

California State University Channel Islands

President's Planning & Policy Council

Monday, November 4, 2013

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Pamela Abbott-Mouchou, Vanessa Bahena, Michael Berman, Kristina Cervi, Terrie Cilley, Bill Cordeiro, Chanda Cunningham, Amy Denton, Therese Eyer mann, Scott Frisch, Gayle Hutchinson, John Griffin, Jill Leafsteadt, Kathryn Leonard, Chris Mattia, Jennifer Miller, , Laurie Nichols, Cheryl Peckham, Stacy Roscoe, Richard R. Rush, Greg Sawyer, Tiffany Smith, Ysabel Trinidad, Dianne Wei

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sunshine Garcia

OTHERS PRESENT: Karen Carey, Dave Chakraborty, John Gormley, Neal Fisch, Nancy Gill, Melissa Remotti, Merissa Stith, Steve Stratton, Dan Wakelee,

PRESIDENT'S REPORTS

President Rush welcomed the President's Planning and Policy Council members and guests. He acknowledged some new members and wanted them to know that the purpose of this council is to get the very best policies for the campus that we possibly can. He asks that members think about these policies, talk to the people around them, especially the people who will be affected directly by these potential policies, and see if they are effective or if they have holes in them or if there are adjustments that need to be made. We have two readings; the first reading exposes us to what's coming and the second reading is the decision maker. We have time to talk to people and see if there's input of things we may have overlooked.

President Rush addressed last week's campus global message regarding his conversation with the Chancellor's Office. For the first time in many years we will be fully funded this year (2013-14). We had a 31 percent gap between our funded base and our actual base and that's not sustainable. We expanded for two years and it enabled us to do some things but we couldn't possibly keep it up. This year we are fully funded—next year we're funded for an increase and we're waiting to get all of the details about that. We'll be able to grow next year and we'll put together a plan that has a growth component for the next several years. Preliminary reports are that the revenues are up beyond what the projections have been.

The third year out, there are no commitments yet because there is going to be a task force that the Chancellor will appoint that will look at the way that the CSU campuses are funded. He wants to get away from enrollment growth margin money being the basis for every single campus. We are poised to grow. Some of the campuses have already declared that they don't want to grow, such as San Diego. The campuses that don't want to grow and can get Trustee approval will likely have other standards for funding. If they put together a package that funds the campuses on the campuses' stated goals as approved by the Board of Trustees, then we have a reasonable way of proceeding for the system to serve students and to serve the state. That is expected to take place the third year out although we don't have any sense of what that will look like. This year we are good and next year we are even better because the money we get this year goes into our base. We expect the money we get next year will go into our base beginning the third year out because the

commitment for next year is for one-time money due to this change that will take place in the third year.

POLICY

Consent: University Events Calendar (Merissa Stith)

This policy has no substantive changes, just some language clarification edits recommended, such as reflecting that CI has an operating events calendar. It's also recommended to insert the link to the live events calendar, as well as some punctuation changes. None of these revisions change the substance of the policy and it remains accurate as of today. The policy was renewed as presented on consent.

Recommendation: Policy on Unmanned Aerial Systems (Karen Carey)

This policy is a second reading. Karen Carey has nothing to add from the first reading. She received no responses from anyone on the Council. Greg Sawyer motioned to approve and Bill Cordeiro seconded. All council members approved the policy.

Recommendation: Policy on Postings and Signage (Nancy Gill)

Nancy Gill reported that there have been no changes or comments since the last meeting. Michael Berman motioned to approve and Kristina Cervi seconded. All council members approved the policy.

Recommendation: Policy on Instructionally Related Activities Fee (Kristina Cervi)

Kristina Cervi is the Chair of the IRA Fees Committee. There are some changes to the policy. The committee added in a reference to the California Education Code. In the past the code wasn't neglected, but the committee didn't have a full understanding of it. There are now references made to the code in the text. Also, it did not read correctly in regards to what quorum was. The committee has always operated with four students having to be present for quorum so we want to match the policy to our procedures. Associated Students Inc. has also been inserted as another body that students can come to if they wanted to create an initiative. Before, it just read "the campus," which is the University in general and not the students. We want to make sure there is transparency with the students that ASI is another outlet they can go to. If there are any questions about the IRA they can be directed to Kristina.

President Rush encouraged Council members to contact Kristina if they have any concerns while reviewing this policy and we will bring this back next time. Kristina also mentioned that the IRA will be reviewing this one more time tomorrow to review these changes.

Recommendation: Policy on Data Classification Standards (Neal Fisch)

Neal Fisch explained that this is a new policy. Based on the integrative CSU Administrative Manual policy, which relates to information security, data on every campus needs to be classified so that we can protect level 1 data, which is personal and confidential information and level 2 data, which is protected information. This policy is using the CSU-given standard of data classification to be put in place to oversee the classification of all of the data we have on campus so that we can put them into these particular categories.

President Rush asked everyone to review this policy and send their thoughts to Neal.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Strategic Resource Planning Task Force Update (Ysabel Trinidad)

Ysabel Trinidad reported where we are in the budget process. We will plan our 2014-15 budget development cycle earlier than we have in the past. Budget instructions will go out in December. We will have a meeting with the task force in a couple of weeks to look at strategic initiative funding that is currently earmarked. Divisions have been looking at their requests and looking at some funding that has come in as well. The 2013-14 strategic initiative funding should be resolved by the end of this month.

Strategic Plan Draft Update (Michael Berman/Gayle Hutchinson)

Gayle reported that in talking with a lot of faculty, the Senate Executive Committee and also the Academic Senate, the input that we received is that it's really important that we engage input in the strategic plan. November 13th the University Strategic Planning Steering Committee is convening to review the good work of that committee from last spring and then rethink and relook at that good work in regards to the proposed themes that Michael talked about last time. Once the committee rethinks the work that was done and those themes, they will also help to determine next steps in terms of getting greater input from faculty, staff and students across campus. Once we have that meeting, a calendar will come out talking about the opportunity for input. We will then determine what the themes are going to be and solidify goals and SMART strategies.

PRESENTATIONS

WASC Process (Gayle Hutchinson)

Gayle reminded everyone that WASC is coming! The major changes to WASC are about the process not the standards itself. This is a self-study preparation with step 1 being an off-site review and step 2 being an actual on-campus visit. We are engaging in option 1, which means our timeline is going to be next September 2014 so we're going to schedule our opportunity to submit compliance lists and other information followed by the offsite review which would be late Fall 2014. This includes a phone call with campus where the WASC visit team reviews the information that was sent to them up to that point and then we have a phone call where they ask us additional questions and ask for further information. An onsite review is going to happen somewhere between Spring 2015 and Fall 2015.

Three months prior to the offsite review WASC pulls financial data from our annual reports and it's reviewed by a panel of experts. We typically submit retention data, graduation data, but that will all be woven into our report this time. We submit a detailed compliance checklist where we establish links to each of the items that are on the list. Then we submit a 75-page institutional

narrative where we reflect on our practices and we are going to do five essays. There are nine essays that are typically included in the 75-page report.

Six months before the onsite review we have the WASC team review all of our information, we have a telephone call, they talk to us about the questions they have and they give us suggestions as to what additional information we may want to pull together for their onsite review.

The onsite review (Spring 2015 but may happen as late as Fall 2015) has to include 25 percent of our approved off-campus sites, so we are thinking Goleta or SBCC. The self-study report and compliance checklist is a list of links and exhibits. We are going to be asking for two people to be assigned to each one of WASC's 48 compliance areas. These will be areas that you are not familiar with in order to engage deeper in the investigation of that area as it will not be in your realm of expertise. The team will interview relevant people and electronically submit URLs that demonstrate that we have met compliance areas as well as the contact information and a short description on how the persons ensure that the selected compliance area is student-centered and a short description to ensure that innovation and continuous improvement are infused in that component's area. We are asking two people to head up each of those compliance areas and there are 48, so it really is going to be all-hands-on-deck in getting everybody involved in this.

The self-study report narrative will have five essays:

- 1. Response to Previous Commission Actions and Recommendations Team (Facilitated by Dennis Muraoka)**
 - a. This essay will address how CI has incorporated past Commission actions and recommendations into our planning and continuous improvement.
- 2. Undergraduate Degree Team (Co-facilitated by Karen Carey and Jennifer Miller)**
 - a. This essay will address the meaning and integrity of our bachelor degrees.
- 3. Graduate Degree Team (Co-facilitated by Bill Cordeiro and Kaia Tollefson)**
 - a. This essay will address the meaning and integrity of our masters degrees.
- 4. Student Success Team (Co-facilitated by Gayle Hutchinson and Greg Sawyer)**
 - a. This team will address that not only are our students and graduates learning and well prepared for graduate school and the professional workforce, but we are pondering access, retention, and graduation in relationship to our mission.
- 5. Sustainability Team (Co-facilitated by Michael Berman and Ysabel Trinidad)**
 - a. This essay addresses how we ponder and adapt to the changing higher education environment.

As we have leadership in each of these team areas, there's going to be a lot of people involved—faculty, staff and students—who are really going to help us craft and shape these things. They have to be done in concert with the others because this is about showing that we have a very informed and integrated effort, much like we did in 2007. That really shows that the entire community is involved in shaping this report.

President Rush closed the meeting by saying that he will be putting out an announcement asking for everyone to help participate. He asks that the PPC members encourage those around them. Last time, we had 101 volunteers from across campus, from faculty, staff, students, administrators and community members. Last time when they told the commission that we had 101 volunteers they were stunned because most campuses had at most 5—the predominant number was 3. It really pushed our agenda forward. If we can show that kind of community involvement this time, it will only benefit us as well. It will also enable us to have a richer community because more people will know about what we're doing, what our goals are, where our weaknesses are (and we need to address them), and will also encourage everyone to take ownership of the university and that's really important.

The meeting adjourned at 9:33 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Alanna Trejo