

FACULTY SENATE

C A L S T A T E ,
S A N B E R N A R D I N O

2 0 1 4 - 2 0 1 5

COMMITTEE REPORTS BOOK



June 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
STANDING COMMITTEES	3
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE	4
EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE	5
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE	6
GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE	7
LIBRARY COMMITTEE	9
AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES	10
AWARD COMMITTEE	11
COMMERCIALIZATION/ COPYRIGHT / FAIR USE COMMITTEE	12
DISTRIBUTED LEARNING COMMITTEE	13
EVALUATION COMMITTEE (University)	14
FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE	15
GRADUATE COUNCIL	16
HONORARY DEGREE COMMITTEE – 2014-2015	27
HONORS COMMITTEE	28
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD	29
INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY COMMITTEE	31
SOTE INSTRUMENT REVIEW AD-HOC COMMITTEE	32
STUDENT GRADE APPEAL PANEL	33
TEACHING ACADEMY	34
OTHER COMMITTEES REPRESENTATIVES	35
ACADEMIC COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS	36
Alcohol, Tobacco, & Other Related Drugs Advisory Committee	37
ASSOCIATED STUDENTS INC. BOARD OF DIRECTORS	38
ATHLETICS ADVISORY	39
CALENDAR COMMITTEE	40
CAMPUS ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY BOARD	41
CHILDREN'S CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE	42
DIVERSITY COMMITTEE (UNIVERSITY)	43
ENERGY CONSERVATION COMMITTEE	45
FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE	46
INSTRUCTIONALLY RELATED PROGRAMS BOARD	47
INTELLECTUAL LIFE AND VISITING SCHOLAR COMMITTEE	48
INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE	49
PALM DESERT CAMPUS PLANNING & OPERATIONS COUNCIL	50
PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS	51
RECREATION COMMITTEE	52
SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE (UNIVERSITY)	53
STUDENT AID COMMITTEE	54
STUDENT HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE	55
STUDENT RESEARCH COMPETITION – GRADUATE & UNDERGRADUATE	56
SANTOS MANUEL STUDENT UNION BOARD OF DIRECTORS	57
UNIVERSITY ENTERPRISES CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS	59



STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

As usual, Academic Scheduling Administrative Analyst and Specialist Kim Nicholl has used her invaluable skills and continually increasing knowledge to see the committee through always more administrative changes in regards to CMS and other concerns. Through her suggestion of some electronic meetings involving simple house-cleaning operations in curriculum, we have been able to streamline in-person meetings and concentrate on the more exacting curricular concerns. This change has been very successful.

We were able to conduct our business in five collegial meetings. In addition to handing specific curricular changes, we are dealing with new electronic forms that will, ultimately, make the process easier for academic committees across the campus.

This year the committee was composed of the following members:

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

T. Provenzano, Arts & Letters/Library (Chair)	2014-2016
W. Stewart, Business & Public Administration	2013-2015
T. Long, Social & Behavioral Sciences/Student Affairs	2013-2015
J. Sylva, Education	2014-2016
D. Smith, Natural Sciences/Coaches	2014-2016
J. Zorn, Administrative Representative	Ex-officio
K. Nicholl, Administrative Representative	Ex-officio
J. Thompson, Administrative Representative	Ex-officio

This year, the committee conducted routine business regarding curriculum changes. There were only a few contentious issues, which were all dealt with through a very collegial system. The committee is grateful to the efforts of faculty to form and maintain a highly rigorous and creative curriculum.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Report to be submitted.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Report to be submitted.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE

The purpose of this report is to communicate the activities of the General Education (GE) Committee for fall 2014 through spring 2015. The GE committee is tasked with reviewing the General Education plan, and making recommendations to the Curriculum Committee. This year included three main tasks including participating in the WASC review, reviewing proposals, and creating new General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs).

WASC – The GE committee participated in the WASC review by providing documents, participating in campus meetings, and directly meeting with WASC reviewers to discuss the status of the CSUSB GE program and future improvements in assessment.

Proposal Review – Proposals reviewed by the committee focused on waivers requested by high unit majors to allow for double counting units in GE and major requirements. These requests were initiated to address the Chancellor's mandate to reduce units to graduate in high unit majors. The committee approved A.4 and D.4 waivers for Cyber Security, Computer Engineering, and Computer Science while ensuring that the material is covered in classes within the major.

GELOs - Student learning outcomes for the General Education program at CSUSB were developed following a self-review that revealed a lack of coherent learning outcomes for the program as a whole. Following the self-review, WASC mandated that we create learning outcomes for the General Education program. The Senate GE Committee, in cooperation with TRC, formed a GE think tank to provide greater representation across the campus teaching community. The think tank discussed contemporary trends in GE and assessment to create the GE student learning outcomes for CSUSB. The initial product was discussed with the greater campus community at critical conversations, shared in a campus survey to obtain feedback, and discussed at a student meeting on GE outcomes. Changes were made based on this feedback.

It is important to note that the GE student learning outcomes refer to the whole program, not individual courses or areas of breadth included in the program requirements. The outcomes apply regardless of the specific course requirements designed to achieve the outcomes. This means they apply to our current program, and to any future changes in the program that occur based on semester conversion. CSU system requirements for GE are not in conflict with these outcomes as they guide the design of GE strategies that achieve the outcomes. The outcomes include the CSU “Golden 4” learning outcomes, and the WASC core competencies.

Outcomes

General Education at CSUSB fosters intellectual rigor and exploration whereby students understand and investigate the foundations and implications of ideas, theories, beliefs, and expressions. The program uses a multidisciplinary approach to encourage ongoing, self-motivated learning and to inform student creativity, reasoning, problem-solving, expression, and responsible action. It's a process whereby students:

* Develop awareness of their learning processes, becoming reflective, self-directed learners who are able to apply and adapt their processes of learning in new contexts. (Learning How to Learn/Metacognition)

- * Think critically, evaluate, analyze, and solve problems employing multiple methods of reasoning. (Thinking Critically)
- * Analyze the ways that information and expression, including quantitative, technological, artistic, oral, and written modes, shape and are shaped by social contexts. (Critical Literacies)
- * Develop the ability to understand global contexts so they are prepared to contribute to an ever changing and pluralistic world. (Global Perspective)
- * Become aware of connections and differences across disciplines and learning experiences in order to frame and address ideas and questions they encounter in their lives. (Integrative Learning)
- * Recognize that they are ethically responsible for the impact that their ideas, decisions, and actions have upon their lives, and on local and global communities. (Ethical Responsibility)
- * Explore and understand multiple perspectives in order to collaborate and communicate effectively with diverse people across a variety of contexts and cultures. (Collaboration)

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

No report submitted.

***AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES
OF THE
FACULTY SENATE***



AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
(Special Committee)

AWARD COMMITTEE

No report submitted.

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

COMMERCIALIZATION/ COPYRIGHT / FAIR USE COMMITTEE

Committee did not meet during the 2014-15 AY.

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

DISTRIBUTED LEARNING COMMITTEE

Members: Jonathan Anderson, Brian Newberry, Joon Son, Teresa Dodd-Butera, Janine Kremling

Ex-officio: Kimberly Costino, Tatiana Karmanova, Michael Chen,

Admin support: Shelley Campbell

Co-Chairs: Teresa Dodd-Butera, Janine Kremling

Summary of Work Completed

The Distributed Learning Committee met bi-weekly during the 2014/15 academic year. The committee completed the revision of the Distributed Learning Policy FAM 827.3. The revised policy was submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval, but due to time constraints, the policy was not approved during the 2014/15 academic year. The committee will resubmit the revised policy in the Fall 2015 quarter.

In addition, the committee submitted a request for the merger of the Distributed Learning Committee and the ATI Subcommittee of the IT Governance Committee to the Faculty Senate together with a new charge and title. Due to time constraints, however, the Faculty Senate did not approve the request during the 2014/15 academic year. The merger request, new charge, and request for title change will be resubmitted in the Fall 2015 quarter.

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

(Special Committee)

EVALUATION COMMITTEE (University)

The University Evaluation Committee (UEC) reviewed and made recommendations on ten cases during the 2014-2015 Academic Year. One case was reviewed during the fall 2014 quarter, another three in the winter 2015 quarter, and the remaining six in the spring 2015 quarter.

Eight of the ten cases reviewed were faculty WPAF's that were not unanimous for retention, tenure and/or promotion and the remaining two of the WPAF's reviewed were for librarians.. In the latter case, the committee served as the higher level peer review committee.

The breakdown of files reviewed from the various colleges and other entities was as follows:

	CAL	CBPA	CEDUC	CNSCI	CSBS	Library	SSP, AR
Files Reviewed	7	1	0	0	0	2	0

The UEC reviewed 5, 15, 11, and 10 cases in the academic years 2013/14, 2012/13, 2011/12, and 2010/11, respectively. Thus, the load this year is somewhat heavier than the last year but similar to recent years. The College of Arts and Letters stands out with a disproportionate number of files.

The distribution above indicates that all colleges are doing an excellent job preparing faculty for promotion and tenure, particularly those faculty members going up "on time".

In our review of the files, we noticed that in some cases, RPT committees, chairs and deans did not recognize the major change in the current RPT document that the faculty are to be rated at their current rank instead of the rank that that they are requesting to be promoted to.

We encourage the EC to revisit the language of the RPT document to clarify that the current RPT document has not changed the standards, that existed in previous versions of the RPT document, for retention/tenure/promotion at the Assistant, Associate, and Professor levels.

The UEC, during the academic year 2014/15, consisted of six members instead of the usual seven because there was no representative from SSP, AR.

A list of all committee members is provided below. As usual the Committee worked together harmoniously, with everyone carrying an appropriate share of the load. Each member of the committee worked very hard and did his/her best to provide a thorough and fair evaluation of each file. It truly was a pleasure and an honor to be a part of the committee.

Committee Member

Zahid Hasan (Chair)
Terri J. Nelson
David Chavez
Sung-Kyoo Huh
Margaret Cooney
Xiwen Zhang
VACANT

Constituency Represented

College of Natural Sciences
College of Arts and Letters
College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
College of Business and Public Administration
College of Education
Library
SSP, AR

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

(Special Committee)

FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE

The committee members including (in alphabetical order) Eun-Ok Baek, Mohammad Bazaz, Kimberly Costino, Laura Newcomb, Richard Samuelson, Brent Singleton, Jeff Thompson, and Richard Weiss met during the Winter Quarter of 2015.

The budget for the academic year of 2015-2016 has not been changed since the previous year and stay at \$191,649.

The committee members unanimously voted to the following 2015-2016 FPDCC budget allocation:

<u>Awards</u>	<u>Allocations</u>	<u>Source</u>	<u></u>
A. 24 Mini-Grants @ \$4,500 maximum	\$105,649	RSCA	\$91,649
		Roll-over	\$ 5,000
		IDC	\$ 9,000
B. 20 Summer Fellowship	\$ 60,000	IDC	\$60,000
C. Faculty Research Leave	\$0		\$0
D. 16 Professors Across Borders	<u>\$ 31,000</u>	IDC	<u>\$31,000</u>
Total	\$196,649		\$196,649

On February 2015, the committee requested an additional \$50,000 fund from UEC Board of Directors to support at least 10 more mini-grants from a large pool of research proposals. This request has not been funded yet.

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

(Special Committee)

GRADUATE COUNCIL

- I. Members of the Graduate Council (see Appendix A)
- II. Meeting dates (meeting minutes available upon request) 2014:

September 30, October 16, November 18

2015: January 22, February 26, April 8, May 13, June 3
- III. Objectives of the Graduate Council 2014-2015
 - A. Revise the *Graduate Degree Completion Facilitation Policy*
 - B. Revise the Graduate Entrance Writing Requirement
 - C. Increase funding for graduate students
 - C.1. Increase funding for graduate teaching and research assistants (subset of above)
 - D. Augment support for the administration of graduate programs
- IV. Final Reports 2014-2015
 - *CSUSB Grad Survey 2013-2014 Summary Report* (Appendix B)
 - *Writing Requirement for Graduate Classification Proposed Policy* (Appendix C)
 - *Graduation Degree Completion Policy Revised* (Appendix D)
- V. Other comments
 - Objectives A-B have been accomplished
 - Work continues on Objectives C and D

Appendix A: Members of the Graduate Council

Name	Program	College	(Representing)
Thompson, Jeff	Dean, Graduate Studies (Ex-officio)		
Anderson, Jonathan	Coordinator, Masters in Public Administration	CBPA	CBPA (Prog. Coord.)
Brantley, Diane	Coordinator, MA in Ed., Curriculum & Instruction	CoE	CoE (Prog. Coord.)
Díaz-Rico, Lynne (Chair)	Coordinator, MA in Ed., Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	CoE	Doctoral Studies (Rep.)
Fryxell, Joan	Coordinator, M.S. in Earth and Environmental Sciences Program	CNS	CNS (Prog. Coord.)
Gutierrez, Juan	Chair, Teacher Education and Foundations	CoE	Credential Programs
Jany, Carmen	Coordinator, MA in Spanish, World Language and Literatures	CAL	CAL (Prog. Coord.)
Jetter, Madeleine	CNS, Mathematics	CNS	CNS (Prog. Coord.)
Leh, Amy	Coordinator, MA in Ed., Teacher Leadership	CoE	CoE (Prog. Coord.)
Lewin, Michael	M. S. in Psychology, Clinical Counseling	CSBS	CSBS (Prog. Coord.)
Muhtaseb, Ahlam	Graduate Coordinator, Communication Studies	CAL	CAL (Prog. Coord.)
Qiu, Ranfeng (Stella)	Management	CBPA	CBPA (Rep.)
Schoepfer, Andrea	Graduate Coordinator, Criminal Justice	CSBS	CSBS (Prog. Coord.)

GRADUATE COUNCIL 2014-2015
2013-2014 Survey of Graduate Coordinators
Summary of Findings

prepared by

A. Muhtaseb, D. Brantley, A. Leh

Overall, 21 graduate coordinators from across campus completed all or part of the survey. The majority of the coordinators were responsible for just one graduate program. The number of students in these programs ranged from 214 students to only 4 students, showing little consistency in graduate enrollment numbers.

According to the data, most graduate students do not receive teaching assistantships, research assistantships, scholarships and/or fee waivers. When any of these funds are awarded, they are generally awarded based upon the following three criteria (in order of its weight in the award decision): 1) review of the student's file, 2) faculty recommendation/s, and 3) academic merit. Additionally, over 94% of graduate students have never been awarded a Study Abroad Scholarship.

39% of students in graduate programs do not receive any type of financial assistance for attending conferences and/or workshops or for participation in student organizations. The remaining percentage of students receive some level of financial support though they do so in very small numbers in any given graduate program. Again, they are generally awarded based on the following three criteria (in order of its weight in the award decision): 1) review of the student's file, 2) faculty recommendation/s, and 3) academic merit.

Based upon the survey findings, over 61% of the graduate programs reported having some type of discipline-specific student organization. Overwhelming these organizations serve both graduate and undergraduate students from a given discipline.

Half of the reporting graduate programs organize one event for their graduate students per academic year while 16.67% hold at least one event per quarter. 16.67% of the programs do not have any type of event for their graduate students.

The majority of the programs that responded to the survey

- offered a formal orientation program for incoming graduate students,
- offered special support (faculty advising) for non-resident/international students,
- offered a workshop (Graduate School Application Workshop) to the undergraduate students to prepare them for graduate school,
- Offered courses taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty,
- did not offer formal internship, career services, and/or placement services (besides the CSUSB Career Services Center) to their graduate students,
- did not offer professional skills workshops to their graduate students (besides formal classes), nor encouraged them to take such workshops somewhere else on campus,
- did not count independent study courses taught by faculty towards their teaching load,
- were satisfied or very satisfied with the classrooms used for graduate education, and
- viewed the advising system for graduate students in their programs as being effective.

Sources of funding to support graduate student activities varied from program to program. Participants provided some ideas on supporting graduate students, e.g., tuition waivers, funding for a student adviser and for recruitment. The total number of tenured or tenure-track faculty members teaching in the graduate programs ranged from 1 to 25. When asked, “how many of the tenured or tenure-track faculty teaching graduate courses apply for university-wide awards for teaching?” the majority of the participants was not certain about the answer to the question.

In terms of class size, it seems that the majority of our graduate classes were in the range of 10-25 students, with few that were less than 10. In terms of support for faculty who teach graduate classes or supervise graduate work, the majority do not get compensated for such extra work through release time, higher WTUs, etc., with few exceptions in some programs (one depends on grant funding for such compensation). Several reported very specific formulas of compensation, which should be taken into consideration across all graduate programs. The majority of the respondents don't get any student assistant support or any staff support (beyond what trickles down from the department administrative assistants). In terms of compensation of graduate coordinators in general, it seems that the majority receive only one class release. However, it would have been helpful to see if there was any correlation between the size of the program and the compensation offered to the graduate coordinator.

In terms of marketing and publicizing our graduate programs, it seems that most of our programs are behind. For example, in terms of using digital and social media, the majority of our programs are behind because while the majority of programs have a Website, the update process is either sporadic or unknown. In addition, only few programs utilized social media outlets and fewer used Google tags. Lastly, the majority of our programs mainly used the traditional promotional means of fairs, information sessions, and promotional materials such as fliers and brochures. In this age of digital media, and dealing with a population group who are high tech, this puts us at a disadvantage against our competition.

Lastly, the main support for the professional development of graduate program faculty/staff coordinators used was conference presentations.

Recommendations:

The main recommendation noted based on the overall findings indicates a need for more financial support for graduate students and coordinators across campus. These can come in the form of teaching assistantships, research assistantships, scholarships and fee waivers as well as other, yet unidentified funding sources. Additionally, it would be beneficial to further support our graduate students by funding their participation in discipline-specific local, state, national and international organizations. In addition, both graduate coordinators and faculty teaching and serving graduate students are mainly not compensated for all the extra work they do. Therefore, we recommend a process or specific formula to compensate those faculty members across campus and in a fairly manner.

The last question of the questionnaire is probably the most important part of the survey with concrete important suggestions. The question (What other areas of concern should the CSUSB Graduate Council address on behalf of graduate education at CSUSB?) yielded the following important recommendations:

1. To keep a competitive edge over other higher educational institutions, especially other CSUs, we need to start offering tuition waivers.
2. Grad students need intellectual spaces where they could congregate, study, and store their belongings.

3. Create a grad school culture that promotes the rights and needs of graduate students who come to campus mainly in the afternoons and nights; such as bookstore availability, food court availability, etc.
4. Creating more teaching and research assistantships, in addition to scholarships.
5. Also support to send students to academic conferences.
6. The need for more staff support.
7. The need for more release time.
8. The need for web and social media support.
9. The need for more support in terms of research and quality education.
10. Academic Affairs should provide support for faculty supervising independent studies or graduate research projects or theses.
11. More support of graduate coordinators in general.

In addition, the committee recommends keeping class size within 20 for a graduate course and within 15 for an online graduate course.

Proposal: Writing Requirement for Graduate Candidacy

This Writing Requirement for Graduate Candidacy (WRGC) document outlines the procedures for assessing master's student writing proficiency preparatory to classification or advancement to candidacy, serving as a set of criteria for a CSUSB master's program to determine that a master's student has fulfilled the California State University (CSU) graduation entrance writing requirement for master's candidates.

Specifications

I. In the following, “the Program” refers to the College, Department or program from which the student will receive the master’s degree.

II. This Writing Requirement for Graduate Candidacy (WRGC) applies to graduate students enrolled in master's programs. The writing requirement must be satisfied before a graduate student is classified or advanced to candidacy. (The point at which the WRGC must be satisfied shall be a Program decision.)

III. Programs shall submit to the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) notice of the candidates’ satisfaction of the WRGC, and the OGS will maintain a record thereof

IV. The Program shall determine the manner by which a student satisfies or does not satisfy the WRGC by requiring one of the four options below. Students shall

- take an existing 306 course and attain a grade of B or better; or
- achieve an acceptable standardized test score, such as the Analytical Writing subtest of the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) or the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE), or the CSUSB Writing Requirement Exemption Examination (WREE), as determined by the Program; or
- complete a Program-specific writing intensive course with a grade no lower than a B-; or
- submit a paper(s) that receive(s) a passing score as described in Point VI below (the Program shall determine which faculty member(s) will evaluate such a submission).

V. If a Program-specific writing intensive course is offered to satisfy the WRGC as in Option IVc above, the Program will file the course syllabus with the OGS for approval. The course syllabus should demonstrate a focus on writing in the discipline of study.

VI. If a Program uses Option IVd above, the following rubric, or similar rubric provided by the Program, shall be used to evaluate students’ writing performance. Paper(s) shall be scored using a rubric (1-3) in each of four areas: A) Integration/Critical Analysis, B) Content/Organization, C) Style/Format, and D) Grammar/Usage, for a maximum score of 12. The minimal acceptable combined score from all of the four (A-D) sections is 8 points. Using this or a similar rubric, a Program may establish a higher minimum score for passing. If using Option IVd above, the Program shall submit a rubric as part of its plan for candidates to satisfy the WRGC, showing how students are assessed in the four areas A-D, and what minimum score is acceptable for satisfying the WRGC.

VII. The Program shall have a remediation protocol for admitted graduate students who do not satisfy the WRGC on their first attempt. The Program shall specify the maximum number of attempts that students may be allowed to satisfy the WRGC.

VIII. The Program shall file its respective WRGC and remediation protocol with the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) for approval. Upon approval, the Program shall provide the OGS with annual aggregate student WRGC performance data.

IX. For candidates seeking to transfer to a different program, the Program to which the candidate is applying has the option of accepting or not accepting a candidate's WRGC from a previous program.

X. The policy will go into immediate effect. Programs that gain approval for their WRGC plan may specify for which admission cycle candidates shall be held to the Program's WRGC.

XI. Until such time as the Program's WRGC is approved by OGS, candidates will be held to the existing Graduate Entrance Writing Requirement (GEWR) policy.

Rubric that May Be Used to Evaluate Student Submissions for Satisfaction of the Writing Requirement for Graduate Classification

A. Integration/Critical Analysis

3: The submission represents the current state of knowledge for the topic being addressed. Information about the topic is presented in an organized manner, resulting in an orderly discussion of the topic being addressed. Research source material originates from sources appropriate to the discipline such as national and international peer-reviewed journals, and sources are accurately and concisely analyzed and correctly cited in both text and bibliographic citations.

2: There are inconsistencies in the organization and logic of the information presentation, but still clear analysis of the presented materials. Synthesis of various aspects of the topic may show incomplete degrees of development, but overall, the document is well crafted. There is evidence of analysis and correct citation of appropriate source materials.

1: Discussion of the topic is incomplete and the presentation of ideas is poorly developed or lacking. Complex topics and related concepts are awkwardly presented and linkages among topics may be unclear. Analysis is limited to categorizing and summarizing topics. The resulting manuscript is confusing, with an inadequate number of sources or lack of appropriate use and citation of reference material.

B. Content/Organization

3: Follows all requirements for the paper. Topic is carefully focused and the major points related to the topic are clearly outlined. Ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Paper is interesting and holds the reader's attention. General ideas are expanded upon in a logical manner, thereby extending the significance of the work presented beyond a restatement of known ideas.

2: Ideas presented closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Certain logical connections or inclusion of specific topics related to the student's area of study may be omitted. Ideas and concepts are generally satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic and organization are apparent. The reader is suitably introduced to the topic being presented such that the relationship to the student's area of study is obvious.

1: The paper is logically and thematically coherent, but is lacking in substantial ways.

The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. Overall, the content and organization needs significant revision to represent a critical analysis of the topic.

C. Style/Format

3: Conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the paper. Thoroughness and competence are demonstrated in documenting sources; the reader would have little difficulty referring back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper. The writing suitably models the discipline's overall scholarly style.

2: The style and format are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent. There is selection of less suitable sources (non-peer reviewed literature, web information). Weak transitions and apparent logic gaps occur between topics being addressed. The style may be difficult to follow, so as to detract from the comprehensibility of the manuscript.

1: While some discipline-specific conventions are followed, others are not. The paper lacks consistency in style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased. Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty connecting to cited sources to the references given. Major revisions would be needed to render the paper comprehensible.

D. Grammar/Usage

3: While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions and organizational structures, such as subheadings, are effectively used which help the reader move from one point to another.

2: Grammatical conventions are generally used, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. Effective discipline-specific vocabulary is used.

1: Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure, and/or other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is poor or improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. There is some confusion in the proper use of discipline-specific terms. Writing does not flow smoothly from point to point; appropriate transitions are lacking.

GRADUATE DEGREE COMPLETION FACILITATION POLICY FAM 841.4

I. Introduction

The purpose of this proposed policy is to reduce the time to graduation for graduate students and to promote financial equity. The current situation has a negative effect on both, since regular tuition for 0-unit courses creates cost barriers to timely completion of culminating projects (and thus graduation) and it seems unfair to charge students over

\$1600 a quarter for 0-unit courses. The Graduate Council would like to incentivize graduate degree completion by removing the negative effect of cost barriers to student progress.

This policy would ease the financial burden of graduate education and improve graduation rates. Currently it costs \$1667 for graduate students to enroll for the 0- unit continuous enrollment and comprehensive exam courses through regular enrollment, as opposed to \$260 through CEL. In order to retain privileges (email, library, learning management systems, access to faculty), these students must currently pay regular tuition. Under the proposed policy, students eligible to enroll through CEL would save \$1407 per quarter.

Because these graduate students are paying for *access to services* instead of a regular course (most will have taken an actual “culminating project” or “thesis” course earlier), it seems only fair to reduce the inordinate financial burden placed on them to complete their degrees.

- A. Continuous Enrollment:** Graduate students who have completed all other coursework will be allowed to enroll, with department consent, for 0-unit continuous enrollment courses through the College of Extended Learning (CEL). Graduate students enrolled in continuous enrollment courses in this way shall retain the privileges of regularly matriculated students: access to email, library, learning management systems, and faculty.
- B. Comprehensive Examination:** Graduate students who have completed all other coursework will be allowed to enroll, with department consent, for the comprehensive examination through the College of Extended Learning (CEL). Graduate students enrolled in the comprehensive exam in this way shall retain the privileges of regularly matriculated students: access to email, library, learning management systems, and faculty.
- C. Graduate Portfolio:** Graduate students will be allowed to enroll, with department consent, for the graduate portfolio through the College of Extended Learning (CEL) if the credit amount for this course is 0 unit. Graduate students enrolled in the graduate portfolio in this way shall retain the privileges of regularly matriculated students: access to email, library,

learning management systems, and faculty.

II. Rationale

- A. **Continuous Enrollment:** These students have already completed all of their program requirements except for the culminating project, and may take several quarters to complete that project. In order to retain privileges (email, library, learning management systems, faculty, catalog rights), these students must currently pay regular tuition. Many students, rather than paying this amount of money, choose to take a leave of absence instead. This policy change would alleviate the following concerns: (1) during a leave of absence, students lose access and thus have a harder time working on their projects; (2) students often do not return after a leave of absence and don't finish the degree; (3) students must go through an abundance of paperwork to leave the university and then re-enroll. Currently, 73% of students graduate after enrollment in continuous enrollment courses; 27% do not. The percentage varies according to college, from a low of 50% of continuous enrollment students in Arts & Letters to a high of 82% in Natural Sciences. Graduation rate overall for graduate students is 67%. (See attachment 1: Continuous Enrollment Report [Fall 2010-Summer 2013]).
- B. **Comprehensive Exam:** These students, in order to speed their time to graduation and to avoid paying regular tuition for the 0-unit comprehensive exam, often enroll in comprehensive exam courses while they are still taking coursework, even though they are strongly encouraged not to do so. This policy change would make it practical for programs to require students to complete all coursework before taking the exam.
- C. **Graduate Portfolio:** In some programs, graduate students are required to enroll in a graduate portfolio course while they are still taking courses, creating additional pressure, or after having completed their coursework and before being able to address the graduate exit writing requirement. This policy change would make it practical for programs to require students to complete all coursework before developing their portfolio.

III. Costs/Resources

- A. **Continuous Enrollment:** In Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 there were 65 students enrolled in 698 (Continuous Enrollment) each quarter, generating \$108,355 to the General Fund through regular fees of \$1667/student per quarter. Changing the continuous enrollment policy would reduce General Fund dollars, decrease student financial burden and increase dollars allocated to Programs. Approximately 25% of CEL fees is returned to campus. For 65 students this would be a return of \$4225 to the graduate program providing the services.
- B. **Comprehensive Exam:** As noted in II.B, comprehensive exam students often take regular coursework while enrolled for the comprehensive exam. Therefore, it is difficult to get specific financial data about cost savings.

However, the proposed policy change would encourage students to complete all coursework before taking the exam; it would also make it practical for departments/programs to require that coursework completion. Following the general rationale laid out in III.A, the proposed change in policy would provide a net financial benefit to departments programs. While students *save* money, departments/programs *get* money.

- C. **Graduate Portfolio:** As noted in II.C, candidates who must develop an outcomes assessment portfolio often take regular coursework while enrolled for the portfolio course. Therefore, it is difficult to get specific financial data about cost savings. However, the proposed policy change would encourage students to complete all coursework before taking on the development of the portfolio; it would also make it practical for departments/programs to require that coursework completion. Following the general rationale laid out in III.A, the proposed change in policy would provide a net financial benefit to departments/programs.

Faculty Supervision: The question was raised about faculty WTU credit or other credit for supervising 698/699 students should this policy be adopted. As noted in the attached survey (attachment 2, question #35), most faculty members do not currently receive credit for this work anyway. *This is not to say that faculty should not receive credit.* Rather, it is to point out that the policy change would not unduly burden graduate faculty any more than they are currently burden

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
(Special Committee)

HONORARY DEGREE COMMITTEE – 2014-2015

No report submitted.

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
(Special Committee)

HONORS COMMITTEE

No report submitted.

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

(Special Committee)

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

(Research Involving Human Subjects)

During the Academic Year 2014-2015, IRB members included, Dr. Judy Sylva (Chair), Dr. Caroline Vickers, Dr. Robert Phalen, Dr. Ted Coleman, Dr. Jeff Thompson (Ex-Officio), Dr. Debra Stine, and Dr. Teresa Dodd-Butera. Dr. John Clapper, Dr. Michael Lewin, and Dr. Jason Reimer served as IRB Co-Chairs for the Department of Psychology IRB sub-committee, and Dr. Rosemary McCaslin, served as the IRB Chair for the School of Social Work IRB sub-committee, which represent the two departmental sub-committees.

Additional board members included Mr. John Coleman of Redlands and Mrs. Nancy Johnson from the San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools who represent the nonscientific and community/unaffiliated board members. The student position was filled by Ms. Alissa Ramos, an Ed.D. student in the College of Education, Educational Leadership Program. Javier Torner was the technical consultant and Mr. Jose Rivera (CSUSB Lecturer) served as the prisoner representative.

The individual responsible for processing all IRB paperwork, maintaining the IRB website, providing local training, and keeping the committee running smoothly was Mr. Michael Gillespie, Research Compliance Officer and Administrative Analyst Specialist II for the Office of Academic Research. Mr. Gillespie, has National Board Certification as a Certified Institutional Review Board Professional (CIP) and a Certified Research Administrator (CRA). He has 10 years of experience as the CSUSB IRB Secretary and he earned a Certificate in Research Integrity in 2014.

Meeting Frequency

The committee met every other week (Fridays, 1:30 PM) during the three quarters of the academic year. In addition, the IRB receives, reviews, and responds to human subjects research protocols during the summer months as well.

As required by federal regulations, minutes of all meetings are retained and are available from the Board Research Compliance Officer/AAS.

Activities – IRB Protocol Reviews

The IRB Chair and Research Compliance Officer reviewed all administrative (previously known as exempt) proposals and the IRB Chair and one additional board member, routinely the Research Compliance Officer/AAS, reviewed expedited proposals. The full board reviewed all full board proposals submitted from the university community including faculty, students, and administrators. The delegated subcommittees in Psychology and Social Work review administrative and expedited protocols submitted by faculty and students of their respective departments/schools.

Reviews of the proposals consist of a minimum of one reading and commentary feedback to the primary investigator. Many proposals involve initial consultation, review, and re-review when changes are required.

Reviews by Type, AY 2014-2015

Reviewed By	Administrative	Expedited	Full Board	Renewals	Other (Revisions)	Other Data Set, Withdrawn, Closed, Not Research	Totals
Psychology sub-committee	50	41	0	8	18	0	117
Social Work sub-committee	21	47	0	2	0	35 (in Process)	105
IRB Committee	47	49	9	12	41	12	170
Totals	118	137	9	22	59	47	392

Adverse Events

One unanticipated event was reported during the 2014-2015 academic year which required filing with the Office of Human Research Protections.

- 1) A study participant in a Department of Psychology study had suicidal ideation during the research study. The faculty member and the student research assistant reached out to the student to provide needed resources to including counseling centers and hotline numbers. The faculty member incorporated more resources into the IRB protocol to ensure future participants would have the needed assistance and referral resources in seeking assistance. The report was filed with OHRP. OHRP concurred with the IRB's recommendations for corrective actions that were implemented in the faculty member's protocol.

Activities – Education and Consultation

All board members provide consultation to researchers who request pre-submission assistance and often provide consultation after initial reviews. A record of hours spent in consultation is not kept.

Continuing Education of the IRB

Each meeting of the Full Board includes federally required continuing education. The IRB secretary, Mr. Gillespie, provides journals, updates, and readings on a wide range of ethical issues in research.

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE
(Special Committee)

INSTRUCTIONAL QUALITY COMMITTEE

No report submitted.

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

(Ad Hoc Committee)
(Faculty Representatives)

SOTE INSTRUMENT REVIEW AD-HOC COMMITTEE

The Committee started meeting in the Winter quarter and developed surveys for students and faculty. The Committee will continue to meet in 2015-2016 to develop a new SOTE instrument with the goal of completion prior to the end of the AY.

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

(Special Committee)
(Faculty Representatives)

STUDENT GRADE APPEAL PANEL

Please see attached Student Academic Grievance Summary for the 2014-15 Academic Year.

There were a total of six (6) University-Level Student Academic Grievances regarding grades. Of these grievances, three (3) were denied a request for a hearing, two (2) were approved for a hearing and resulted in grade changes, and one (1) was resolved with the instructor.

Student Academic Grievance Summary

2014-15 Academic Year

Academic Year	Total Academic Grievance Cases Filed	Denied Hearing	Approved for Hearing	Resolution / Discontinuance by Student / Instructor	Continuance to next Academic Year	Resulted in Grade Change / Reinstatement
2014-15	6 (100%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	2 (33%)

AD HOC AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY SENATE

(Special Committee)
(Faculty Representatives)

TEACHING ACADEMY

For the AY2014-15, the Teaching Academy (TA) explored a number of topics important to teaching at CSUSB. From the exploration of these topics, it was recognized that the organization and Senate documentation on the TA needed to be revisited, clarified, and probably modified. The cabinet members worked throughout the summer to develop a program for the AY2015-16. This program includes the following:

1. Teaching Workshop – “Food for Thought”

On the fourth Wednesday of every month, the Teaching Academy will sponsor a “Food for Thought” lunch (a lunch will be served!), in which a variety of facilitators (one per session) will bring in an article, pose a question, or present ideas or results as a means of promoting open-ended conversation and learning.

2. Book Club

On the second Thursday of every month, the Teaching Academy will host a lunchtime book club discussion—a light lunch will be served! The book that will start off the series involves the craft of posing problems in the classroom in ways that engage students’ imagination and interest. Free electronic copies of this will be provided on a TRC iPad that can be borrowed. Subsequent books will be chosen by the participants.

3. Reorganization of the administration of the TA and planning for next year’s events

The TA will be meeting after the book club every month to work on a proposal for reorganization of the TA and will put together documentation for Senate approval this coming year.

MEMBERS:

College of Arts and Letters

Kareen Gervasi
Wendy Smith
Mary Boland

College of Business and Public Administration

Craig Seal
Kimberly Collins, Chair
Kathy Pelletier

College of Education

Diane Brantley
Robert London

College of Natural Sciences

Su Liang
Davida Fischman, Vice-Chair
Dorothy Chen-Maynard

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Janelle Gilbert
Janine Kremling
Cherstin Lyon
Britt Leatham, Ex-officio member on cabinet

Library

Gina Schlesselman-Tarango

TRC

Kimberly Costino, Ex-officio

This coming year will be one of change and growth for the Teaching Academy that will lead to a better organization that works on excellence in teaching at CSUSB.



OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES (Faculty Representative)

ACADEMIC COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The CSU Academic Council (ACIP) is an advisory body of the Office of International Programs (OIP), located at the Office of the Chancellor at the CSU headquarters in Long Beach.

Dr. Aurora Wolfgang, Department of World Languages and Literatures, is the ACIP Representative from CSUSB for 2014-15. She is the Chair of the Faculty Affairs sub-committee of the ACIP, which recruited Resident Directors for France, Spain, Italy, and China for 2016-17. In addition, the committee organized a “Resident Director De-Briefing” session via conference call on January 30th, 2015 (9-11:30 AM) for the four RDs who served in 2013-14. As the Chair, Dr. Wolfgang wrote reports on all the deliberations for the recruitment of RDs and on the de-briefing of former RDs. Lastly, she attended the two yearly meetings of the ACIP and worked on projects to address the needs of faculty serving as Resident Directors during those meetings. The Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee also serves on the Executive Committee of the ACIP.

ACIP MEETINGS

The ACIP held its two annual meetings on October 29-31, 2014 (CSU Chancellor’s Office) and April 15-17, 2015 (San Francisco State). An additional meeting was held on Feb. 20-21, 2015 at the Chancellor’s Office to interview potential Resident Directors (China, France, Italy, Spain). Two regional Pre-Departure Orientations for students planning to participate in International Programs for 2015-16 were hosted by Cal Poly Pomona (May 9) and San Francisco State University (May 2).

The next ACIP meeting is scheduled for late October 2015 at the Chancellor’s Office in Long Beach.

CSU IP ENROLLMENTS

This year the Office of International Programs received 566 applications for programs in 16 countries. Among the accepted CSU IP applicants for 2015-16 were 17 students from CSUSB to study abroad in the following countries: France (4), Germany (1), Italy (1), Japan (1), Korea (3), Spain (3), Sweden (2), Taiwan (1), and the United Kingdom (1).

CSU IP UPDATES

- The 2016-17 search for a Resident Director in China has been suspended due to low enrollment in the China program. CSU IP is now exploring combining its China program with that of another U.S. university.
- The program in Israel was suspended in Fall 2014, but resumed in Spring 2015.
- For the first time in many years, the number of students studying in the United Kingdom has increased. This is due primarily to the increase in incoming exchange student from two of our key partners there.

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

The CSU IP appointed the following International Resident Directors for AY 2016-17:

China: No Director chosen due to low enrollment in China program

France: Dr. Luda Popenhagen (Performing Arts) Channel Islands

Italy: Dr. Kevin Fagan (Modern Languages and Literatures) San Luis Obispo

Spain: Dr. Juan Carlos Gallego (Modern Languages and Literatures) Fullerton

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representative)

Alcohol, Tobacco, & Other Related Drugs Advisory Committee

ATOD met each quarter in 2014-2015 and submitted two biennial ATOD reports to the Chancellor's Office. In addition, we reviewed proposed changes to the forthcoming CO's EO re: tobacco on campus policy. We also reviewed a calendar of educational activities for Spring 2015. Finally, we partnered with a local public health organization to support increasing awareness of the dangers of spice and the social host ordinance.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES
(Faculty Representative)

ASSOCIATED STUDENTS INC. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

No report submitted.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representatives)

ATHLETICS ADVISORY

The Committee met twice during the AY, once during the Winter quarter to discuss the Coach Review process, and, once during the Spring quarter to further discuss updates regarding the Coaches review process.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representatives)

CALENDAR COMMITTEE

The committee did not meet during the 2014-15 AY.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representatives)

CAMPUS ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY BOARD

The Campus Accessibility Advisory Board (CAAB) meets on a quarterly basis, typically on a Thursday from 2:00pm to 4:00pm.

This year the CAAB committee discussed the continued revisions of the Student Academic Grievance Procedures based on Executive Order 1096, the installation of bollards in select locations of the campus, the installation and completion of updated campus signs and maps, the upgrades to all ADA compliant hardware and door knobs across campus, the identification of all campus courtesy phones in hallways that need to be adjusted for ADA compliance, the expansion of the Services to Student with Disabilities office, the changes to the Web Accessibility Policy, the initial draft of the Americans with Disabilities Act Application for Accommodation Policy for employees, the enforcement of options for Student Union Drive, the coordinated efforts with other institutional committees, such as ATI, and also discussed various ADA related projects on campus.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

CHILDREN'S CENTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The main focus of the advisory committee is fundraising. This year, the Committee raised approximately \$4,425.00. The Committee met 2-3 times each quarter.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES
(Faculty Representatives)

DIVERSITY COMMITTEE (UNIVERSITY)

Committee Membership:

Cesar Caballero (Chair)
 Kamerin Bateman (Ex-Officio)
 Carmen Carswell ACM
 Kimberly Collins Public Administration
 Iwona Contreras (Ex-Officio)
 Claudia Davis Nursing
 Charli Eaton Ethnic Studies (Student Org.)
 Shohreh Esfandiari IT- Palm Desert Campus
 Twillea Evans-Carthen Human Resources
 Andre Harrington Arts & Letters
 Todd Jennings, Ph.D. Gender and Sexuality Studies
 Jan Moore Santos Manuel Student Union
 Ahlam Muhtaseb Communication Studies
 Carmen Murillo-Moyeda Public Affairs
 Jeffrey Andreas Tan Counseling & Psychological Services
 Mary Teixeira Sociology
 Felix Zuniga IRT

Sub-Committee Membership:

<p>Conversations on Diversity (Sub-Committee): Twillea Evans-Carthen (Chair) Kamerin Bateman Carmen Carswell Iwona Contreras Marci Daniels Andre Harrington Janet Honn-Alex Thelma Moore-Steward Ahlam Muhtaseb Cindy Paxton Jeffrey Andreas Tan Mary Teixeira (Co-Chair)</p>	<p>Felix Zuniga</p> <p>Events Funding (Sub-Committee): Carmen Murillo-Moyeda (Chair) Jan Moore Mary Teixeira</p> <p>Webpage (Sub-Committee): Jeffrey Andreas Tan (Chair) John Baumann Iwona Contreras Carmen Murrillo-Moyeda</p>	<p>Diversity Initiative Grant (Sub-Committee): Cesar Caballero Kimberly Collins Claudia Davis</p> <p>Diversity Training (Sub-Committee) Trainers Carmen Carswell Academic Computing & Media Twillea Evans-Carthen Human Resources Judi Cruz Student Health Center</p>	<p>Shohreh Esfandiari Palm Desert Campus Lisa Gordon Marketing Andre Harrington Theatre Arts Jonathan Higgins Housing & Redsidential Life Tamara Holder Cross-Cultural Center Misty Levingston SLD Thelma Moore-Steward Leadership & Curriculum</p>	<p>Carmen Murillo-Moyeda Public Affairs Ray Navarro Advising & Academic Services Ron Profeta Parking Services Jeffrey Andreas Tan Psychological Counseling Center Nena Torrez Language, Literacy & Culture</p>
--	---	---	---	---

UDC Committee Summary

During the 2014-2015 AY, the University Diversity Committee (UDC) would meet on the 1st and 3rd Thursdays of each month from 2pm to 4pm. A complete listing of attendance by date along with detailed minutes can be found on our UDC Webpage at: <http://diversity.csusb.edu/> . UDC sub-committee meetings would be held from bi-monthly to once a quarter as needed on assigned tasks. Below is a brief accounting of the business conducted by UDC in the 2014-2015 AY:

Conversations on Diversity (COD)

The Conversations on Diversity sub-committee reviewed, recruited, and organized the three COD events for this 2014-2015 AY. The titles of the Conversations on Diversity presentations this year included, “Is Modernity Inherently Genocidal”, “Black Image: Pop Culture in Media”, and “Diversity and Inclusion: Culture Pride in America”. Evaluations by student, faculty, staff, and community members in attendance posited high ratings for the COD events this year.

Events Funding

The Event Funding sub-committee reviewed and co-funded several diversity speakers, events, and CSUSB conferences this past year. Event funding grants were granted after review by subcommittee and voted on by the entire UDC committee. Events this year that were funded included: Japan Day, Chinese New Year, LGBTQ Graduation, AFSSA Scholarship Banquet, Black Student Graduation, ALFSS Latino Graduation, Student Affairs Tunnel of Oppression,

World Help, From Ferguson to Palestine Speakers, Civil Rights Town Hall, Mental Health Expo, Spotlight on Turkey, and the CSUSB 1st Annual Q-Summit (LGBT) Conference: Meeting at the Intersections 2015. For a complete listing of funding criteria and procedures, please visit: <http://diversity.csusb.edu/>.

Webpage

The webpage subcommittee continued to work hard in creating the new UDC webpage, increasing ADA compliance on the webpage to higher standards, and allowing ease and our UDC mission guide the successful work this year. Please visit our new updated webpage at: <http://diversity.csusb.edu/>.

Diversity Initiative Grant

The Diversity Initiative Grant in collaboration with the Faculty Teaching Resource Center created the 1st CSUSB Summer Diversity Institute in the Summer of 2014. This 3-day diversity institute was created and attended by CSUSB faculty. The faculty had applied and were approved for attendance and funding with the goal of increasing their innovative ideas of infusing diversity into their teaching. The mandate that the CSUSB faculty had were to create a new course with diversity in the fabric of their teaching pedagogy. The facilitators for this diversity institute were Dr. Kim Costino, Dr. Mihaela Popescu, and Dr. Jeff Andreas Tan. This first ever CSUSB Summer Diversity Institute was reviewed as being very beneficial and very high in quantitative and qualitative responses by all attending CSUSB faculty.

CSUSB Diversity Training

The CSUSB Diversity Trainers conducted two day-long trainings per quarter for both new hires and returning CSUSB staff and any interested faculty. Trainings are held in the lower commons and are evaluated with high reviews by participants. A complete listing of upcoming diversity trainings can be found at: <http://diversity.csusb.edu/>.

Conclusion

It is clear that UDC was hard at work and very productive during the 2014-2015 academic year. The overall goal was to increase diversity awareness, appreciation, and advancement of our greater CSUSB student, campus, and community.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

ENERGY CONSERVATION COMMITTEE

With all the changes at Facilities Services, I don't think that there is a report for this year. The others can correct me if I am wrong. I know that facilities has been very busy with their conservation efforts, and transition to new personnel, but I have not been told about any meetings since Tony Simpson left.

Our past energy conservation work has brought about some great changes on campus, and I suspect that this was a "transition year," and we will get settled down to business in the coming academic year.

I also attach (contact the Senate office for a copy) a document which details an award that was made to Facilities Services late last year (after 2014 reports were due), for their energy efficiency work. This clearly shows that the work being done is of high quality.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

The committee did not meeting during the 2014-15 AY.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

INSTRUCTIONALLY RELATED PROGRAMS BOARD

The Instructionally Related programs Board will undergo a name change to become the Instructionally Related Activity Committee (IRA). The Committee met once or twice a quarter to review and distribute IRA funds collected from student fees.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representatives)

INTELLECTUAL LIFE AND VISITING SCHOLAR COMMITTEE

No report submitted.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representatives)

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE

No report submitted

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representative)

PALM DESERT CAMPUS PLANNING & OPERATIONS COUNCIL

No report submitted.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representatives)

PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

No report submitted.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representative)

RECREATION COMMITTEE

In 2014-15, the Recreation Committee advised the Recreational Sports Department on various issues related to the needs of the campus community. A continuing topic of discussion was expansion of the Student Recreation and Fitness Center (SRFC). The committee was updated and provided input into the possible programs in an expanded facility. The committee recommended the approval of using funding from equipment replacement reserves to replace kayaks, snowboards, and the climbing wall floor pad. The committee provided feedback on increasing personal training fees.

The committee reviewed and recommended approval of the 2015-16 Recreational Sports budget. This included all aspects of the Recreational Sports program and included the services offered and hours of operation. The committee recommended approving the accrual method for part time sick leave to comply with Assembly Bill 1522. Finally, the committee provided input on new programming, as well as feedback on Recreational Sports' existing programs.

The Recreation Committee meets on Wednesdays, once each quarter. The committee consists of Mohammad Bazaz (Faculty Representative), Alex Gutierrez (Chair, Student-At-Large Representative), Franciny Gonzale, (Vice-Chair; Student-At-Large Representative), Giovanni Escalera (Student-At-Large Representative), Ed Mendoza (Staff Representative), and Anthony Johnson (Santos Manuel Student Union Student Representative).

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representatives)

SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE (UNIVERSITY)

The University Scholarship Committee for AY14-15 consisted of Lasisi Ajayi, Dorothy Chen, Ryan Keating, Su Liang, Allen Menton, Ranfeng Qiu, and Renwu Zhang. We were assisted and guided throughout by Louise Jones of the Scholarship Office.

The committee met five times over the course of Winter and Spring quarters, 2015. The first meeting introduced the group to the committee's timeline and we did initial allocations of funds for scholarships with tight deadlines. In between each meeting, we worked as pairs to review candidates for particular scholarships. We would then reconvene as a committee to compare results and decided upon the two candidates.

We discussed candidates for a total of nineteen different scholarships. Some scholarships could provide for more than one recipient, so we made a total of 128 scholarship awards. There was a total of 619 unduplicated applications, but many students were eligible for more than one scholarship, so a large number of applications were reviewed multiple times, to see how they fit for different scholarships. In addition, we reviewed 137 applications for the Chancellor's scholarship. In total, the committee distributed a total of \$132,777 in scholarship funds.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representative)

STUDENT AID COMMITTEE

The Committee meets twice a week to review SAP submitted by students who are no longer eligible for financial aid due to various reasons. The Committee also meets over the Summer and on a as needed basis when SAP applications are received or any appeals.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES
(Faculty Representative)

STUDENT HEALTH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The committee did not meet during the 2014-15 AY.

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representatives)

STUDENT RESEARCH COMPETITION – GRADUATE & UNDERGRADUATE

Link to the [Student Research Competition Report](#).

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

(Faculty Representatives)

SANTOS MANUEL STUDENT UNION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Compiled by Mary Fong and Josephine Mendoza, Faculty Representative Board Members, with assistance from the SMSU Administrative Office.

The Student Union Board of Directors oversees the operations and programs of the non-profit Santos Manuel Student Union. The SMSU is an auxiliary enterprise of California State University, San Bernardino and is incorporated as a California Non-Profit Corporation. All Board members are also part of standing committees that advise the Board on matters concerning the SMSU. The Board meets every second Thursday of the month from 10 a.m. to noon. Nine Standing Committees of the Board meet once a quarter depending on need.

Senate Appointed Members:

Mary Fong, Professor, Communication Studies

Josephine Mendoza, Professor, School of Computer Science & Engineering

Summary of Board of Directors Accomplishments

Approved the 2015-2016 Operating Budgets for the SMSU and Student Recreation and Fitness Center

Approved the artist for the Coyote Statue Approved the SMSU Lobby and Pub redesign Approved the SMSU Hydration Stations

Summary of the Commercial Services Committee Accomplishments

Meet with Sodexo General Manager and UEC Executive Director to review the food service operation

Discussed the future direction for the campus food services contracts Discussed SMSU Pub décor

Summary of the Personnel Committee Accomplishments

Reviewed the SMSU Personnel Policies Manual

Reviewed the established managerial objectives for Executive Director Reviewed applications for the SMSU Board of Directors Student Representative positions

Reviewed recommendation of general salary increases for staff Reviewed SRFC Reclassifications

Attendance Sheet for Santos Manuel Board of Directors/Committee Meetings

Committee	Name	Dates	Attendance
Commercial Services	Mary	11/18/2014	No
	Mary	2/27/2015	No
	Mary	5/29/2015	No

Personnel	Josephine	10/30/2012	Yes
	Josephine	***	n/a
	Josephine	5/23/2013	Yes

*** No Winter Quarter Personnel Committee meeting was held.

Board of Directors Meeting Attendance		
Dates	Mary	Josephine
10/9/2014	No	Yes
11/13/2014	No	Yes
1/15/2015	Yes	No
2/12/2015	Yes	No
3/12/2015	No	No
4/16/2015	No	Yes
5/14/2015	No	Yes
6/11/2015	No	Yes

OTHER COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

UNIVERSITY ENTERPRISES CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Summary:

This year has been a year with many changes with a focus on Dining Services. A new C-Store located by the Social and Behavioral Sciences Building opened in fall 2014. There has been many conversations on the future plans of Dining Services and the new Commons that is scheduled to open in the fall of 2017. Until the new Commons is open and students are on mandatory meal plans there are plans to refresh and improve the existing Commons. There will be additional staffing and a fresh look but the focus will be on culinary.

Debbie Burns, Executive Director, is retiring and supported her last Board meeting on June 11th. She has succeeded in eliminating a huge deficit in Dining Services and the Coyote Bookstore and turned the financial position completely around.

Agendas and Minutes:

Agendas and minutes from the UEC Board of Directors meetings can be found on the UEC website at <http://uec.csusb.edu>.