

California State University Channel Islands

President's Council Meeting Notes: Monday, September 30, 2004

In Attendance: Bill Allen, Gary Berg, Renny Christopher, Julie Corelli, Tania Garcia, Therese Eyer mann, Art Flores, Peggy Hinz, Lisa LaFrenz, Ed Lebioda, Steve Lefevre, George Morten, Peter Mosinskis, Ray Porras, Melissa Remotti, Richard Rush, Greg Sawyer, Michellyn Shonka, Mitchel Sloan, Dale Velador, Melissa Woodling, Nick Pencoff, Damon Blue

1. **President's Report:** President Rush reported that Fall semester enrollments are good, helping our argument for the need to increase the rate of growth as a campus. We are planning on 1,800+ FTES for Spring semester. Conversely, some of the other CSU campuses are under their enrollment expectations. This fact may also help CSUCI's case for increased growth. The President also reported that he continues to hear positive comments from the community and parents about CSUCI and congratulates the staff on their good work.
2. **Policies:** No comments.
3. **Recommendation A:** Policy on Distribution of Written Materials
In Gill's absence Lebioda reported on one minor change in the language about "student development." Flores raised question about charging for the distribution of materials coming from outside organizations. It was agreed to send this policy back for appropriate revision.
4. **Recommendation B:** Policy on Student Judicial Process
Lebioda reported no changes to recommendation. Flores asked for clarification of p. 2-3. By voice vote, the policy was recommended.
Recommendation C: Policy on Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress
Pencoff reported only grammatical changes to the proposed policy. Flores asked that references to specific relevant regulations be referenced in the document. By voice vote, the policy was recommended.
5. **Recommendation D:** Policy on EOP Grant Awarding
Pencoff reported minor corrections specifically in defining "students." Lefevre proposed "current" be used rather than identifying a specific funding amount, as this may change over time. By voice vote, the policy was recommended with revisions.
6. **Recommendation E:** Policy on Assessment
In Frisch's place, Christopher presented recommendation. The President requested changing of "will" to "shall." Coville raised question about language on reporting lines. Finally, it was recommended that the language of "All divisions shall report to president on an annual basis" be used. By voice vote, the policy was recommended with revisions.
7. **Discussion F:** Policy on Whistleblowing
Flores presented policy. Christopher asked about accountability issues and definition.
8. **Discussion G:** Policy on Submission of an Official Transcript

Blue presented policy. Lefevre asked about electronic transcripts. The President asked about CSU policy. Blue was unaware of a CSU policy. Christopher made grammatical correction.

9. **Discussion H:** Policy on Processing Applications Without a Fee
Blue withdrew this proposal.
10. **Discussion I:** Policy on Issuing Official Transcripts
Blue presented proposal. Berg asked about the inclusion of CEUs. President proposed including CEUs in definition section of policy.
11. **Discussion J:** Policy on Admission Exceptions
Blue presented policy proposal. Christopher suggested naming committee “Submission Appeal Committee.”
12. **Discussion K:** Policy on Application Rollover
Blue presented this proposal. The President asked if a second application fee would be charged. Blue responded that the fee from the original application would be rolled over. Lefevre asked about the use of “extreme hardship” terminology. It was agreed that the word “extreme” would be deleted from the proposal. Hinz asked if readers would know when “census date” occurs. Blue explained where that information is found.
13. **Discussion L:** Policy on Intent to Enroll
Blue presented proposal. Coville reminded Blue that if a fee were involved that the Fee Committee would need to approve.
14. **Discussion M:** Policy on Use of Facilities
Porras presented this proposal. Coville gave the background on the development of this proposal pointing out that it was formed from a broad-based university committee. Berg questioned applicability to various university groups. Additionally, Berg suggested clarification of how specific fees are determined. Christopher questioned definitions of priorities. The President suggested clarification on direct and indirect ties to the university as defined in the proposal. Finally, the President encouraged committee members to share the proposal and bring back additional suggestions/questions to next meeting.
- 16 **Other Business**
Lefevre pointed out that there is already an Admissions Appeals Committee in place which might overlap with the proposed Academic Appeals Board. The President suggested that it is important to look for duplication of committee responsibilities.

Meeting adjourned.