on January 27, 2016. Links to the call and guidelines for proposal submissions were posted on the Faculty Research page of the Office of Graduate Studies

and Research website, and at the Faculty Center website.

This year the committee benefited from a new platform called “InfoReady” for submitting and reviewing grant proposals, a process that was strongly encouraged by the Chancellor’s Office (CO). We experienced technical difficulties with this new platform and, as a consequence, we also relied on a shared CSUSM Box Folder managed by Teri Woods, administrative coordinator to OGSR, to review and update relevant files.

Proposals were due on February 22. The Committee Chair led a Faculty Center UPD/RSCA proposal writing Workshop on February 9, from 12-1 PM, which was attended by 6 faculty members.

This academic year, the FGC received a total of 23 proposals (none of which was submitted by a member of FGC) requesting \$128,862 in funding. The Dean of the Office of Graduate Studies and Research worked closely with the FGC to review the proposals using a publicized rubric, and the committee determined that all 23 of these proposals warranted funding. **Based on the merits of the proposals, the committee identified full and partial funding options, and recommended \$84,999 in awards.**

Professional development funds at CSUSM have historically been funded with campus IDC and general funds; but this year, the campus received \$66,990 in one-time RSCA funds from the Chancellor’s Office.

Due to this one-time funding provision by the CO, applicants were differentiated into UPD or RSCA awards. The RSCA funds provided by the CO are open to faculty regardless of rank, whereas the UPD funds are provided by the Office of Graduate Studies and Research to support junior faculty in their efforts to secure tenure and promotion. A total of \$18,009 in OGSR general budget funds will be used to make UPD awards to assistant professors.

### **Acknowledgements**

The Chair of FGC would like to acknowledge the hard work of the committee members; this committee demands a significant commitment of time and attention.

The Committee would like to acknowledge the support of Dean Schultz and his staff in the Office of Graduate Studies and Research. The Dean is a steadfast proponent of faculty (and student) research and a wonderful colleague, who was instrumental in guiding the work of the committee. The committee would also like to acknowledge Teri Woods, staff member in the Office of Graduate Studies, who provided invaluable administrative support to FGC for the duration of the grant cycle.

Finally, the committee would like to remind the campus community that faculty members at CSU San Marcos are conducting fascinating and important research, scholarly, and creative activities as evidenced by this year’s awards. We encourage faculty to learn more about their colleagues’ research by attending the Celebration of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities in Fall 2016.

93 **Recommendations**

- 94
- 95 • The Committee recommends that the technical problems inherent in the new
- 96 “InfoReady” platform be resolved prior to the launch of the upcoming academic
- 97 year grant cycle
- 98
- 99 • The Committee recommends that the colleges, the Faculty Center, and grant
- 100 writers increase mentoring for faculty submitting proposals, particularly assistant
- 101 professors.

## **Academic Policy Committee Year End Report 2015/2016**

### **Membership**

#### **Voting Members**

David Barsky, CSM (Chair, Spring)  
Jeff Charles, GSC  
Debbie Kang, CHABSS  
Talitha Matlin, Library  
Open Seats: At-Large and CEHHS

#### **Non-voting Members, Designees and Regular Guests**

Dawn Formo, Undergraduate Studies  
Aaron Guy, Extended Learning  
Mads Nilson, Sam Rantin (Fall) and Chris Morales (Spring), ASI  
David McMartin, Student Affairs  
Lourdes Shahamiri and Heather Steiger, Academic Programs  
Lynn Marie Rantanen and Pam Bell, Project & Degree Audit Coordinator  
Wes Schultz, Graduate Studies  
Thomas Swanger, Enrollment Management Services

### **APC Policies Sent to Senate**

#### **1. Curriculum Proposer Policy**

- This was a revision to a policy passed in November 2014
- The revision requires lecturers who are sole proposers of curriculum to have three-year (or multi-year) contracts. Lecturers who are not on such contracts may still initiate curriculum changes, but must do so through another faculty “sponsor.”
- Passed 38-3-1 by the Academic Senate on February 3, 2016.
- Approved by the Provost and President on March 16 and 17, respectively.

#### **2. Academic Calendar Revisions for Academic Years 2016-17 and 2017-18**

- Removed the dual-listing of the Friday of Finals Weeks as both a Final Exams Day and a Commencement Day; this is now only a Commencement Day.
- Passed unanimously by the Academic Senate on March 2, 2016.

#### **3. Academic Calendars for Academic Years 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21.**

- The calendars were developed using the same set of Calendar Assumptions that have guided construction of academic calendars for more than a decade, and which were shared with the Academic Senate at its October 2015 meeting.
- Passed unanimously by the Academic Senate on April 6, 2016.

#### **4. Graduate Probation, Disqualification and Reinstatement Policy**

- Shortens “academic-administrative” probation/disqualification/reinstatement to “administrative” probation/disqualification/reinstatement, and has certain of these processes for professionally accredited master’s and credential programs carried out in the Office of the Dean of CEHHS instead of the Dean of Graduate Studies.

- Passed 34-1-1 by the Senate on April 20, 2016 .
- 5. Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement: Graduate Level (GWARGL) Policy
  - Renames the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) Policy the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement: Graduate Level (GWARGL) Policy.
  - Passed 37-2-1 by the Senate on April 20, 2016.
- 6. All-University Writing Requirement Policy
  - Extends the All-University Writing Requirement to all degree-credit courses with an exemption provision for certain graduate courses.
  - Passed 37-1-1 by the Senate on April 20, 2016.
- 7. Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement: Baccalaureate Level (GWARBL) Policy
  - States that undergraduates meet this requirement through their coursework, because courses are governed by the All-University Writing Requirement.
  - Passed 34-1-4 by the Senate on April 20, 2016.
- 8. Final Exam Policy
  - Creates a process for students who have three or more final exams on a single day, or four or more final exams in a 24-hour period, to have a final exam rescheduled.
  - Passed 34-2-1 by the Senate on April 20, 2016.
- 9. Undergraduate Probation, Disqualification and Reinstatement Policy
  - Shortens “academic-administrative” probation/disqualification/reinstatement to “administrative” probation/disqualification/reinstatement, and updates the names of various administrative positions mentioned in the policy.
  - Passed unanimously by the Senate on April 20, 2016

### **Other Policy Work Conducted During 2015/16**

1. Ethnic Studies Task Force Report
  - APC responded to a request from the statewide Academic Senate to provide feedback on the Draft Ethnic Studies Task Force Report. APC expressed concern that focusing campus multicultural and diversity requirements exclusively on ethnic studies might diminish attention to other dimensions of diversity
2. Excess-Units Seniors Policy
  - APC revised this policy with significant input from Enrollment Management Services and sent it to Executive Committee where it was discussed on April 6, 2016. The revision was returned to APC to address concerns that the proposed revisions were overly restrictive.
3. Online Instruction Policy
  - APC completed a revision of this policy and sent it to the Technology Policy Advisory Committee for comments in January 2016. TPAC comments were received in mid-March and APC will continue working through these next year.
4. English Language Admissions Requirement Policy
  - APC has been asked by Global Programs to raise the IELTS score requirements for international students. APC has requested data that supports this request.

5. Academic Discontinuance Policy
  - APC is revising this policy to reflect experience gained through the first applications of this policy.
6. Impaction Declaration Policy
7. Academic Department Creation Policy

### **Other APC News for 2015/16**

The Senate Executive Committee has been informed that an official response by administration to the Academic Freedom Policy (passed without dissent by the Senate on April 8, 2015) may be coming soon.

### **Carry-forward Items for 2016/17**

The following two items will have the highest priority for next year:

1. Revision of the On-line Instruction Policy.
2. Revision of the Academic Program Discontinuance Policy

The next two items are ones that APC should be able to build upon work already done in 2015/16 to bring to conclusion rather readily:

3. Excess-Units Seniors Policy
4. English Language Admissions Requirement Policy

The next item is one where APC has done some preliminary work, but has not gotten very far along in drafting a policy

5. Impaction Declaration Policy

APC was asked to review the following referral to determine whether this was appropriate for APC.

6. Academic Department Creation Policy

Report submitted by David J. Barsky

1 **BLP Annual Report, 2015-16**

2  
3 Committee Members: Allison Carr (co-chair), Robert Yamashita (co-chair), Rong-Ji  
4 Chen, Kamel Haddad, Olaf Hanson, Katherine Kantardjieff, Carlos Morales, Kevin  
5 Morningstar, Toni Olivas, Mike Schroder  
6

7 **P-Forms Completed**

- 8
  - Water Resources Management Certificate, approved 4/5/16
  - Business Minor, approved 4/12/16

10  
11 **A-Forms Completed**

- 12
  - American Indian Studies, approved 11/17/16
  - Chican@ Studies, approved 11/17/16
  - Wildfire Science, approved 11/17/16

15  
16 **Policies Completed**

- 17
  - Moving Programs from Self-Support to State-Support Funding, approved by  
18 Senate, 4/20/16
  - University Academic Master Plan, approved by Senate, 4/20/16

20  
21 **Discussion Items/Referrals Completed**

- 22
  - Adding a Self-Support option to State-Support program: MEd Educational  
23 Administration: BLP report to Dean Schroder and Dean Eisenbach, March  
24 2016
  - AALC/BLP Meeting and task force to complete prioritization of budget  
25 requests for AA, February 2016
  - Policy to create new departments: BLP completed discussion; policy referred  
26 to APC, February 2016
  - Assigned time document presented by Kamel Haddad at the EC Retreat: BLP  
27 discussed possible uses for the information in review of programs, October,  
28 2015
  - BLP Charge: Does the charge for BLP accurately reflect the work BLP does,  
29 especially in regards to long-range planning? BLP concluded that the charge  
30 is accurate through the work done on LAMP, September, 2015  
31

32  
33 **Business to Carry Forward**

- 34
  - Ethnic Studies P-Form (see addendum)

## Faculty Affairs Committee AY 2015-2016 Report

### Introduction

FAC meets weekly for two hours. The committee membership for the academic year was the following:

Ann Fiegen, Library 14-16, chair (Fall 2015), on sabbatical Spring 2016

Marie Thomas, At-large, 14-16, chair (Spring 2016)

Mayra Besosa, CHABSS 15-17

John Drewe, Lecturer 15-16

Ahmad Hadaegh, CSM 14-16

Sean Newcomer, CEHHS 15-17

**Vacant, CoBA 15-17**

**Vacant, At-large 15-16**

**Vacant, At-large 15-17**

Michelle Hunt, ex-officio, Faculty Affairs

Anne Lombard, ex-officio, CFA

Ann Fiegen has been elected FAC chair for AY 16-17. FAC meeting day/time/location TBD.

FAC acted on 12 documents this academic year. FAC reviewed seven different department RTP documents. FAC approved one and is awaiting response to feedback on seven (one holdover from AY 14-15).

### New FAC documents approved in Academic Senate

- Evaluation for Athletic Coaches policy
- LBST RTP document
- Policy for Assigned Time for Exceptional Service
- Visiting faculty policy and procedures (2<sup>nd</sup> reading, 5/4/16 Academic Senate)

### Revisions to existing documents approved in Academic Senate

- University RTP policy (see below)
- Faculty Awards Policy (now Brakebill policy)
- Sabbatical policy
- Faculty Grants Review Committee document
- Grant Proposal Seed Money policy

### FAC Revisions to University RTP document approved in Academic Senate

- Documentation of service credit clarified
- Role of service credit in retention, tenure, and promotion clarified
- Clarification that there must be a record of achievement at CSUSM (this affects college/department policies that speak of achievements at “a university”)
- CBA article updates



47 **Referrals removed from FAC**

- 48 • Conflict of interest for evaluators of RTP files  
49 • Consideration of CUGR Committee resolution  
50

51 **FAC referrals deferred to AY 2016-2017**

- 52 • Faculty Ethics Policy (sent to CFA Statewide; awaiting response)  
53 • Lecturer inclusion (see below)  
54 • Physics Department RTP document (returned with responses to FAC feedback on  
55 4/28/16)  
56 • College of Science and Math PRC Nominations and Election Policy (returned with  
57 responses to FAC feedback on 4/28/16)  
58 • Waiting for response to FAC feedback  
59 • Biology Department RTP document  
60 • Chemistry Department RTP document  
61 • Computer Science and Information Systems Department RTP document  
62 • Math Department RTP document  
63 • Library RTP document  
64 • College of Science and Math Lecturer Evaluation Policy  
65

66 **Issue for future discussion – Lecturer Inclusion across the University**  
67

68 FAC members met on 3/16/16 lecturers involved in college or university service/governance.  
69 The result of this meeting was a series of ideas and issues that warrant further investigation.  
70

- 71 • The Lecturer Advisory Council (LAC) chair in each college should be a voting member  
72 of the college's coordinating committee.  
73  
74 • Each college's LAC should become an official part of the college governance structure.  
75  
76 • LAC members should be compensated for their work.  
77  
78 • Academic Senate should provide guidance to colleges about lecturer participation in  
79 department business (e.g., invitations to department meetings, making meeting minutes  
80 available, etc.).  
81  
82 • Because space is such an issue, perhaps there should be a lecturer on the Provost's space  
83 advisory council.  
84  
85 • Academic Senate should look carefully at the definition of "faculty" in the Constitution;  
86 currently, only full-time lecturers are considered "eligible faculty" for voting purposes  
87 (plus those part-time lecturers who are filling designated lecturer seats on committees).  
88  
89 • Within the colleges, full-time lecturers are not franchised.  
90  
91 • There should be a strategic plan for lecturer support and development.

92  
93  
94 Terri Metzger (Lecturer Faculty Fellow) and Elisa Grant-Vallone (Faculty Center Director)  
95 provided FAC with additional issues and ideas:  
96

- 97 • Because recommendations made by Senate state the will of the faculty and can be an  
98 effective impetus for future action, a recommendation could be that CSUSM continue to  
99 actively seek ways to integrate lecturer faculty perspective into decision making at all  
100 levels of the University and in areas such as facilities, resource allocation, curriculum,  
101 task forces, administrator search committees, strategic planning groups, etc. There has  
102 been progress on this front and we think the Senate could encourage that to continue.  
103
- 104 • A second recommendation could be that AA build funding capacity into the AA budget  
105 plan in order to compensate lecturers for service (funding could be a pool administered to  
106 lecturer applicants). This would be something different from the CBA exceptional service  
107 to students funding, but would be specifically for lecturer service to the academic  
108 community at CSUSM.  
109
- 110 • An additional idea is to commission a self-study of lecturer inclusion efforts across  
111 campus, like a program review of sorts, to pull together a comprehensive report of the  
112 “ad hoc” improvements that have occurred that can then inform future planning and  
113 decision-making.  
114
- 115 • Finally, we discussed that rather than individual colleges trying to manage the lecturer  
116 office space concerns, it may be more effective and efficient if AA took a long-term  
117 comprehensive approach by providing innovative spaces that have private student-  
118 meeting options, secure storage for individuals’ items, as well as “landing” places for  
119 faculty between classes.  
120

121 **Based on the above points, the members of FAC make the following recommendations:**  
122

- 123 • In Fall 2016, FAC should create a subcommittee to focus on lecturer issues. The first  
124 task of the subcommittee should be to do a “self-study” to understand current campus  
125 practices and to look at best practices at other campuses (thanks to Elisa Grant-Vallone  
126 for this idea).  
127
- 128 • Based on the results of the self-study, the subcommittee will consider and make  
129 recommendations about the issues described above and other issues that may come out of  
130 the self-study.  
131

132  
133  
134 FAC report respectfully submitted by Marie Thomas  
135 May 2, 2016

## **General Education Committee 2015-16**

### **Annual Report to Academic Senate**

#### **Membership**

##### **Voting members:**

CHABSS – Humanities/Arts: Catherine Cucinella, Ibrahim Al-Marashi

CHABSS – Social Sciences: Joely Proudfit, Fredi Avalos-C'Debaca

CSM: Julie Jameson, Andre Kundgen

COEHHS: Rodney Beaulieu

Library: Yvonne Meulemans (Chair)

**Non-voting members and others in attendance:** Regina Eisenbach (Dean of Academic Programs), Dawn Formo (Dean of Undergraduate Studies), Akilah Green (ASI), Melissa Simnitt (Assessment Specialist-Academic Programs), Virginia Mann (Curriculum Specialist-Academic Programs), Lynn Rantanen (IITS eAdvising), David McMartin (Director - Undergraduate Advising), Patti Garnet (Articulation Officer)

##### **Curriculum**

As of this writing, GEC considered 23 courses submitted for GEC designation and approved 21 of these proposals.

##### **Review of the lower division curriculum**

Over the past two years, the General Education Committee (GEC) exercised its duty to review curriculum periodically, which the GE Philosophy Statement directs:

*All courses certified for General Education shall be evaluated periodically to determine if they satisfy all applicable General Education criteria. New courses will be reviewed after the second semester in which they are taught. All courses will be reviewed every three years.*

In the 14-15 GEC Annual Report, this review was deemed complete. In fact, GEC reviewed 23 lower-division GE recertification proposals over the course of the fall semester; these courses had been submitted for review, but further information was needed by the committee. Eighteen (18) of these courses were recertified in Fall 2015; five (5) were decertified. Detailed information about the process can be found in the 14-15 report.

##### **GE Assessment**

GEC continued progress on establishing a process of assessing the general education program. The 14-15 GEC Annual Report detailed the steps taken last year: identifying learning outcomes to assess and determining a tentative assessment cycle. In the fall semester, the GEC finalized a feasible assessment cycle all nine General Education Program Learning Outcomes over three years.

*Year 1*

2. Compare and contrast relationships within and between human cultures.

6. Think critically and analytically about an issue, idea or problem, considering alternative perspectives and re-evaluation of one's own position.

8. Describe the importance of diverse experiences, thoughts, and identities needed to be effective in working and living in diverse communities and environments.

*Year 2*

1. Describe and/or apply principles and methods that are necessary to understand the physical and natural world.

5. Find, evaluate, and use authoritative and/or scholarly information to comprehend a line of inquiry.

7. Apply numerical/mathematical concepts in order to illustrate fundamental concepts within fields of study.

*Year 3*

3. Communicate effectively in writing, using conventions appropriate to various contexts and diverse audiences.

4. Use oral communication to effectively convey meaning to various audiences.

9. Apply knowledge gained from courses in different disciplines to new settings and complex problems.

GEPSLO's are also posted online at: <http://www.csusm.edu/ge/GEPSLOs/>

Later in the fall semester, GEC convened a subcommittee the included the GEC Chair, Jacquelyn Kilpatrick (Director, School of Arts), Catherine Cucinella, and Melissa Simnitt to consider how to move forward on this effort. GEC had received feedback that assessment of student work in arts and related courses seems to be most difficult and for this reason, asked Dr. Kilpatrick to be on the subcommittee. The subcommittee was concerned that there was little awareness and/or understanding of the General Education Program Student Learning Outcomes (GEPSLO's). In order to determine if this is the case, a brief survey was administered in Spring 2016 to instructors who are teaching GE courses that include the learning outcomes identified in the first cycle of assessment. The subcommittee met to review the survey results and will submit to the GEC an assessment plan that makes use of the results at the upcoming May 5 meeting. Should the committee agree to accept the report and plan, it will be placed in the GEC community web site.

**Diversity in the GE Program**

The 2014-15 GEC Annual Report included substantive discussion of the findings from diversity mapping initiative done by Halualani & Associates. GEC's work calendar for 2015-16 included that the committee was to identify next steps (if any) in addressing the findings of the mapping initiative. At the Executive Committee (EC) retreat at the start of the academic year, the President

asked that any next steps related to the mapping initiative be put on hold pending the creation of a strategic plan for diversity and inclusion. As of this writing, a draft diversity and inclusion strategic plan has been disseminated to the campus community.

At the start of the academic year, GEC members were still interested in the issue of diversity in the GE program and to this end, the committee collected and included in the online container for the GEC: documents detailing how issues of diversity and inclusion have been addressed previous iterations of the GE Program, Senate documents detailing the GE program, and materials from GEC's efforts related to this issue from 2010-11. These materials were discussed in a number of GEC meetings with the goal to ensure there was an easy accessible record of this issue available to the next GEC or any person or group that would be interested in this information.

GEC feels strongly that this issue should be a priority for next year's committee. Not only because of the diversity mapping findings, but also because students, in the past academic year, have been clearly been expressing interest that issues of diversity are more substantively included in the GE curriculum. While certainly the curriculum is the purview of the faculty, the curriculum exists for students and their input can be invaluable.

Additionally, GEC discussed that this issue also touches on ensuring students' workplace readiness. In the current global atmosphere, cultural intelligence is an essential skill in order for students to address conflict cross-culturally and creatively. In this way, this issue extends beyond GEC and becomes a campus-wide issue.

There has been discussion beyond the GEC that GEC is aware of regarding how to move this issue forward: the formation of a subcommittee or entirely other committee to consider this issue, prioritizing courses that address those issues of diversity that were identified as lacking in the diversity mapping findings, and offering a professional development certificate on teaching cultural intelligence are all examples.

#### **Updating Upper-Division General Education curriculum forms**

During course review this past year, committee members identified a few issues related to the upper-division GE curricular forms that bear being noted for next year's GEC.

GEC has been directing course proposers who are asked to provide additional information to review approved courses from the same GE area on the curriculum tracking page ([http://www.csusm.edu/academic\\_programs/catalogcurricula/2015-16\\_curriculum.html](http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/catalogcurricula/2015-16_curriculum.html)). Approved courses can be helpful examples to proposers in understanding the level of detail and information the committee needs. But even with exemplars, the committee has concluded that the forms could be improved and made easier for proposers and GEC.

The issues noted below occurred with such regularity that GEC members wonder if rewriting the questions or a larger, substantive change to the curriculum forms would be more helpful to proposers and future committees. It may be worthwhile to note that the updated LDGE forms could

offer a possible format and structure to address these concerns. GEC asks that these issues be added to the 2016-17 GEC work calendar.

*Question 3b-c: courses that are also for majors*

If a course is offered to majors as well as GE students, question 3c asks: “Please describe how this course is designed to provide valuable and appropriate learning experiences to both majors and non-majors.” GEC found that many proposers had to be asked to provide more detail in how students without a background in a particular subject would have the same opportunity to succeed as students who have taken some coursework in the subject. GEC recognizes that many small programs create courses for both audiences. However, in order to determine if the course is appropriate for GE, the committee needs information as to how students with disparate knowledge will experience the course.

*Questions 4-7 on CC and DD forms: Ensuring discussion of content and pedagogy/assignments*

Proposers typically do an excellent job of describing course content in response to these questions. GEC regularly asks proposers for more information about how the course content is taught and considered by the students. For example, question 4 asks: “Please explain how this course introduces such students to the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the discipline, and how connection is made between these fundamentals and the particular applications emphasized in the course.” Proposers often describe the basic assumptions, principles, and methods of the discipline, but not how students learn them (e.g. class discussions, written work, presentations, etc.) This issue has also been observed in responses to questions 5-7. It can be quite daunting for proposers to hear back from the committee that a substantive part of their course proposal is still needs in order for their course to be considered. Further, GEC members need sufficient information in order to determine if the course should have GE designation. The committee has not observed the same issues with questions 4-7 on the BB form.

*Revising Question 8 (on CC, DD forms) and Question 7 (BB form)*

This question on the UDGE forms asks specifically for information about assessing student learning. The substance of responses to this question vary widely. In some cases, there is no response, in part because there is language that indicates assessment is optional; Q8b literally includes: “If you use any course assessment activities...” GEC believes that the word ‘if’ erroneously indicates that an instructor could choose to not be doing some type of course assessment and GEC would have enough information to consider the course. This is not the case. Some discussion of assessment of student learning is required in the LDGE forms. GEC is unaware of any reason why this can’t also be required in UDGE forms.

Lastly, the UDGE forms need to have the appropriate learning outcomes on the actual form, just as the LDGE forms do. Particularly for Q8, having the learning outcomes on the form could go a long way in helping proposers provide all the information GEC needs to review a course.

**GE curricular review: Process concerns**

GEC is concerned that the existing process and procedure in place to review and designate GE courses is insufficient in a number of ways and advises next year's committee to consider improvements. Currently, a proposer only has to complete the form and then the course can go to GEC for consideration. While this seems simple and straightforward, requiring additional steps in the process may actually make the review and approval process more efficient for everyone involved. Two concerns have consistently been noticed by GEC this academic year:

1. There is no clear process for determining impacted departments and no explicit detail as to what input the departments are expected to provide when there are concerns about a proposed course.
2. Proposers need additional information about the level of detail needed for GEC to consider a course.

For issue 1, there needs to be clarity as to how impacted departments/colleges are defined. What a proposer considers as a possible impacted department/college may be different from what GEC considers impacted. A means to address such a discrepancy is needed. Also, perhaps a detailed work flow or procedure that includes impacted departments or other colleges, before a course comes to GEC, would be helpful. There are signature lines with a note regarding support/do not support from impacted departments, but the forms are silent about timeline and what further information departments could provide to GEC regarding proposed courses.

For issue 2, while there is information available on the GE program web site: <http://www.csusm.edu/ge/facdevcourse.html>, perhaps this site could include more context and detail would be helpful to proposers and departments. GEC has, in previous years, noted a need for a "GE Handbook" and this type of information would also be appropriate to include.

Lastly, we ask that GEC 2016-17 consider including approved GE courses on the consent calendar. The rationale for this is unclear to the existing committee. Current GEC members wonder if adding GE courses to the consent calendar would be yet another avenue for alerting departments/colleges of courses that may impact them.

### **WASC findings: Defining student success as it relates to the GE program**

The final report from WASC will be received in May. However, at the March 2016 exit meeting, the WASC team included the recommendation that substantive progress is made on GE assessment and CSUSM consider how the campus defines "student success" generally and specifically, as a result of the GE program. As we expect the final recommendation to say the same, GEC asks that the 2016-17 committee to consider how to move forward on this rather large and abstract idea. Since such a conversation applies to virtually every aspect of the campus, it seems essential that there is campus-wide leadership on this recommendation.

### **Addressing minimum grade requirement for B4**

210 In the fall semester, it was again brought to GEC's attention that EO 1100 would require a minimum  
211 grade of **C** in the Golden Four requirements (aka 'basic subjects' which include: writing, oral  
212 communication, critical thinking and mathematics/quantitative reasoning) for students to earn GE  
213 credit. At CSUSM, the mathematics/quantitative reasoning GE requirement is known as B4. There  
214 was concern that this minimum grade requirement would now keep students who had earned a **C-**  
215 in their B4 course would be unduly burdened by having to complete the B4 requirement. GEC  
216 convened a subcommittee in order to identify a possible solution. The subcommittee proposed a  
217 change to the existing GE policy to allow students to earn credit if they earned a C- in a B4 course.  
218 The existing GE policy did not allow any GE course to be taken for credit/no credit. There were  
219 many other details in the proposed policy change that are not mentioned here that would have kept  
220 students from enrolling in other GE courses for credit/no credit. The policy change went to Senate  
221 for a first reading in Spring 2016 but was removed from the agenda because an April 13 2016  
222 coded memo (ASA-2016-08) made explicit that on those CSU campuses that used "+/-" grading  
223 scales could allow C- grades to be sufficient to earn GE credit in the Gold Four requirements. The  
224 proposed policy change became moot with this memo. GEC unanimously voted to remove this from  
225 the Senate agenda.



**Nominations, Elections, Appointments, & Constitution Committee (NEAC)**  
**2015-2016 END-YEAR REPORT**

**Members during AY 2015-2016:**

Chair: Moses Ochanji, CEHHS 15-17  
Ian Chan, Library 14-16  
Robert Sheath, CSM 14-16  
Wenyuh Tsay, CoBA 14-16  
Paul Stuhr, At-large 15-17  
Anibal Yanez-Chavez, CHABSS 15-17

**Activities during AY 2015-2016:**

NEAC Report to Senate

- 1 NEAC's major focus during the year was filling seats for committees; several calls for service were issued throughout the year for vacancies. NEAC evaluated the nominees for each seat and made recommendations to the Executive Committee and the Senate. NEAC notes that filling vacant seats remain an issue for some committees.
- 2 NEAC initiated a new procedure for conducting calls for vacant senate committee seats. By this procedure, there will be an open call for all vacant seats so that eligible faculty may self-nominate for vacant seats as they become available. The senate office will keep and maintain a posted list of the vacant seats on the senate website so that eligible faculty can go there any time to identify seats and self nominate. NEAC will send out monthly reminders for faculty to make nominations and NEAC still review the names of the nominees received by the last Thursday prior to the next senate meeting on a monthly basis and make the appropriate recommendation to EC and the senate. No such nominations will be accepted after the senate meeting in March each year to ensure that approved nominees have some significant participation on committee business for the year. This procedure will go into effect in starting 2016/17 academic year
- 3 NEAC garnered feedback on Spring 2015 Referendum on uncoupling Vice-Chair and Chair seats. NEAC initiated and conducted a Constitution and Bylaws Referendum. The referendum had sufficient number of faculty voters participating and the proposed amendments passed.
- 4 NEAC deliberated on whether to consider majority of voters versus majority of eligible faculty when conducting a referendum and whether a referendum was necessary to change the constitution on this issue. NEAC recommend keeping the current practice where the majority of eligible faculty (two thirds) are required to participate in a referendum.
- 5 NEAC reviewed other CSUS's senate constitutions for qualifications of senate chairs and made a recommendation to the EC on the qualifications and election process for the CSUSM senate chair.
- 6 NEAC made a recommendation to EC on changes to the constitution on the

47 participation of ex-officio members on senate standing committees. The  
48 constitutions amendments to reflect these changes will be coupled with the  
49 next initiated referendum on a constitution amendment.  
50 7 NEAC oversaw the Academic Senate Spring Elections that occurred in April  
51 2016. NEAC ratified the results of the spring 2016 elections. The results were  
52 presented to the senate in April.  
53 8 NEAC conducted two Constitution and Bylaws Referendums. In both cases,  
54 the Referendums had sufficient number of faculty voters participating, and  
55 the proposed amendments passed. This resulted in a number of changes to  
56 the Constitution and Bylaws.  
57

### 58 **Agenda for AY 2016-2017**

59 During the next academic year, NEAC will continue to focus on filling vacant seats in  
60 the Senate and university committees, as well as conducting the Academic Senate  
61 Elections.  
62 NEAC deliberated but did not make significant process on the charge on how to  
63 handle long-term vacant seats senate committees. A recommendation that may need  
64 further discussion is whether these seats can be converted to at-large seats if the  
65 unit responsible did not seat a person for the entire previous year.  
66

### 67 **Members, Chair, and Meeting Time for 2016-17**

68 The new NEAC members for next year include: Wenyuh Tsay (CoBA), Torie  
69 Quinonez (Library), and (CSM rep currently vacant). They will join the continuing  
70 members on the committee: Aníbal Yáñez-Chávez (CHABSS), Moses Ochanji  
71 (CEHHS), Paul Stuhr (At large).  
72

73 The chair for the 2016-2017 academic year will be determined in our last meeting of  
74 the year, which occurs during finals week. NEAC conducts most of its business  
75 electronically; in-person meetings are typically scheduled twice a semester (at the  
76 beginning and at the end of the semester) and on an as-needed basis.

1 **Program Assessment Committee**

2 **Final Report to the Academic Senate, 2015-2016**

3 **Members:**

4 David Chien, At Large  
5 Rocio Guillen-Castrillo, CSM  
6 Sue Thompson, Library (Fall)  
7 Anne Lombard, CHABSS-AH  
8 Linda Shaw, Co-Chair, CHABSS-SS  
9 Jill Weigt, Co-Chair, At Large  
10 Regina Eisenbach, Dean, Academic Programs  
11 Wesley Schultz, AVP Research, Dean of Graduate Studies  
12 Melissa Simnitt, Assessment Specialist  
13 Alejandra Sanchez, Staff  
14

15 **PAC 2015-16 AY Accomplishments**

16 The PAC accomplished a considerable amount of work during the current AY focused on  
17 reviewing all Program Review documents including the Program Self Studies, External  
18 Reviewers' Reports, Program Responses to External Reviewers' Reports, Library Dean's Reports  
19 (optional), and College Dean's Reports, for seven programs. Based on its review of these  
20 documents, the PAC also makes a recommendation (based on criteria contained in the Program  
21 Review Policy and Guidelines) for the length of the next review cycle, as well as  
22 recommendations to the program and administration for ways to enhance and strengthen the  
23 program prior to the next review.

24 During the past AY, the PAC has responded to reviews for the following degree programs: Global  
25 Studies B.A., Mathematics B.S., Mathematics M.S., Psychology B.A., Psychology M.A., Visual and  
26 Performing Arts B.A., and Special Major B.A.

27 The Program Review documents, as well as PAC's responses and recommendations, were  
28 considered by those involved in developing the Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) that  
29 guide program planning during the next review cycle as stipulated by the Program Review Policy  
30 and Guidelines. The PAC Chairs' tasks that are associated with completion of the PAC's work on  
31 Program Reviews are listed separately in the section below.

32 In addition to the tasks performed by the PAC committee members, the PAC Co-Chairs wrote  
33 summary letters containing recommendations for the future plans for each Program Review.  
34 These letters (which averaged 25 pages) are central to the final step of the Program Review  
35 process, the MOU meeting, because they organize and synthesize the various reviewers'  
36 responses for the department representatives, the PAC Chair(s), the College Deans, the Dean  
37 of Academic Programs, and the Provost who, together, develop the MOU that stipulates the  
38 plan for program development and change during the next Program Review cycle. Finally,  
39 working with PAC committee members, the Co-chairs provided feedback and guidance to five

programs that submitted Interim Reports: Education M.A., Educational Leadership Ed.D., Nursing B.S., Liberal Studies B.A., and Biotechnology M.S. The purpose of the Interim Reports is to enable programs to discuss their progress, as well as the obstacles they encounter, in meeting MOU goals and for the PAC to provide guidance and constructive feedback to the program prior to the next Program Review.

In addition to the work completed in collaboration with the entire committee, the PAC Co-Chairs also undertook the following additional tasks: participated in orientation meetings for the programs undergoing review in the next academic year, responded to questions from Department Chairs and Program Review leads throughout the two-year review cycle, met with the external reviewers for each program review to respond to questions about the Program Review process and about expectations regarding the External Reviewers' Report, participated in MOU meetings, worked with the Dean of Academic Programs to draft the document that specifies the actions that parties to the MOU process have agreed upon, and coordinated the work of the PAC (e.g., organizing the committee's work, preparing minutes and agendas, etc.) to ensure that PAC meets deadlines for completing its responses to Programs Reviews.

#### **PAC 2016-17 AY Agenda**

During the 2016-17 AY, the PAC will review and respond to Program Reviews from the following degree programs: Communication B.A., Human Development B.A., Literature and Writing M.A., and Spanish B.A.

In addition, the PAC will also review and respond to mid-review cycle Interim Reports from the following degree programs: Anthropology B.A., Literature and Writing B.A., and Social Sciences B.A.

#### **PAC 2016-17 AY Chair(s) and Meeting Time**

PAC Chair(s): TBD

PAC Meeting Times: 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Fridays, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

## Program Assessment Committee

## Final Report to the Academic Senate, 2015-2016

**Members:**

David Chien, At Large  
Rocio Guillen-Castrillo, CSM  
Sue Thompson, Library (Fall)  
Anne Lombard, CHABSS-AH  
Linda Shaw, Co-Chair, CHABSS-SS  
Jill Weigt, Co-Chair, At Large  
Regina Eisenbach, Dean, Academic Programs  
Wesley Schultz, AVP Research, Dean of Graduate Studies  
Melissa Simnitt, Assessment Specialist  
Alejandra Sanchez, Staff

## PAC 2015-16 AY Accomplishments

The PAC accomplished a considerable amount of work during the current AY focused on reviewing all Program Review documents including the Program Self Studies, External Reviewers' Reports, Program Responses to External Reviewers' Reports, Library Dean's Reports (optional), and College Dean's Reports, for seven programs. Based on its review of these documents, the PAC also makes a recommendation (based on criteria contained in the Program Review Policy and Guidelines) for the length of the next review cycle, as well as recommendations to the program and administration for ways to enhance and strengthen the program prior to the next review.

During the past AY, the PAC has responded to reviews for the following degree programs: Global Studies B.A., Mathematics B.S., Mathematics M.S., Psychology B.A., Psychology M.A., Visual and Performing Arts B.A., and Special Major B.A.

The Program Review documents, as well as PAC’s responses and recommendations, were considered by those involved in developing the Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs) that guide program planning during the next review cycle as stipulated by the Program Review Policy and Guidelines. The PAC Chairs’ tasks that are associated with completion of the PAC’s work on Program Reviews are listed separately in the section below.

In addition to the tasks performed by the PAC committee members, the PAC Co-Chairs wrote summary letters containing recommendations for the future plans for each Program Review. These letters (which averaged 25 pages) are central to the final step of the Program Review process, the MOU meeting, because they organize and synthesize the various reviewers' responses for the department representatives, the PAC Chair(s), the College Deans, the Dean of Academic Programs, and the Provost who, together, develop the MOU that stipulates the plan for program development and change during the next Program Review cycle. Finally, working with PAC committee members, the Co-chairs provided feedback and guidance to five

programs that submitted Interim Reports: Education M.A., Educational Leadership Ed.D., Nursing B.S., Liberal Studies B.A., and Biotechnology M.S. The purpose of the Interim Reports is to enable programs to discuss their progress, as well as the obstacles they encounter, in meeting MOU goals and for the PAC to provide guidance and constructive feedback to the program prior to the next Program Review.

In addition to the work completed in collaboration with the entire committee, the PAC Co-Chairs also undertook the following additional tasks: participated in orientation meetings for the programs undergoing review in the next academic year, responded to questions from Department Chairs and Program Review leads throughout the two-year review cycle, met with the external reviewers for each program review to respond to questions about the Program Review process and about expectations regarding the External Reviewers' Report, participated in MOU meetings, worked with the Dean of Academic Programs to draft the document that specifies the actions that parties to the MOU process have agreed upon, and coordinated the work of the PAC (e.g., organizing the committee's work, preparing minutes and agendas, etc.) to ensure that PAC meets deadlines for completing its responses to Programs Reviews.

#### **PAC 2016-17 AY Agenda**

During the 2016-17 AY, the PAC will review and respond to Program Reviews from the following degree programs: Communication B.A., Human Development B.A., Literature and Writing M.A., and Spanish B.A.

In addition, the PAC will also review and respond to mid-review cycle Interim Reports from the following degree programs: Anthropology B.A., Literature and Writing B.A., and Social Sciences B.A.

#### **PAC 2016-17 AY Chair(s) and Meeting Time**

PAC Chair(s): TBD

PAC Meeting Times: 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Fridays, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

## SAC 2015-16 Year End Report

Fall 2015	Spring 2016
<b><u>Members (voting)</u></b> <b>Chair:</b> Marion Geiger, CHABSS 15-17 Nahid Majd, CSM 14-16 Vacant, At-large 14-16 Tricia Lantzy, Library 15-17 Jeff Nessler, CEHHS 15-16 Vacant, At-large 15-17 Vacant, CoBA 15-17 Yazmin Doroteo, Student Representative Bianca Garcia, Student Representative <b><u>Members (non-voting)</u></b> Jennie Ruiz, Vice President of Student Affairs' Designee Dawn Formo, Dean of Undergraduate Studies P. Wesley Schultz, Dean of Graduate Studies	<b><u>Members (voting)</u></b> <b>Chair:</b> Marion Geiger, CHABSS 15-17 Nahid Majd, CSM 14-16 Vacant, At-large 14-16 Tricia Lantzy, Library 15-17 Vacant, CEHHS 15-16 Michelle Ramos Pellicia, At-large 15-17 Vacant, CoBA 15-17 Vacant, Student Representative Bianca Garcia, Student Representative <b><u>Members (non-voting)</u></b> Jennie Ruiz, Vice President of Student Affairs' Designee Dawn Formo, Dean of Undergraduate Studies P. Wesley Schultz, Dean of Graduate Studies

### Work completed

- **Internship Policy**, approved by Senate in February and effective since April 12, 2016 (date of President's approval).
- **Student Grade Appeal Policy**, approved by Senate in April 2016.

### Continuing work

- **Student Grade Appeal Resource Website**
- **Engaged Education Definitions Document**

### Internship Policy

The 2011 Chancellor's Office Executive Order 1064 "Student Internships" requires campuses to "develop, maintain and publish a student internship policy governing internships where the university makes the placement"<sup>i</sup>. Previous SAC committees began to draft a CSUSM Internship policy, which was put on hold while the new University Office of Internship was being created; over the summer 2015, Cynthia Chavez Metoyer, the newly appointed Faculty Director of this Office, provided substantial input to the draft in consultation with the Division of Community Engagement, so SAC could finalize the policy in early Fall 2015, adding language and vetting the document campus-wide with stakeholders. In September, SAC met the Office of Internship Director and Bianca Mothé, Faculty Director of Service Learning, to clarify questions about the scope of the policy, current department practices, role and responsibilities of faculty, departments, Internship office, and community members, and about the online database. SAC had suggestions concerning the student orientation and for additional procedure documents with guidance about the online submission process. Subsequently, SAC asked for input from College Associate Deans, Department Chairs, their constituents, and Internship coordinators,

whose feedback was also integrated into the draft. The SAC chair attended meetings with stakeholders across the University for further feedback, and prepared, in collaboration with the Internship Office Director, “associated background information” to the policy, clarifying the online process (including printouts of the online forms that students and community partners submit, sample learning agreements, and a list with weblinks to the forms), so constituents would have a clear vision of the online process. The policy went to EC in November; it was approved by Senate in February and became effective on April 12, 2016.

SAC wishes to thank Cynthia Chavez Metoyer for her contributions and the excellent collaboration.

### **Student Grade Appeal Policy**

The Student Grade Appeal Policy was referred to SAC in Fall 2015. The policy contained some inaccurate language about the submission process of formal grade appeals (now fully online and no longer requiring submission of hardcopies), which we removed. We thoroughly edited the text, looking for redundancies, consistency of terminology and accuracy of section references within the document, and updated names of offices/administrators. SAC worked with Karno Ng, chair of SGAC, to revise and edit the policy appendixes (describing the online forms and submission process), ensuring that they were identical to the information on the SGAC submission website. SAC believes that these factual corrections will greatly help reduce the confusion surrounding the policy and the process. Since we heard from several stakeholders that students are either confused about the policy or are not following it, SAC discussed how to better communicate the grade appeal process to the students. We deliberated about possible solutions, and the committee decided to add further clarifying language in the policy (to highlight the structure of the process, the timeline, and consequences for not following the process). In coordination with the SGAC chair, SAC added a deadline extension to the Formal process to distinguish it from the Informal process. Language has been added to clarify that the Informal process is not optional and it is being referred to as “Informal Resolution Process” to differentiate it from the “Formal Grade Appeal Process”. We hope this will facilitate students’ compliance with the Informal Resolution process described in the policy.

Additionally, ASI had asked if SAC could help with providing information about the grade appeal process in an “overview” or “checklist” format. We decided, after exploring various options, to create a Resource Website. The committee researched Student Grade Appeal websites at other universities, and we decided to include five tabs (Overview; Instructions; Policy; FAQs; Contacts) on the website. Scott Hagg, AVP of Enrollment Management, graciously agreed to host the website. The material for the website is drafted; in May, there will be an information meeting with staff and administrators, and SAC looks forward to their feedback on the materials.

The policy was accepted by Senate in April 2016; we would like to publish the Resource Website as soon as the policy is approved by the President.



SAC would like to thank Karno Ng, Chair of SGAC, and Adrienne Durso, Academic Senate Coordinator for their contributions and excellent collaboration.

## **Engaged Education Document**

SAC spent some time discussing the document with stakeholders, to revise sections and to clarify its purpose, before we decided on next steps. The initial idea to create the document came from the President's Student Placement Task Force, which recommended in spring 2014 to "inventory existing activities related to student placement, the stakeholders, and units involved; and to create definitions specific to CSUSM for the various types of experiential education or engaged learning" (Summary Report); previous SAC committees had drafted a detailed matrix which served as basis for the current "Engaged Education Definitions" document. Its goal is to offer definitions useful to faculty when "managing the approval and oversight of engaged education activities" and which could serve "as the basis of a website for faculty, who wanted information about the forms and administrative offices related to managing various types of Engaged Education activities in courses" (2014-15 SAC Report). The document will further contribute to highlight a set of high-impact practices at CSUSM. In AY 2015-16, SAC continued discussing the document and added language to the categories *Research*, *Service Learning*, and *Clinical Experience*. SAC would like to thank Bianca Mothé and Scott Gross for providing useful comments and background information. Moving forward, after consultation with Community Engagement and the Office of Undergraduate Studies, SAC has found a home for the document on the Faculty Center website, and will work with Matt Atherton, the FC Associate Vice Director, on the website project.

We would like to thank all members of the SAC for their excellent work and thoughtful discussion. All committee members made important contributions to the discussions, gathered feedback from their constituents, did research, and made substantial contributions to the documents we wrote, which, we believe, will clarify the administrative processes for students, faculty, staff and administrators, and are in the best interest of our students.

**Continuing members:** Marion Geiger; Tricia Lantzy; Michelle Ramos-Pellicia

**New members:** Devan Romero (CEHHS) and Badal Joshi (CSM)

---

<sup>i</sup> Full Internship policy rationale: "This policy was created to comply with the Chancellor's Office Executive Order 1064 "Student Internships" which requires campuses to "develop, maintain and publish a student internship policy governing internships where the university makes the placement". The Executive Order provides policy guidelines for academic, for-credit internships; **not** under its purview are internships that are "teacher preparation placement or clinical placements such as for nursing, counseling, physical therapy or occupational therapy", as well as non-credit internships. The policy uses the purview and internship definition of the Executive Order. To foster compliance with the Executive Order issued in 2011, the President convened a task force on student placements; it recommended the

---

creation of a University Office of Internships as designated campus office, to fulfill the functions defined for such an office in EO 1064. The Office of Internships manages an online database which lists organizations with whom the University has a fully executed partnership agreement; the database allows students to electronically upload required documents such as the placement guidelines, emergency contact information, and the learning agreement. The University provides general and professional liability insurance policies that afford coverage for students during credit bearing placements with community agencies provided there is a written agreement in place between the University and the hosting community organization.”

### Summary of TPAC Tasks AY 15-16

Tasks from EC Referral	Status																																			
(1)Development of an open access policy (this is an unfinished item from AY14-15). Incorporate EC comments and update the draft of the Open Access Policy	<div>INCOMPLETE, see detail below:</div> <div><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The following information sessions for open access policy were conducted.</li></ul></div> <table><tr><th>Event</th><th>Date / Time</th><th>Presenter</th><th>Number of Attendance</th></tr><tr><td>All-Chair Meeting</td><td>2/12/16 (Fri.) , noon to 12:15 p.m.</td><td>Carmen Mitchell</td><td>20</td></tr><tr><td>Faculty Brown Bag</td><td>2/ 15/16 (Mon.) 1:00 p.m—2:30 p.m.</td><td>Carmen Mitchell</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Faculty Brown Bag</td><td>2/23/16 ( Tues.) noon –1:00 p.m.</td><td>Carmen Mitchell</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>Academic Senate Meeting</td><td>3/2/16 ( Wed) .</td><td>Karno Ng</td><td>~50</td></tr></table> <div><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Open Access Policy Survey was sent out to tenure track faculty ( Note: Academic Senate Office sent out survey on behalf of TPAC on 3/31/16. Access period of Survey: 3/31/16—4/6/16). Results of Survey:  Which one of the following options do you prefer for the Open Access Policy at California State University San Marcos?</li></ul></div> <table><tr><th>Value</th><th>Count</th><th>Percent</th></tr><tr><td>A. Opt-IN</td><td>47</td><td>56.6%</td></tr><tr><td>B. Opt-OUT</td><td>26</td><td>31.3%</td></tr><tr><td>C. No preference</td><td>7</td><td>8.4%</td></tr><tr><td>D. Unsure, need more information (please provide more information, below)</td><td>3</td><td>3.6%</td></tr></table> <div><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Survey results was discussed and the draft for the Open</li></ul></div>	Event	Date / Time	Presenter	Number of Attendance	All-Chair Meeting	2/12/16 (Fri.) , noon to 12:15 p.m.	Carmen Mitchell	20	Faculty Brown Bag	2/ 15/16 (Mon.) 1:00 p.m—2:30 p.m.	Carmen Mitchell	2	Faculty Brown Bag	2/23/16 ( Tues.) noon –1:00 p.m.	Carmen Mitchell	2	Academic Senate Meeting	3/2/16 ( Wed) .	Karno Ng	~50	Value	Count	Percent	A. Opt-IN	47	56.6%	B. Opt-OUT	26	31.3%	C. No preference	7	8.4%	D. Unsure, need more information (please provide more information, below)	3	3.6%
Event	Date / Time	Presenter	Number of Attendance																																	
All-Chair Meeting	2/12/16 (Fri.) , noon to 12:15 p.m.	Carmen Mitchell	20																																	
Faculty Brown Bag	2/ 15/16 (Mon.) 1:00 p.m—2:30 p.m.	Carmen Mitchell	2																																	
Faculty Brown Bag	2/23/16 ( Tues.) noon –1:00 p.m.	Carmen Mitchell	2																																	
Academic Senate Meeting	3/2/16 ( Wed) .	Karno Ng	~50																																	
Value	Count	Percent																																		
A. Opt-IN	47	56.6%																																		
B. Opt-OUT	26	31.3%																																		
C. No preference	7	8.4%																																		
D. Unsure, need more information (please provide more information, below)	3	3.6%																																		

	<p>Access Policy was revised to reflect current faculty preference for an opt-in procedure. ( <i>See attachment # 1 for the revised policy</i>). However, the committee voted (4 in favor, 1 opposed of the 5 voting members in attendance) that TPAC do not endorse moving forward with any open access policy at this time. A memo dated April 22, 2016 was sent to Executive Committee outlining the reason for this action. ( <i>See attachment # 2 for the memo</i>)</p>
(2) Determine next steps of online quality teaching in terms of guidelines, policy and/or procedures about faculty preparation/training to teach online courses	<p><b>COMPLETE</b>, See detail below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Discussion results of the option of “recommended” ( from OQTC report) or “mandatory” ( from Vice-provost Kamel Haddad memo) for:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Certification of online/hybrid courses.</li> <li>▪ Training of faculty members who teach online/hybrid</li> </ul> <p>Was sent to APC chair, David Barsky on 9/14/16</p> </li> <li>• Comments for APC’s online teaching policy was sent to APC chair, David Barsky on 3/11/16.</li> </ul>
(3) Write a resolution to support the Open Education Resources (OER) memo.	<p><b>COMPLETE</b>, See detail below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A resolution was sent to academic senate office on 2/15/16. ( <i>See attachment # 3 for the resolution</i>)</li> </ul>

3  
4

**Attachment # 1**

**Revised Draft for the Open Access Policy Reflecting Current Faculty Preference for an Opt-in Procedure**

**TPAC: OPEN ACCESS POLICY**

**Scope**

The policy applies to - all tenure-track faculty in their activities as authors of published journal articles ..

**RATIONALE**

Senate passed a Resolution in Support for Open Access for Faculty Publication in AY 2013-2014. In the AY 2014-2015, TPAC received a referral to draft an open access policy on our campus. This task continue in AY 2015-16 by conducting information sessions (2 brown bags, 1 all-faculty meeting and 1 academic senate meeting). At the end of information sessions, a survey was conducted among all the tenure-track faculty. The results of the survey was considered for the development of this policy.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Open access refers to free, online public access to scholarly and scientific works. Open access is independent of journal editorial and peer review policies. Open access articles may be available via a university repository; some journals also make articles openly accessible. For journals that are not open access, authors can often negotiate with publishers to retain a non-exclusive license to archive articles in an institutional open access repository.

**Comment [MM1]:** Dear TPAC members- Thank you for your leadership in drafting this policy and educating us faculty about its significance for our research careers, our teaching, and our campus access to information resources. Please accept these suggestions as such, intended only to help you ready the document for Senate presentation.

**Comment [MM2]:** For presentation to Senate, policy needs Motion language: Either a "Rationale" or 'Whereas's and 'therefore be it resolved's ---motion language provides overview and support for passage of motion. And these positions might not not belong in the policy itself, if they invite dissent. (See the "Business Items Template": document in the committee Moodle container.)

**Comment [MM3]:** Suggestion---pull back from these details and cover them in the policy itself. This is too much too soon. Instead, it's a "higher-altitude" view: "This policy applies to all faculty and MPP in their activity as authors of scholarly articles." Period. This is not the place to explain everything. The policy is. ☺

## II. DEFINITIONS

- A. Open Access: Open access refers to free, online public access to scholarly and scientific works. Open access is independent of journal editorial and peer review policies. For journals that are not open access, authors can often negotiate with publishers to retain a non-exclusive license to archive articles in an institutional open access repository. For the purpose of this policy, open access refers to publisher accepted scholarly content made available through ScholarWorks.
- B. ScholarWorks: Scholarworks is a digital repository for the scholarship, research, and creative works created by the faculty, researchers, and students of CSUSM.
- C. Embargo: Delay access for a specified period of time.
- D. Authors: tenure-track faculty at CSUSM at the time an article is published and their co-authors.
- E. Nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license: This license grants CSUSM permission to capture and make available the author's publisher-accepted journal articles to make available as open access.

## III. POLICY

- A. Participating faculty members grant California State University San Marcos permission to make available his or her scholarly articles. More specifically, participating faculty members may grant to California State University San Marcos a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit, and to authorize others to do the same.
- B. The policy applies to all published journal articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy.
- C. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing CSUSM policy.

## IV. PROCEDURE

- A. To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each faculty member is encouraged to provide an electronic copy of the author's final version of each article no later than 90 days after the date of its publication at no charge to the appropriate representative of the library in an appropriate format (such as PDF) specified by the library for inclusion in ScholarWorks, the

**Comment [KN4]:** This section can be used for language of motion.

**Comment [MM5]:** Regardless of time base? TT faculty? 2 unit lecturers without entitlements? Need 'definitions' section...

**Comment [MM6]:** In drafting your rationale, and rallying the Senate to support this policy, consider these q's: How many faculty have been consulted in the drafting of this policy? Any surveys? Any consultation with productive and well-published colleagues? Is there any evidence of faculty buy-in or support for this practice, to be newly imposed?

**Comment [MM7]:** Devil's advocate: "Really?" One will say, "Please persuade me why we should all agree to such scary language. I don't like anything that is 'irrevocable'..." (I.e., the *motion* needs sufficient evidence/rationale to convince the skeptical senator... and that should include assurance of a due process of consultation, opinion gathering, focus group reactions, etc....)

**Comment [MM8]:** Devil's advocate: "Really? How does this work? Even if I'm a sixth author on something?" (Cover in definition of 'author' or address explicitly at some point?)

**Comment [MM9]:** One will object, "But it sounds like that copyright is worthless anymore, since whatever I write is out there for free." Address this concern at some point?

56 institutional repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify CSUSM if the article will be freely available in  
57 another repository or as an open access publication. To submit an article, please refer to the Form in Appendix 1.  
58

59 B. The University will delay access for a specified period of time (embargo) upon express direction by a faculty member. To set an  
60 embargo period for a specific article, please refer to the Form in Appendix 1.  
61

62  
63 C. This policy applies to published journal articles after the effective date of the policy. Previously published articles may be added  
64 to ScholarWorks at the discretion of the author(s). To submit an article, please refer to the Form in Appendix 1.  
65

66 D. Within the first 2 weeks of each academic year, an annual reminder will be sent by the the University library informing the  
67 faculty about this policy including a link to the policy itself and a link to support documents.  
68

69 E. CSUSM Library faculty and staff have expertise and can provide support in negotiating with publishers over initial  
70 copyright permission. and have developed a process for faculty to contribute publications to the ScholarWorks open access  
71 repository.  
72

73  
74 F. Notwithstanding the above, this policy does not in any way prescribe or limit the venue of publication. This policy  
neither requires nor prohibits the payment of fees or publication costs by authors.

**Comment [MM10]:** One will ask, "What if I don't?" I.e., What are consequences for noncompliance? How will the library ensure compliance?

**Comment [MM11]:** What's this? Definitions...

**Comment [MM12]:** Definitions

**Comment [MM13]:** Definitions

**Comment [MM14]:** What's this? How does it work? Who has access? Etc. (Definitions.)

**Comment [MM15]:** Why is negotiation needed, over what, to what end? Elaborate?

**Comment [MM16]:** 'Mechanisms'... Meaning what? Computer systems? Legal hot lines? ?? This whole clause is a little shadowy... ?

Attachment # 2

Memo dated April 22, 2016 from TPAC to Executive Committee Regarding the Open Access Policy



California State University  
SAN MARCOS

Date: April 22, 2016

To: Debbie Kristan Academic Senate Chair

Cc: Executive Committee Members

From: Technology & Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC)

We are writing to update the Academic Senate with our progress and action in response to the proposed open access policy.

As requested, we have made various efforts to educate faculty about open access. We have held two brown bag informational sessions, and presented at one all-chair meeting and at Academic senate. As part of this process, we developed an informational slide presentation, including a list of pros and cons for the opt-in and opt-out options that we presented at the sessions. In addition, after these presentations, we created a survey for all tenure-track faculty to determine their preferences; this survey included background information about open access as well.

We reviewed the data from the faculty survey. Less than one third (32.67%) of the TT faculty responded to the survey (83 of 254); 56.6% of respondents voted for the opt-in option; 31.3% of the respondents voted for opt-out, 8.4% indicated no preference, and 3.6% indicated they were unsure and needed more information.

Based on faculty feedback, we revised the draft of the policy to reflect current faculty preference for an opt-in procedure. However, the committee voted (4 in favor, 1 opposed of the 5 voting members in attendance) that we do not endorse moving forward with any open access policy at this time. We have several reasons for this position:

- We do not believe that a policy is needed to participate in this initiative. The resolution (Resolution in Support of Open Access for Faculty Publications, 2013-2014) already allows faculty to opt-in to sharing their research through the University's institutional repository (ScholarWorks).
- Given faculty feedback, we believe that our only feasible option is to put forward an opt-in open access policy.

However, professional best practice states that opt-in policies do not reflect the current best practice for open access initiatives (Shieber & Suber, 2013).



- 109 • The comments from the survey reflect some confusion by faculty which indicates that we need more examples of our faculty participating and more
- 110 education about the difference between open access and Open Access Journals.
- 111 • The Executive Committee (EC) requested that we add the definitions, form, responsibilities, and procedure to the policy.
- 112     ○ The resolution includes this information.
- 113     ○ Given current support for an opt-in initiative, we would like faculty to work with the library to choose how to opt-in and participate in this
- 114 initiative. Therefore, we are concerned that documenting a formal procedure for opting-in through policy at this early stage of this initiative
- 115 could discourage faculty participation.
- 116     ○ We have identified approved Senate policies that do not include this information (e.g., social media policy).
- 117 • Moving forward with an additional policy for opt-in, that has no mandate, could create ill will with the faculty respondents that voted for an opt-out,
- 118 no preference, or unsure/need more information (43.3% total).

121 We recommend that the Library continues to work with interested faculty across colleges on the open access process and continue open-access discussions on

122 campus to provide faculty with needed information about open access.

123

124

125

**Attachment # 3**  
**Open Education Resolution**

**CSUSM Academic Senate Resolution in Support of AB-798 College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015**

WHEREAS, CSU San Marcos established the Cougars Affordable Learning Solution Initiative (CALM) in Fall 2013 that was funded by the CSU's Affordable Learning Solutions program and encouraged CSUSM faculty to consider using high quality, low cost or no cost, accessible text book alternatives; and

WHEREAS, The efforts of CSUSM faculty members and the CALM program have already saved CSUSM students over \$1.2 million dollars; and

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 798, "College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015" (AB-798) was signed into law on October 8, 2015 by the Governor of the State of California, establishing the Open Educational Resources Adoption Incentive Program and grants up to \$50,000 per campus; and

WHEREAS, To be eligible for the grant funds, AB-798 requires the local academic senate to adopt a resolution in support of increasing student access to high-quality open educational resources and approve a plan in collaboration with students and campus administration that meets the Program's requirements; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate support Assembly Bill 798, "College Textbook Affordability Act of 2015"; and

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate urge all faculty to explore ways to increase the use of high quality, low cost or no cost, accessible instruction materials alternatives and consider participating in the Open Educational Resources (OER) and CALM programs on campus in order to accomplish cost savings for students.

1 | **TPAC: OPEN ACCESS POLICY**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

**Definition**

Open access refers to free, online public access to scholarly and scientific works. Open access is independent of journal editorial and peer review policies. Open access articles may be available via a university repository; some journals also make articles openly accessible. For journals that are not open access, authors can often negotiate with publishers to retain a non-exclusive license to archive articles in an institutional open access repository. CSUSM ScholarWorks is our open access institutional repository.

**Scope**

The policy applies to ~~all scholarly articles~~ all tenure-track faculty in their activities as authors of published journal articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles published before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. Upon express direction by a Faculty member, California State University San Marcos will waive the license for a particular article or delay access to the article for a specified period of ~~time~~.

9 | **RATIONALE**

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

Senate passed a Resolution in Support for Open Access for Faculty Publication in AY 2013-2014. In the AY 2014-2015, TPAC received a referral to draft an open access policy on our campus. This task continue in AY 2015-16 by conducting information sessions (2 brown bags, 1 all-faculty meeting and 1 academic senate meeting). At the end of information sessions, a survey was conducted among all the tenure-track faculty. The results of the survey was considered for the development of this policy.

**Comment [MM1]:** Dear TPAC members- Thank you for your leadership in drafting this policy and educating us faculty about its significance for our research careers, our teaching, and our campus access to information resources. Please accept these suggestions as such, intended only to help you ready the document for Senate presentation.

**Comment [MM2]:** For presentation to Senate, policy needs Motion language: Either a "Rationale" or 'Whereas's and 'therefore be it resolved's ---motion language provides overview and support for passage of motion. And these positions might not belong in the policy itself, if they invite dissent. (See the "Business Items Template" document in the committee Moodle container.)

**Formatted:** Numbering: Continuous

**Comment [MM3]:** "Definition" here refers to a basic description of the policy---its overall purpose basically---and is typically written by the Senate office staff. These definitions included here are definitely needed; consider including these (and more) in a "Definitions" section---usual practice in a complete policy (see the Univ. RTP document).

**Comment [MM4]:** Suggestion---pull back from these details and cover them in the policy itself. This is too much too soon. Instead, it's a "higher-altitude" view: "This policy applies to all faculty and MPP in their activity as authors of scholarly articles." Period. This is not the place to explain everything. The policy is. ☺

**Comment [MM5]:** And wherever this detailed discussion of scope is eventually described, the opt-out or opt-in process should be mentioned too, yes?

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0", Hanging: 1.5"

## I. ~~PREAMBLE~~ “INTRODUCTION”<sup>1,2</sup>

Open access refers to free, online public access to scholarly and scientific works. Open access is independent of journal editorial and peer review policies. Open access articles may be available via a university repository; some journals also make articles openly accessible. For journals that are not open access, authors can often negotiate with publishers to retain a non-exclusive license to archive articles in an institutional open access repository. ~~The landscape of scholarly publishing is changing, and we must adapt with it. Journal prices continue to rise<sup>1,2</sup> and campus budgets are not keeping pace.~~

~~Implementing an open access policy supports the campus values:~~

- ~~• Intellectual Engagement: making scholarship available to all encourages engagement with scholars in our community as well as around the globe.~~
- ~~• Community: showcasing to the community the research happening on campus shows that CSUSM is an engaged community partner.~~
- ~~• Integrity: open scholarship encourages transparency and encourages collaboration.~~
- ~~• Innovation: an open access policy shows that CSUSM is dedicated to innovation, and adapting to current trends in technology and data sharing.~~
- ~~• Inclusiveness: by inviting others to access CSUSM scholarship, we are encouraging participation within the academic community and a removing the cost barrier to CSUSM-generated research.~~

~~Implementing an open access policy would provide CSUSM faculty a tool to support retaining certain rights to their research and scholarship, and make it easier to utilize faculty-generated works in teaching.~~

## II. DEFINITIONS

A. ~~Open Access:~~ Open access refers to free, online public access to scholarly and scientific works. Open access is independent of journal editorial and peer review policies. For journals that are not open access, authors can often negotiate with publishers to retain a non-exclusive license to archive articles in an institutional open access repository. For the purpose of this policy, open access refers to publisher accepted scholarly content made available through ScholarWorks.

B. ~~ScholarWorks:~~ Scholarworks is a digital repository for the scholarship, research, and creative works created by the faculty, researchers, and students of CSUSM. ▲

C. ~~Embargo:~~ Delay access for a specified period of time.

D. ~~Authors:~~ tenure-track faculty at CSUSM at the time an article is published and their co-authors.

E. ~~Nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license:~~ This license grants CSUSM permission to capture and make available the author's ~~published~~ publisher-accepted journal articles to make available as open access.

**Comment [MM6]:** Suggestion: Change to “Introduction” and keep this content matter-of-fact and value-neutral, in the policy document itself. And here, simply describe the purpose and scope and goals of this policy at an intro level of exposition, in order to establish context. Then, for a second section, add a “Definitions” section. Please consider transposing this justification for the policy into the language of the motion—these are the policy’s “rationale” or “whereas’es”, right? Present them as such, in the proper part of the whole package. The motion is one thing, the policy another.

**Comment [KN7]:** This section can be used for language of motion.

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: I, II, III, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0" + Tab after: 0.25" + Indent at: 0"

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.69", No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Font: 12 pt

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Not Bold

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

<sup>1</sup> <http://libraries.calstate.edu/equitable-access-public-stewardship-and-access-to-scholarly-information/>

<sup>2</sup> <http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2013/04/publishing/the-winds-of-change-periodicals-price-survey-2013/#>

57  
58  
59 ~~II~~.III. POLICY

60 A. ~~Each Participating Faculty members grants to~~ California State University San  
61 Marcos permission to make available his or her scholarly articles. More specifically,  
62 ~~each participating Faculty members may grants to~~ California State University San Marcos  
63 a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under  
64 copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the  
65 articles are not sold for a profit, and to authorize others to do the ~~same~~.

66 B. The policy applies to all ~~scholarly published journal~~ articles authored or ~~co-authored~~  
67 while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles completed before the  
68 adoption of this policy and any articles for which the ~~Faculty~~ member entered into an  
69 incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy.

70 C. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors  
71 under existing CSUSM ~~policy~~.

72 ~~C. D. Faculty Rights. (Please spell these out and explain that faculty have a right to opt~~  
73 ~~out without repercussion or question, etc.)~~

74 ~~III~~.IV. PROCEDURE

75 A. To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each ~~Faculty~~ member is  
76 encouraged to provide an electronic copy of the author's final version of each article no later than  
77 90 days after the date of its publication at no charge to the appropriate representative of the library  
78 in an appropriate format (such as PDF) specified by the library for inclusion in ScholarWorks, the  
79 institutional repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify CSUSM if the  
80 article will be freely available in another repository or as an open access publication. To submit an  
81 article, please refer to the Form in Appendix ~~1~~.

82  
83 B. The University will delay access ~~application of the license for a particular article (opt-out) or~~  
84 ~~delay access~~ for a specified period of time (~~embargo~~) upon express direction by a ~~Faculty~~  
85 member. To ~~opt-out or~~ set an embargo period for a specific article, please refer to the Form in  
86 Appendix 1.

87  
88  
89 C. This policy applies to ~~published journal~~ articles ~~published~~ after ~~its adoption the effective date~~  
90 ~~of the policy~~. Previously published articles may be added to ~~ScholarWorks~~ at the discretion of the  
91 author(s). To submit an article, please refer to the Form in Appendix 1.

92  
93 D. Within the first 2 weeks of each academic year, an annual ~~notification reminder~~ will be sent by  
94 the ~~Office of the Provost the University library~~ informing the faculty about this policy including a  
95 link to the policy itself and a link to support documents. ~~The purpose of this message is [.....?]~~

96  
97 E. CSUSM Library faculty and staff have expertise and can provide support in  
negotiating with ~~publishers~~ ~~over initial copyright permission....?~~ and have ~~developed~~

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.69"

Formatted: List Paragraph

Comment [MM8]: Regardless of time base? TT faculty? 2 unit lecturers without entitlements? Need 'definitions' section...

Comment [MM9]: In drafting your rationale, and rallying the Senate to support this policy, consider these q's: How many faculty have been consulted in the drafting of this policy? Any surveys? Any consultation with productive and well-published colleagues? Is there any evidence of faculty buy-in or support for this practice, to be newly imposed?

Comment [MM10]: Devil's advocate: "Really?" One will say, "Please persuade me why we should all agree to such scary language. I don't like anything that is 'irrevocable'..." (I.e., the *motion* needs sufficient evidence/rationale to convince the skeptical senator... and that should include assurance of a due process of consultation, opinion gathering, focus group reactions, etc....)

Comment [MM11]: Devil's advocate: "Really? How does this work? Even if I'm a sixth author on something?" (Cover in definition of 'author' or address explicitly at some point?)

Comment [MM12]: One will object, "But it sounds like that copyright is worthless anymore, since whatever I write is out there for free." Address this concern at some point?

Comment [MM13]: One will ask, "What if I don't?" I.e., What are consequences for noncompliance? How will the library ensure compliance?

Comment [MM14]: What's this? Definitions...

Comment [MM15]: Definitions

Comment [MM16]: Definitions

Comment [MM17]: What's this? How does it work? Who has access? Etc. (Definitions.)

Comment [MM18]: Why is negotiation needed, over what, to what end? Elaborate?

98 | mechanisms: a process for faculty to contribute publications to the ScholarWorks open  
99 | access repository.

100 | F. Notwithstanding the above, this policy does not in any way prescribe or limit the venue  
101 | of publication. This policy neither requires nor prohibits the payment of fees or  
102 | publication costs by authors.

**Comment [MM19]:** 'Mechanisms'... Meaning what? Computer systems? Legal hot lines? ?? This whole clause is a little shadowy... ?

**Comment [MM20]:** Devil's advocate, again: "Why an opt-out system? Why is this in the faculty's interest? Why not incentivize an opt-in, if one has an article that is appropriate and easy to place on open access?" To ensure passage of the item: In your motion, make the case for open access as the default position of all authorship on campus, and provide evidence that the faculty are aware of this and are agreeable to it.

**Formatted:** Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Comment [MM21]:** Thanks again, TPAC! I hope some of this might be helpful, and please forgive anything that sounds snarky or weird. I really didn't mean it! I've only tried to offer some formatting/structuring suggestions and anticipate typical questions. Best--Michael

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single, Tab stops: Not at 1.54"

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

## SCHOLARWORKS—OA Article Submission/Embargo/Opt-out Request Form

This form is for submitting an article to ScholarWorks, or to opt-out of the CSUSM Open Access Policy. <http://microsites.csusm.edu/openaccess/>

Campus Email\*

@csusm.edu

Name\*

First Last

Article Title\*

Journal Name\*

138 ~~Volume, Issue, Page Numbers\*~~

139

140

141 ~~Publisher\*~~

142

143

144

145

146 ~~Attach a File~~

147

148  ~~No file selected.~~

149

150

151 ~~Open Access Options:~~

152

153 ~~Please specify when, if at all, you would like us to make this article openly accessible through~~

154 ~~Scholarworks. Please note that this is a separate issue from the license transfer waiver option~~

155 ~~addressed in the next field, though the two may be related in some cases.\*~~

156 ~~Make this article openly accessible immediately~~

157 ☐

158 ~~Make this article openly accessible after an embargo period (please specify embargo length~~

159 ~~below)~~

160 ~~Never make this article openly accessible while it remains in copyright (deposit for~~

161 ~~archiving purposes only)~~

162

163 ~~If your article is available online, you may cut and paste the link here~~

164

165

166

167 ~~Please enter the length of the embargo period. (Embargo periods vary. Most are between 1-3~~

168 ~~years-~~

169 ~~Please check your publishing agreement.)~~

170

171

172

---

173

174 ~~Are you opting out/requesting a waiver of the license transfer aspect of CSUSM's~~

175 ~~opt-out policy?~~

176

177 ~~If the publisher requests that you obtain a waiver of the license transfer, and you (at your sole discretion)~~

178 ~~check the box below, the waiver is granted automatically. You will receive an automated email confirming~~

179 ~~this, which will be sent to the submitter's address above. We will supply you with a more formal letter if~~

180 ~~needed:~~

181

182 ~~If you obtain a license transfer waiver and then sign rights away in your publishing contract, in most cases~~

183 ~~you will need to ask the publisher permission before including your own figures in other articles, including~~

184 ~~your own articles in your course packs, or re-using your own materials in other ways (or authorizing others~~

185 ~~to do the same). If you have questions, please contact us at scholarworks@csusm.edu:~~

186

187 ~~Yes, I am opting out of the license transfer to CSUSM:~~

188 ☐

189

190 ~~Do you have an additional article that you would like to submit or embargo?~~

191 ☐

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Space Before: 0.8 pt

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Space Before: 0.8 pt

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0.8 pt

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

192 | Yes  
193  
194 | No  
195  
196

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.64", Space Before: 0.8 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, Line spacing: single

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.64", Space Before: 0.8 pt

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.64", Right: -0.01", Space Before: 0.8 pt, After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, No widow/orphan control



## UCC Annual Report

**Voting Members:** Nicoleta Bateman, Judith Downie, Matthew Escobar, Mtafiti Imara, Suzanne Moineau (Chair), Paul Stuhr, Jacqueline Trischman, Carol Van Vooren

**Non-Voting Members:** Regina Eisenbach, Virginia Mann, Candace Van Dall

**Student Reps:** Sam Ramtin (Fall), James Farrales (Spring)

### Work completed in 2015/2016:

At the end of AY 2014/2015, the previous backlog of curriculum submitted to Academic Programs for review by UCC had been eliminated. The community will recall that in the 2014/2015 AY, UCC had proposed a resolution to create a UCC consent calendar, which would operate much like the Senate consent calendar. Program and course changes that did not constitute significant changes or have impact to other disciplines would be placed on a UCC consent calendar. In cases where a member or members of UCC felt a more thorough review was needed, items could be removed from the UCC consent calendar and placed on the agenda for full review. The resolution was approved by Senate in December 2014, and the 2015/2016 AY marked implementation of the UCC consent calendar.

In Academic Year 2015/16, UCC received 214 pieces of curriculum, reviewed 191 of these items, and approved 186 for movement on to Senate. Of these items, 56 items were reviewed by means of the new UCC Consent Calendar. There remain 23 items in the queue that were not reviewed by the end of the AY as they were received in late April. As well, 5 pieces of curriculum reviewed but not yet approved by UCC remain in the queue awaiting edits by the proposers for continued review in the 2016/2017 AY.

The breakdown by college and type of curriculum proposal is provided in the following table:

**Curriculum Forms 15-16**  
**Forms Reviewed by UCC**

College	New Courses (C forms)	Course Changes & Deletions (C- 2 & D forms)	New Programs (P forms)	Program Changes (P-2 Forms)	All Curriculum Proposals
COBA	10	4	2	7	23
CEHHS	24	43	0	9	76
CHABSS	35	32	1	17	85
CSM	4	1	0	2	7
All Colleges	73	80	3	35	191

The three new program proposal forms reviewed by UCC, and their status are below:

- Certificate of Specialized Study in Water Management and Leadership\*\* (On the Senate agenda for a Second Reading on May 4, 2016)
- Bachelor of Arts in Ethnic Studies (Back with CHABSS for continued revisions)
- Business Administration Option Minors (Back with CoBA for continued revisions)

**Continuing Members of UCC:** Nicoleta Bateman, Matthew Escobar

**New Members of UCC:** Melanie Chu, Sajith Jayasinghe, Jodi Robledo, Qi Sun