

AGENDA
Executive Committee Meeting
CSUSM Academic Senate
Wednesday ~ January 21, 2015 ~ 12:00 – 2:00 pm
Provost's Conference Room – Kellogg 5207

I. Approval of Agenda

II. Approval of Minutes – 12/3/14

III. Chair's Report, [Laurie Stowell](#)

Referrals to Committee:

- APC: Academic Program Discontinuance Policy
- NEAC: Clarification on 2nd Readings: Robert's Rules vs. Senate Standing Rules
- BLP: Moving Self Support Academic Programs to State Support (revision of last year's draft)
- FAC: Exploratory: Visiting Professor Procedures or Policy? (see CBA 12.32)

IV. Vice Chair's Report, [Debbie Kristan](#)

V. Secretary's Report, [Vivienne Bennett](#)

- Expanding Existing Stateside Programs to Self-Support Delivery Policy *approved by President Haynes and Provost Oberem, effective 1/12/15*

VI. Provost's Report, [Graham Oberem](#) (Not able to attend.)

VII. Vice Provost's Report, [Kamel Haddad](#)

VIII. Presentations

IX. Discussion Items

- A. Program Suspension of P.E. option (2 attachments: Ad Hoc Committee's Recommendation, Senate Officers Motion)**
- B. Senate Officers: Student Access Initiative (2 attachments: SAI New Time Blocks, Draft Resolution)**

X. EC Members Concerns & Announcements

Upcoming Presentations:

Academic Senate: 2/4/15 – NCAA Division II Update (Jennifer Milo & Todd Snedden); Quality Online Teaching (Veronica Añover); Shelter in Place Concerns and other Safety Issues (Robert Williams)

Next EC Meeting: Jan 28, 2015, 12:00 noon – 2:00 pm, Kellogg 5207

Please Note: The Senate Meeting of 2/3/15 will be held in Commons 206

BLP: Moving Self-Support Academic Programs to State Support

Rationale: As CSUSM first contemplated opening new academic programs via Extended Learning as fully self-support programs, many asked how such programs might be moved "stateside" once California's budget situation improved and CSUSM could again contemplate enrollment expansion. As we stand now at the cusp of such long-awaited growth, we should examine how such moves might happen. While it is possible to bring self-support programs into the state-supported budget, the benefits and costs (including potential costs to other stateside programs) must be evaluated before any such moves are made. Such a proposal must ultimately be approved by the Chancellor's Office. This document establishes a consistent, consultative process for considering whether existing self-support programs should be moved to the "stateside" budget. We are aware of no such proposals at this time; this document is intended as a preemptive measure to allay possible concerns.

Definition: Policy and procedure for the moving of self-support, for-credit programs to state support

Authority: The President of the University.

Scope: Self-support, for-credit programs considered for moves to ~~EL~~ the state budget

Principles: Any proposed move of a self-support program to the state-supported budget would require consideration of the following:

1. What potential costs and benefits will accrue to a self-support program moved to the state-supported budget? For example:
 - a. how would moving the program stateside affect student tuition/fees?
 - b. can we anticipate any impact on student recruitment?
 - c. what impact can we anticipate on revenues?
 - d. how would currently enrolled students be affected?
2. What potential costs and benefits will accrue to other existing state-supported programs and other units if an existing self-support program is moved to the state-supported budget?
 - a. what is the anticipated effect on FTES?
 - b. what existing (and new) program costs would be added to the Academic Affairs budget? These costs should include FTES, FTEF, Library resources, IITS, advising and other staff resources, and lab and any equipment costs.
 - c. any other potential impacts on existing stateside programs should also be taken into account, including space needs and prioritizations for space assignments.
3. Any other potential costs and benefits, including those to the community and the region, should be addressed.
4. Given the need for thoughtful planning, such programs should be incorporated into the respective unit's 3-year rolling plans in a timely fashion. If the program is not on its respective unit's 3-year plan when the proposal is submitted for review, the proposer should explain why that is the case.

Process: When the Academic Senate is asked to approve any new program, the Budget & Long-Range Planning (BLP) committee assesses likely resource impacts. Moving existing self-support offerings to the state-supported budget requires a re-assessment of resource impacts. Before any existing self-support program moves to the state-supported budget, a proposal addressing all of the points noted above shall be developed by a current CSUSM faculty member. The review of that proposal, submitted by a faculty member from within the program in question, will include the following steps:

1. review by any appropriate College-level committees;
2. review by the Dean of the appropriate College(s) as well as the Dean of Extended Learning;

- 53 3. review by BLP;
- 54 4. consideration for approval by the Academic Senate.

1 **DRAFT**

2
3 Date: October 15, 2014
4 Submitted by: Pat Stall and Sue Moineau
5 Re: Opposition to Suspension of the Physical Education Option in Kinesiology
6

7 As per the Academic Program Discontinuance Policy (APC353-09) when there is an objection to a
8 recommendation to discontinue or suspend an academic program, an Ad-Hoc Viability Review Committee
9 is formed to “conduct a special program review focused on issues related to potential discontinuance or
10 enrollment suspension.” The charge of the committee is to review data and supporting documentation
11 and to make a recommendation back to UCC and BLP.
12

13 As per the Program Discontinuation or Suspension Policy, Ad-Hoc Program Viability Review Committee
14 consisted of:
15 Sue Moineau, UCC Chair
16 Pat Stall, BLP Chair
17 Linda Shaw, PAC Chair
18 Paul Stuhr, KIN faculty member
19 Jeff Nessler, KIN Department Chair
20 Janet Powell, Dean COEHHS
21

22 The Ad Hoc Committee met three times on September 10, September 24 and October 22, 2014.
23

24 Following is a brief summary of the discussion and findings.
25

26 Due to the market-driven nature of education, there has been a decline in demand and enrollment for the
27 Physical Education Option. This decline mirrors the overall decline in employment in recent years in the
28 education field. The significantly reduced demand for courses in the PE option, coupled with the
29 increased demand for other options, resulted in a proposed suspension of the PE option. In the course of
30 the conversation, the committee discovered other reasons for the suspension request, beyond
31 quantitative measures, which are directly related to priorities of the department.
32

33 There was a consensus of opinion that the Physical Education Option is a program of high quality.
34 Opposition to the suspension of the program focused on the importance of meeting community and
35 societal needs for healthy living, reducing childhood obesity, and the critical role that Physical Education
36 teachers play in that effort. Additionally, opposition was predicated on the regions need to comply with
37 California Education Code in regard to the required physical education minutes and assessment practices
38 teaches are required to follow in K-12 schools. The Kinesiology department at CSUSM will no longer offer
39 physical education subject matter preparation for undergraduates interested in pursuing this field. To the
40 best of our knowledge, there will be no institute of higher education in San Diego County where an
41 individual can receive subject matter preparation in the field of physical education. Other programs in the
42 area have been suspended for similar reasons.
43

44 In the end, all parties agreed, some with reluctance, to uphold the suspension. Due to the high quality of
45 the PE option and the societal needs for healthy living, we recommend that the department continue to
46 discuss and implement ways in which other options include PE focused courses. This might entail some
47 revision in courses as well as in the organization of options. We also recommend that the PE faculty
48 continue to monitor employment demand in the field (particularly in CSUSM’s service area) and student
49 demand to ascertain a point when the program might be reinstated.
50

51 Finally, the committee recommends that the required P-2 form for program suspension be submitted and
52 placed ahead of other curriculum forms in the queue so that the department can make catalogue changes
53 and advise students accordingly.
54
55

To: Academic Senate
From: Executive Committee
Date: January 21, 2015
RE: Program Discontinuance of Physical Education option

As per the Academic Program Discontinuance Policy (APC353-09) when there is an objection to a recommendation to discontinue an academic program, an Ad-Hoc Viability Review Committee is formed to “conduct a special program review focused on issues related to potential discontinuance or enrollment suspension.” The charge of the committee is to review data and supporting documentation and to make a recommendation back to UCC and BLP and eventually the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. Per the policy, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate shall collect the individual recommendations from the Ad-Hoc Program Viability Review Committee, the Dean of CEHHS, and the Provost, and shall prepare a summary and a motion to be distributed to the Senate along with the individual recommendations. The Dean of CEHHS served on the Ad Hoc committee and had nothing further to add to the report and neither did the Provost.

Therefore, based on the Ad Hoc Viability Review Committee’s recommendation, this memo serves as a motion to discontinue the Physical Education option in the Kinesiology Department.

Approved Class Meeting Times Proposal - Main Campus (updated on 01-17-15)

Table I - 2 hrs/week

MW/MF/WF	
7:30 AM - 8:20 AM	11:30 AM - 12:20 PM
8:30 AM - 9:20 AM	12:30 PM - 1:20 PM
9:30 AM - 10:20 AM	1:30 PM - 2:20 PM
10:30 AM - 11:20 AM	
MW (Dedicated Space)	TR (Dedicated Space)
Starting at any half hour beginning at 2:30 PM	Starting at any hour beginning at 8:00 AM (except noon)

Table II - 3 hrs/week

MWF	TR
7:30 AM - 8:20 AM	7:30 AM - 8:45 AM
8:30 AM - 9:20 AM	9:00 AM - 10:15 AM
9:30 AM - 10:20 AM	10:30 AM - 11:45 AM
10:30 AM - 11:20 AM	11:50 AM - 12:50 PM <i>University Hour</i>
11:30 AM - 12:20 PM	
12:30 PM - 1:20 PM	
1:30 PM - 2:20 PM	
MW	1:00 PM - 2:15 PM
2:30 PM - 3:45 PM	2:30 PM - 3:45 PM
4:00 PM - 5:15 PM	4:00 PM - 5:15 PM
5:30 PM - 6:45 PM	5:30 PM - 6:45 PM
7:00 PM - 8:15 PM	7:00 PM - 8:15 PM
8:30 PM - 9:45 PM	8:30 PM - 9:45 PM

Table III - 4 hrs/week

MW/MF/WF	MW (Dedicated Space)
7:30 AM - 9:20 AM	2:30 PM - 4:20 PM
8:30 AM - 10:20 AM	4:30 PM - 6:20 PM
9:30 AM - 11:20 AM	6:30 PM - 8:20 PM
10:30 AM - 12:20 PM	TR (Dedicated Space)
11:30 AM - 1:20 PM	8:00 AM - 9:50 AM
12:30 PM - 2:20 PM	10:00 AM - 11:50 AM
MW or TR (1.5-2.5)	11:50 AM - 12:50 PM
One yellow timeblock on one day and 2 consecutive yellow timeblocks on the other day	<i>University Hour</i>
	1:00 PM - 2:50 PM
MTWF or MWRF	3:00 PM - 4:50 PM
50 minutes/day starting at 7:30 AM, 8:30 AM, 9:30 AM, 10:30 AM, or 1:30 PM	5:00 PM - 6:50 PM
	7:00 PM - 8:50 PM

For combination LEC (2 hrs/wk) and LAB/ACT (3 hrs/wk): Use any 2-hour pattern from Table I for LEC, and 3 one-day consecutive GREEN timeblocks or 2 one-day consecutive YELLOW timeblocks from Table I or II for LAB*.

For combination LEC (3 hrs/wk) and LAB/ACT (3 hrs/wk): Use any 3-hour pattern from Table II for LEC, and 3 one-day consecutive GREEN timeblocks or 2 one-day consecutive YELLOW timeblocks from Table I or II for LAB*.

For 1 day/week courses: (Eg: credential, some graduate) Combine consecutive one-day GREEN or YELLOW timeblocks

Dedicated classrooms: A sufficient number of classrooms will be dedicated MW after 2:30 PM and TR all day to once a week 2-unit or twice a week 4-unit classes (expected use: 30 hours per week per classroom). Proposals to dedicate other classrooms to a given program (or programs) will be considered by the Scheduling Office.

*Lab sessions M,W or F from 12:30 to 3:45 or T or R from 8:00 to 10:45 or 11:15 To 2:00 in dedicated labs are also allowed.

39 Resolved, that EC/Senate endorses the adoption of the “Student Access
40 Initiative” as summarized in the attached document.
41
42