AGENDA
Executive Committee Meeting
CSUSM Academic Senate
Wednesday, May 4, 2016, 12-12:50 pm
Reading Room - KEL-5400

I. **Approval of Agenda**

II. **Approval of Minutes –** 4/27/16 EC Meeting

III. **Chair's Report,** Deborah Kristan
Referrals
- FAC: CSM Policy on Election of Peer Review Committee

IV. **Vice Chair's Report,** Michael McDuffie

V. **Secretary's Report,** Laurie Stowell (attached) *Page 2*

VI. **Provost's Report,** Graham Oberem

VII. **Vice Provost's Report**, Kamel Haddad

VIII. **Consent Calendar** (attached)
- NEAC Recommendations
- UCC Course/Program Change Proposals

IX. **Standing Committee Year-End Reports** (attached) (oral, and as written)

-APC	-GEC	-SAC
-BLP	-NEAC	-TPAC
-FAC	-PAC	-UCC

X. **Discussion Items**
A. Senate Officers: Write-in Names Submitted on Election Ballots

XI. **EC Members' Concerns & Announcements**

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
EDST	647		Adventures in Geocaching	D	Sinem Siyahhan	3/30/16	4/25/16

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

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

BLP Annual Report, 2015-16

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

P-Forms Completed
- Water Resources Management Certificate, approved 4/5/16
- Business Minor, approved 4/12/16

A-Forms Completed
- American Indian Studies, approved 11/17/16
- Chican@ Studies, approved 11/17/16
- Wildfire Science, approved 11/17/16

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

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

Business to Carry Forward
- 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 (2nd 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

Referrals removed from FAC
- Conflict of interest for evaluators of RTP files
- Consideration of CUGR Committee resolution

FAC referrals deferred to AY 2016-2017
- Faculty Ethics Policy (sent to CFA Statewide; awaiting response)
- Lecturer inclusion (see below)
- Physics Department RTP document (returned with responses to FAC feedback on 4/28/16)
- College of Science and Math PRC Nominations and Election Policy (returned with responses to FAC feedback on 4/28/16)
- Waiting for response to FAC feedback
  - Biology Department RTP document
  - Chemistry Department RTP document
  - Computer Science and Information Systems Department RTP document
  - Math Department RTP document
  - Library RTP document
  - College of Science and Math Lecturer Evaluation Policy

Issue for future discussion – Lecturer Inclusion across the University

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

- The Lecturer Advisory Council (LAC) chair in each college should be a voting member of the college's coordinating committee.

- Each college's LAC should become an official part of the college governance structure.

- LAC members should be compensated for their work.

- Academic Senate should provide guidance to colleges about lecturer participation in department business (e.g., invitations to department meetings, making meeting minutes available, etc.).

- Because space is such an issue, perhaps there should be a lecturer on the Provost's space advisory council.

- Academic Senate should look carefully at the definition of "faculty" in the Constitution; currently, only full-time lecturers are considered "eligible faculty" for voting purposes (plus those part-time lecturers who are filling designated lecturer seats on committees).

- Within the colleges, full-time lecturers are not franchised.

- 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

1 **General Education Committee 2015-16**
2 **Annual Report to Academic Senate**
3
4 **Membership**
5
6 **Voting members:**
7 CHABSS – Humanities/Arts: Catherine Cucinella, Ibrahim Al-Marashi
8 CHABSS – Social Sciences: Joely Proudfit, Fredi Avalos-C'Debaca
9 CSM: Julie Jameson, Andre Kundgen
10 COEHHS: Rodney Beaulieu
11 Library: Yvonne Meulemans (Chair)
12
13 **Non-voting members and others in attendance**: Regina Eisenbach (Dean of Academic Programs),
14 Dawn Formo (Dean of Undergraduate Studies), Akilah Green (ASI), Melissa Simnitt (Assessment
15 Specialist-Academic Programs), Virginia Mann (Curriculum Specialist-Academic Programs), Lynn
16 Rantanen (IITS eAdvising), David McMartin (Director - Undergraduate Advising), Patti Garnet
17 (Articulation Officer)
18
19 **Curriculum**
20 As of this writing, GEC considered 23 courses submitted for GEC designation and approved 21 of
21 these proposals.
22
23 **Review of the lower division curriculum**
24 Over the past two years, the General Education Committee (GEC) exercised its duty to review
25 curriculum periodically, which the GE Philosophy Statement directs:
26   *All courses certified for General Education shall be evaluated periodically to*
27   *determine if they satisfy all applicable General Education criteria. New courses*
28   *will be reviewed after the second semester in which they are taught. All courses*
29   *will be reviewed every three years.*
30
31 In the 14-15 GEC Annual Report, this review was deemed complete. In fact, GEC reviewed 23 lower-
32 division GE recertification proposals over the course of the fall semester; these courses had been
33 submitted for review, but further information was needed by the committee.   Eighteen (18) of
34 these courses were recertified in Fall 2015; five (5) were decertified. Detailed information about
35 the process can be found in the 14-15 report.
36
37 **GE Assessment**
38 GEC continued progress on establishing a process of assessing the general education program. The
39 14-15 GEC Annual Report detailed the steps taken last year: identifying learning outcomes to assess
40 and determining a tentative assessment cycle. In the fall semester, the GEC finalized a feasible
41 assessment cycle all nine General Education Program Learning Outcomes over three years.
42
43   *Year 1*

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

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

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

49
50   *Year 2*
51   1. Describe and/or apply principles and methods that are necessary to understand
52   the physical and natural world.
53
54   5. Find, evaluate, and use authoritative and/or scholarly information to comprehend
55   a line of inquiry.

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

58   *Year 3*
59   3. Communicate effectively in writing, using conventions appropriate to various
60   contexts and diverse audiences.

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

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

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

65   Later in the fall semester, GEC convened a subcommittee the included the GEC Chair, Jacquelyn
66   Kilpatrick (Director, School of Arts), Catherine Cucinella, and Melissa Simnitt to consider how to
67   move forward on this effort. GEC had received feedback that assessment of student work in arts and
68   related courses seems to be most difficult and for this reason, asked Dr. Kilpatrick to be on the
69   subcommittee. The subcommittee was concerned that there was little awareness and/or
70   understanding of the General Education Program Student Learning Outcomes (GEPSLO's). In order
71   to determine if this is the case, a brief survey was administered in Spring 2016 to instructors who
72   are teaching GE courses that include the learning outcomes identified in the first cycle of
73   assessment. The subcommittee met to review the survey results and will submit to the GEC an
74   assessment plan that makes use of the results at the upcoming May 5 meeting. Should the
75   committee agree to accept the report and plan, it will be placed in the GEC community web site.
76
77   **Diversity in the GE Program**
78   The 2014-15 GEC Annual Report included substantive discussion of the findings from diversity
79   mapping initiative done by Halualani & Associates. GEC's work calendar for 2015-16 included that
80   the committee was to identify next steps (if any) in addressing the findings of the mapping
81   initiative. At the Executive Committee (EC) retreat at the start of the academic year, the President

82 asked that any next steps related to the mapping initiative be put on hold pending the creation of a
83 strategic plan for diversity and inclusion. As of this writing, a draft diversity and inclusion strategic
84 plan has been disseminated to the campus community.
85
86 At the start of the academic year, GEC members were still interested in the issue of diversity in the
87 GE program and to this end, the committee collected and included in the online container for the
88 GEC: documents detailing how issues of diversity and inclusion have been addressed previous
89 iterations of the GE Program, Senate documents detailing the GE program, and materials from GEC's
90 efforts related to this issue from 2010-11. These materials were discussed in a number of GEC
91 meetings with the goal to ensure there was an easy accessible record of this issue available to the
92 next GEC or any person or group that would be interested in this information.
93
94 GEC feels strongly that this issue should be a priority for next year's committee. Not only because of
95 the diversity mapping findings, but also because students, in the past academic year, have been
96 clearly been expressing interest that issues of diversity are more substantively included in the GE
97 curriculum. While certainly the curriculum is the purview of the faculty, the curriculum exists for
98 students and their input can be invaluable.
99
100 Additionally, GEC discussed that this issue also touches on ensuring students' workplace readiness.
101 In the current global atmosphere, cultural intelligence is an essential skill in order for students to
102 address conflict cross-culturally and creatively. In this way, this issue extends beyond GEC and
103 becomes a campus-wide issue.
104
105 There has been discussion beyond the GEC that GEC is aware of regarding how to move this issue
106 forward: the formation of a subcommittee or entirely other committee to consider this issue,
107 prioritizing courses that address those issues of diversity that were identified as lacking in the
108 diversity mapping findings, and offering a professional development certificate on teaching cultural
109 intelligence are all examples.
110
111 **Updating Upper-Division General Education curriculum forms**
112 During course review this past year, committee members identified a few issues related to the
113 upper-division GE curricular forms that bear being noted for next year's GEC.
114
115 GEC has been directing course proposers who are asked to provide additional information to
116 review approved courses from the same GE area on the curriculum tracking page
117 (http://www.csusm.edu/academic_programs/catalogcurricula/2015-16_curriculum.html).
118 Approved courses can be helpful examples to proposers in understanding the level of detail and
119 information the committee needs. But even with exemplars, the committee has concluded that the
120 forms could be improved and made easier for proposers and GEC.
121
122 The issues noted below occurred with such regularity that GEC members wonder if rewriting the
123 questions or a larger, substantive change to the curriculum forms would be more helpful to
124 proposers and future committees. It may be worthwhile to note that the updated LDGE forms could

125 offer a possible format and structure to address these concerns. <u>GEC asks that these issues be</u>
126 <u>added to the 2016-17 GEC work calendar.</u>
127
128 *Question 3b-c: courses that are also for majors*
129 If a course is offered to majors as well as GE students, question 3c asks: "Please describe how this
130 course is designed to provide valuable and appropriate learning experiences to both majors and
131 non-majors." GEC found that many proposers had to be asked to provide more detail in how
132 students without a background in a particular subject would have the same opportunity to succeed
133 as students who have taken some coursework in the subject. GEC recognizes that many small
134 programs create courses for both audiences. However, in order to determine if the course is
135 appropriate for GE, the committee needs information as to how students with disparate knowledge
136 will experience the course.
137
138 *Questions 4-7 on CC and DD forms: Ensuring discussion of content <u>and</u> pedagogy/assignments*
139 Proposers typically do an excellent job of describing course content in response to these questions.
140 GEC regularly asks proposers for more information about how the course content is taught and
141 considered by the students. For example, question 4 asks: "Please explain how this course
142 introduces such students to the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the discipline, and
143 how connection is made between these fundamentals and the particular applications emphasized in
144 the course." Proposers often describe the basic assumptions, principles, and methods of the
145 discipline, but not how students learn them (e.g. class discussions, written work, presentations,
146 etc.) This issue has also been observed in responses to questions 5-7. It can be quite daunting for
147 proposers to hear back from the committee that a substantive part of their course proposal is still
148 needs in order for their course to be considered. Further, GEC members need sufficient
149 information in order to determine if the course should have GE designation. The committee has not
150 observed the same issues with questions 4-7 on the BB form.
151
152 *Revising Question 8 (on CC, DD forms) and Question 7 (BB form)*
153 This question on the UDGE forms asks specifically for information about assessing student learning.
154 The substance of responses to this question vary widely. In some cases, there is no response, in part
155 because there is language that indicates assessment is optional; Q8b literally includes: "If you use
156 any course assessment activities…" GEC believes that the word 'if' erroneously indicates that an
157 instructor could choose to not be doing some type of course assessment and GEC would have
158 enought information to consider the course. This is not the case. Some discussion of assessment of
159 student learning is required in the LDGE forms. GEC is unaware of any reason why this can't also be
160 required in UDGE forms.
161
162 Lastly, the UDGE forms need to have the appropriate learning outcomes on the actual form, just as
163 the LDGE forms do. Particularly for Q8, having the learning outcomes on the form could go a long
164 way in helping proposers provide all the information GEC needs to review a course.
165
166
167 **GE curricular review: Process concerns**

168 GEC is concerned that the existing process and procedure in place to review and designate GE
169 courses is insufficient in a number of ways and advises next year's committee to consider
170 improvements. Currently, a proposer only has to complete the form and then the course can go to
171 GEC for consideration. While this seems simple and straightforward, requiring additional steps in
172 the process may actually make the review and approval process more efficient for everyone
173 involved. Two concerns have consistently been noticed by GEC this academic year:
174
175   1. There is no clear process for determining impacted departments and no explicit detail as to
176   what input the departments are expected to provide when there are concerns about a
177   proposed course.
178   2. Proposers need additional information about the level of detail needed for GEC to consider
179   a course.
180
181 For issue 1, there needs to be clarity as to how impacted departments/colleges are defined. What a
182 proposer considers as a possible impacted department/college may be different from what GEC
183 considers impacted. A means to address such a discrepancy is needed. Also, perhaps a detailed
184 work flow or procedure that includes impacted departments or other colleges, before a course
185 comes to GEC, would be helpful. There are signature lines with a note regarding support/do not
186 support from impacted departments, but the forms are silent about timeline and what further
187 information departments could provide to GEC regarding proposed courses.
188
189 For issue 2, while there is information available on the GE program web site:
190 http://www.csusm.edu/ge/facdevcourse.html, perhaps this site could include more context and
191 detail would be helpful to proposers and departments. GEC has, in previous years, noted a need for
192 a "GE Handbook" and this type of information would also be appropriate to include.
193
194 Lastly, we ask that GEC 2016-17 consider including approved GE courses on the consent calendar.
195 The rationale for this is unclear to the existing committee. Current GEC members wonder if adding
196 GE courses to the consent calendar would be yet another avenue for alerting departments/colleges
197 of courses that may impact them.
198
199 **WASC findings: Defining student success as it relates to the GE program**
200 The final report from WASC will be received in May. However, at the March 2016 exit meeting, the
201 WASC team included the recommendation that substantive progress is made on GE assessment and
202 CSUSM consider how the campus defines "student success" generally and specifically, as a result of
203 the GE program. As we expect the final recommendation to say the same, GEC asks that the 2016-17
204 committee to consider how to move forward on this rather large and abstract idea. Since such a
205 conversation applies to virtually every aspect of the campus, it seems essential that there is
206 campus-wide leadership on this recommendation.
207
208
209 **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.
226
227
228

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 Yánez-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

40 programs that submitted Interim Reports: Education M.A., Educational Leadership Ed.D.,
41 Nursing B.S., Liberal Studies B.A., and Biotechnology M.S. The purpose of the Interim Reports is
42 to enable programs to discuss their progress, as well as the obstacles they encounter, in meeting
43 MOU goals and for the PAC to provide guidance and constructive feedback to the program prior
44 to the next Program Review.
45
46 In addition to the work completed in collaboration with the entire committee, the PAC Co-
47 Chairs also undertook the following additional tasks: participated in orientation meetings for
48 the programs undergoing review in the next academic year, responded to questions from
49 Department Chairs and Program Review leads throughout the two-year review cycle, met with
50 the external reviewers for each program review to respond to questions about the Program
51 Review process and about expectations regarding the External Reviewers' Report, participated
52 in MOU meetings, worked with the Dean of Academic Programs to draft the document that
53 specifies the actions that parties to the MOU process have agreed upon, and coordinated the
54 work of the PAC (e.g., organizing the committee's work, preparing minutes and agendas, etc.)
55 to ensure that PAC meets deadlines for completing its responses to Programs Reviews.
56

57 **PAC 2016-17 AY Agenda**

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

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

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

65 PAC Chair(s): TBD

66 PAC Meeting Times: 2nd and 4th Fridays, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

67
68
69
70
71
72
73

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

40   programs that submitted Interim Reports: Education M.A., Educational Leadership Ed.D.,
41   Nursing B.S., Liberal Studies B.A., and Biotechnology M.S. The purpose of the Interim Reports is
42   to enable programs to discuss their progress, as well as the obstacles they encounter, in meeting
43   MOU goals and for the PAC to provide guidance and constructive feedback to the program prior
44   to the next Program Review.
45
46   In addition to the work completed in collaboration with the entire committee, the PAC Co-
47   Chairs also undertook the following additional tasks: participated in orientation meetings for
48   the programs undergoing review in the next academic year, responded to questions from
49   Department Chairs and Program Review leads throughout the two-year review cycle, met with
50   the external reviewers for each program review to respond to questions about the Program
51   Review process and about expectations regarding the External Reviewers' Report, participated
52   in MOU meetings, worked with the Dean of Academic Programs to draft the document that
53   specifies the actions that parties to the MOU process have agreed upon, and coordinated the
54   work of the PAC (e.g., organizing the committee's work, preparing minutes and agendas, etc.)
55   to ensure that PAC meets deadlines for completing its responses to Programs Reviews.
56

57   **PAC 2016-17 AY Agenda**

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

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

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

65   PAC Chair(s): TBD

66   PAC Meeting Times: 2nd and 4th Fridays, 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

67
68
69
70
71
72
73

1   # SAC 2015-16 Year End Report

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

2

3   **Work completed**

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

7   **Continuing work**

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

10

11   **Internship Policy**

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

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

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

35

36   **Student Grade Appeal Policy**

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

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

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

2

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

66

67 **Engaged Education Document**

68 SAC spent some time discussing the document with stakeholders, to revise sections and to
69 clarify its purpose, before we decided on next steps. The initial idea to create the document
70 came from the President's Student Placement Task Force, which recommended in spring 2014
71 to "inventory existing activities related to student placement, the stakeholders, and units
72 involved; and to create definitions specific to CSUSM for the various types of experiential
73 education or engaged learning" (Summary Report); previous SAC committees had drafted a
74 detailed matrix which served as basis for the current "Engaged Education Definitions"
75 document. Its goal is to offer definitions useful to faculty when "managing the approval and
76 oversight of engaged education activities" and which could serve "as the basis of a website for
77 faculty, who wanted information about the forms and administrative offices related to
78 managing various types of Engaged Education activities in courses" (2014-15 SAC Report). The
79 document will further contribute to highlight a set of high-impact practices at CSUSM. In AY
80 2015-16, SAC continued discussing the document and added language to the categories
81 *Research*, *Service Learning*, and *Clinical Experience*. SAC would like to thank Bianca Mothé and
82 Scott Gross for providing useful comments and background information. Moving forward, after
83 consultation with Community Engagement and the Office of Undergraduate Studies, SAC has
84 found a home for the document on the Faculty Center website, and will work with Matt
85 Atherton, the FC Associate Vice Director, on the website project.

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

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

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

93

---

[i] 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."

1

Summary of TPAC Tasks AY 15-16

2

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	**INCOMPLETE, see detail below:** • The following information sessions for open access policy were conducted.

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

• 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?

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%

• Survey results was discussed and the draft for the Open

Page **1** of **8**

	Access Policy was revised to reflect current faculty preference for an opt-in procedure. (***See attachment # 1 for the revised policy***). 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. (***See attachment # 2 for the memo***)

(2) Determine next steps of online quality teaching in terms of guidelines, policy and/or procedures about faculty preparation/training to teach online courses	**COMPLETE,** See detail below:
	
	o Discussion results of the option of "recommended" (from OQTC report) or "mandatory" (from Vice-provost Kamel Haddad memo) for:
	    ▪ Certification of online/hybrid courses.
	    ▪ Training of faculty members who teach online/hybrid
	Was sent to APC chair, David Barsky on 9/14/16
	
	• Comments for APC's online teaching policy was sent to APC chair, David Barsky on 3/11/16.

(3) Write a resolution to support the Open Education Resources (OER) memo.	**COMPLETE,** See detail below: • A resolution was sent to academic senate office on 2/15/16. (***See attachment # 3 for the resolution***)

3
4

5 <u>**Attachment # 1**</u>
6 <u>**Revised Draft for the Open Access Policy Reflecting Current Faculty Preference for an Opt-in Procedure**</u>

7

8 **TPAC: OPEN ACCESS POLICY**

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

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

16 RATIONALE   Senate passed a Resolution in Support for Open Access for Faculty Publication in AY 2013-2014. In the AY
17   2014-2015, TPAC received a referral to draft an open access policy on our campus. This task continue in AY
18   2015-16 by conducting information sessions (2 brown bags, 1 all-faculty meeting and 1 academic senate
19   meeting). At the end of information sessions, a survey was conducted among all the tenure-track faculty. The
20   results of the survey was considered for the development of this policy.

21

22 I.   INTRODUCTION

23 Open access refers to free, online public access to scholarly and scientific works. Open access is independent of journal editorial and
24 peer review policies. Open access articles may be available via a university repository; some journals also make articles openly
25 accessible. For journals that are not open access, authors can often negotiate with publishers to retain a non-exclusive license to
26 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. ☺

27
28
29 II. DEFINITIONS

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

30   A. Open Access: Open access refers to free, online public access to scholarly and scientific works. Open access is independent of
31   journal editorial and peer review policies. For journals that are not open access, authors can often negotiate with publishers to retain a
32   non-exclusive license to archive articles in an institutional open access repository. For the purpose of this policy, open access refers to
33   publisher accepted scholarly content made available through ScholarWorks.
34
35   B. ScholarWorks: Scholarworks is a digital repository for the scholarship, research, and creative works created by the
36   faculty, researchers, and students of CSUSM.
37   C. Embargo: Delay access for a specified period of time.
38   D. Authors: tenure-track faculty at CSUSM at the time an article is published and their co-authors.
39   E. Nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license: This license grants CSUSM permission to capture and make available the author's
40   publisher-accepted journal articles to make available as open access.

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

41
42
43 III. POLICY

> **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?

44   A. Participating faculty members grant California State University San Marcos permission to make available his or her
45   scholarly articles. More specifically, participating faculty members may grant to California State University San Marcos a
46   nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her
47   scholarly articles, in any medium, provided that the articles are not sold for a profit, and to authorize others to do the same.

> **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….)

48   B. The policy applies to all published journal articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty
49   except for any articles completed before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the faculty member entered
50   into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy.

> **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?)

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

52 IV. PROCEDURE

> **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?

53   A. To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each faculty member is encouraged to provide an electronic
54   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
55   representative of the library in an appropriate format (such as PDF) specified by the library for inclusion in ScholarWorks, the

Page **4** of **8**

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

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

73

74

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… ?

75 **Attachment # 2**
76 **Memo dated April 22, 2016 from TPAC to Executive Committee Regarding the Open Access Policy**

77

78
79
80
81

82

83 Date: April 22, 2016

84

85 To: Debbie Kristan Academic Senate Chair

86

87 Cc: Executive Committee Members

88

89 From: Technology & Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC)

90

91

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

93

94 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-
95 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
96 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
97 preferences; this survey included background information about open access as well.
98 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
99 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
100 information.
101 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
102 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
103 reasons for this position:

104

105 • We do not believe that a policy is needed to participate in this initiative. The resolution (Resolution in Support of Open Access for Faculty
106 Publications, 2013-2014) already allows faculty to opt-in to sharing their research through the University's institutional repository (ScholarWorks).
107 • Given faculty feedback, we believe that our only feasible option is to put forward an opt-in open access policy.
108 However, professional best practice states that opt-in policies do not reflect the current best practice for open access initiatives (Shieber & Suber, 2013).

Page **6** of **8**

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   o   The resolution includes this information.
113   o   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   o   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).
119
120
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

126 **Attachment # 3**
127 **Open Education Resolution**

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

129

130 WHEREAS, CSU San Marcos established the Cougars Affordable Learning Solution Initiative (CALM) in Fall
131 2013 that was funded by the CSU's Affordable Learning Solutions program and encouraged CSUSM faculty to
132 consider using high quality, low cost or no cost, accessible text book alternatives; and

133

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

136

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

140

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

144

145 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate support Assembly Bill 798, "College Textbook Affordability Act of
146 2015"; and

147

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

TPAC: OPEN ACCESS POLICY

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~~.

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.

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.)

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"?]

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~~ [1,2] ~~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. ~~[etc.]~~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.

---

[1] ~~http://libraries.calstate.edu/equitable-access-public-stewardship-and-access-to-scholarly-information/~~
[2] ~~http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2013/04/publishing/the-winds-of-change-periodicals-price-survey-2013/#_~~

II.III.   POLICY

A. ~~Each~~ Participating Ffaculty members ggrants ~~to~~ California State University San Marcos permission to make available his or her scholarly articles. More specifically, ~~each~~participating Ffaculty members may grant~~s~~ 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 ~~scholarly~~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 Ffaculty 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.

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

III.IV. PROCEDURE

A. To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each Ffaculty 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 institutional repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify CSUSM if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open access publication. To submit an article, please refer to the Form in Appendix 1.

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

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

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

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

98
99

~~mechanisms~~ a process for faculty to contribute publications to the ScholarWorks open access repository.

100
101
102

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.

103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116

SCHOLARWORKS – OA Article Submission/Embargo/Opt-out Request Form

117
118

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

119
120

121
122
123

Campus Email *

@csusm.edu

124
125

Name *

126
127
128

First   Last

129
130

Article Title *

131
132
133
134

Journal Name *

135
136
137

Volume, Issue, Page Numbers *

Publisher *

Attach a File

Browse... No file selected.

Open Access Options:

Please specify when, if at all, you would like us to make this article openly accessible through Scholarworks. Please note that this is a separate issue from the license transfer waiver option addressed in the next field, though the two may be related in some cases. *

Make this article openly accessible immediately

Make this article openly accessible after an embargo period (please specify embargo length below)

Never make this article openly accessible while it remains in copyright (deposit for archiving purposes only)

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

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

Please check your publishing agreement.)

Are you opting out/requesting a waiver of the license transfer aspect of CSUSM's opt-Out policy?

If the publisher requests that you obtain a waiver of the license transfer, and you (at your sole discretion) check the box below, the waiver is granted automatically. You will receive an automated email confirming this, which will be sent to the submitter's address above. We will supply you with a more formal letter if needed.

If you obtain a license transfer waiver and then sign rights away in your publishing contract, in most cases you will need to ask the publisher permission before including your own figures in other articles, including your own articles in your course packs, or re-using your own materials in other ways (or authorizing others to do the same). If you have questions, please contact us at scholarworks@csusm.edu.

Yes, I am opting out of the license transfer to CSUSM.

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

192   ~~Yes~~
193
194   ~~No~~
195
196

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