



Channel Islands

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

President's Planning and Policy Council

Minutes

April 26, 2021

9:00 – 10:30 a.m. Via Zoom

Council Members Present: Helen Alatorre, Jim August, Mitch Avila, Dottie Ayer, Isaiah Ball, Dana Lee Baker, Alissa Blough, Toni DeBoni, Cindy Derrico, Nancy Gill, Doreen Hatcher, Tom Hunt, Nichole Ipach, Kathleen Klompien, Becca Lawrence, Ritchie LeRoy, Jazzminn Morecraft, Colleen Nevins, Laurie Nichols, Charles Osiris, Scott Perez, Aurora Rugerio, Barbara Rex, Jon Saclolo, Kaia Tollefson, Greg Wood and Rich Yao

Council Members Absent: Rosa Bravo, Amanda Carpenter, Hung Dang, Robin Mitchell, Sophie Nguyen and Ysabel Trinidad

Guests: Doreen Hatcher and Emily Quinonez

Welcome

Interim President Richard Yao welcomed the Council. He reminded the Council to 'raise hand' in chat for questions and to use the polling feature to vote. Rich introduced the new representative Aurora Rugerio. This is the last PPPC meeting of the academic year.

Policy Review

Recommendation (2nd Reading)

AA.11.008 / SP. 14.0006 – Policy on Subrecipient Monitoring

Scott Pérez presented the policy with several changes as indicated by University Auditor, Jon Saclolo. Subrecipients would only get the amount of money that was agreed upon before. Cindy Derrico asked for clarification on what a subrecipient is. Scott explained that it is usually when you collaborate with someone (usually a faculty member at another university) and they have ability to affect direction of project. Mitch Avila moved to approve the policy; Ritchie LeRoy seconded. Vote: 19 yay, 1 abstain, 0 nay; policy was approved.

CM. 03.002 – Policy on Global Emails

Nancy Gill mentioned two items that were changed since the first read. Both Jim August and Tom Hunt agreed the 60-minute threshold would be sufficient for the threshold to inform campus of outages (water, power, etc.). Additional language was added for surveys distributed to campus. There was language added in to state the principle investigator must be from CSUCI.

Helen Alatorre asked about the satisfaction surveys. Rich responded that satisfaction surveys are not considered research. Scott Perez commented that IRB looks at exactly that to see if the survey meets the definition of research criteria. Helen moved; Dottie seconded to amend the policy.

Mitch asked if a faculty member got IRB approval, would it be allowed? Nancy affirmed because it's being completed by a faculty member. Motion to amend number 10 to add "research" in front of "surveys." 16 Yay, 2 abstain to approve.

Mitch motioned to amend the language "research must benefit CSUCI"; Greg seconded. 17 Yay, 0 nay, 2 abstain to approve.

Toni DeBoni stated there is a separate policy that addresses student global emails and asked if a link should be added to that policy. Nancy indicated revisions will be made to that policy in the fall and the links will be added at that time. Dottie Ayer moved to approve; Ritchie LeRoy seconded. Vote: 17 Yay, nay, 2 abstain; policy was approved.

New / SP.19.01 – Policy on Academic Integrity

Cindy Derrico stated the policy mirrors how the language is articulated in the student code of conduct as a CSU systemwide policy. Items listed at the bottom of the policy (exhibit) represent helpful guidance to faculty on information on academic integrity by offering examples and how to respond to situations. Greg Wood moved to approve the policy; Mitch seconded. Vote: 18 Yay, nay, 1 abstain; policy was approved.

New – Policy on Youth on Campus

Rich indicated that this was in response to one of our audit findings. Laurie Nichols said page 2 identifies who is responsible for inventory of youth programs; all will go through risk manager. The other change was to accurately name youth programs. Nancy moved to approve; Colleen Nevins seconded. Vote: 17 Yay, nay, 1 abstain; policy was approved. Rich asked if this would clear the audit item; Jon confirmed it will be submitted before May 4.

Consent

SA.21.004 – Policy on Eligibility Requirements for Membership in Student Organizations

Rich mentioned that this policy has come up recently as credit/no credit options. Doreen Hatcher stated CSUCI always had an appeal process in place, our minimum GPA requirement (2.5) is higher than CO (2.0). Because of this requirement, some clubs are having trouble finding candidates or currently appointed members for this requirement. Data shows most often officers have 3.0 GPAs or higher. Language was removed, as it was unclear whether it was term or cumulative GPA that was required. The credit/no credit options have affected these students in a unique fashion.

Dottie said there have been a few different discussions with Student Government (SG) and administrators that may have required or reviewed different information across different groups. Clubs and orgs are having difficulty getting students to take on elected positions for not meeting 2.5 GPA; we have posted this on CI sync that this is up for review. We are waiting on revisions on the EO from the CO as well.

Helen said in SG, there was an increase in questions from students about credit/no credit and the pandemic in general had impacted GPAs. SG executives had conversations about whether this should be a permanent option, or if there was another solution. There were discussions about how this will affect candidates for next year in running for office or university committees. We can consider an appeal process for candidates specifically, there was only a process for sitting candidates. There were limited options for students right on the cusp. SG leadership was in support for appeal for candidates.

Cindy asked if there is an expected date for EO update. Doreen stated that the update started two years ago due to audit findings on other campuses. We received information they are hoping to finalize revisions in fall; whatever revisions that need to be taken into consideration, would probably not be until Fall 2022.

Toni said recommended keeping this as a consent item so students can benefit from this in fall semester. Helen agreed that the buffer between 2.0 and 2.5 is the issue. SG and ASI board, would consider a student with a 2.3 and an appeal process this may offer students with an opportunity to serve in the fall. Aurora Rugerio said students want to have the opportunity to apply for these positions.

Mitch reminded the Council that as a consent item, we did not ask to pull from the agenda; agenda was not approved. Doreen feels that the CO is anticipating finalizing their terms by December and giving campuses time to review in time for fall 2022 implementation. If EO does not change for eligibility requirements, we can certainly address those later.

No motion was made to strike from the agenda. Policy approved as consent item.

Updates

Inclusive Excellence on Action Plan (IEAP)

Kaia Tollefson reviewed the Inclusive Excellence on Action Teams (IEATs); they have doubled in size with many new people that may have not had the opportunity to serve in the past. Each of the six teams have met and have two action items; inventory actions that have happened already so we can recognize accomplishments to date, then use summer months to create overall arching framework.

In fall, those plans will be presented as budget requests. The inventory forms have been individualized for each team by Kristi O'Neil Gonzalez. All entries made will be collated as a group. Aspirational date is May 10; we anticipate several groups to continue into the summer. We are working to create spaces where all voices have equal weight and value and importance.

Cabinet members attended a EAB session last week that identified four barriers: insufficient understanding of racial barriers, unclear strategies and communication, inadequate attainability, unclear roles. We are in a position to address these barriers in our IEAT groups.

Helen asked what did the presenters say about lacking understanding of systemic racism? Kaia said they did not go into great depth on each of these. They randomly selected university statements of BLM movements and took into consideration actions with these statements. They found there was a plethora of statements, but not so much action. Another thing they are looking into is where systemic racism is baked into the policies and procedures on campuses

Kathleen Klompien said one of the best ways to be growing in these areas are in deep reading and conversations and work with peers. When staff are included in these conversations with faculty, they are richer in depth. Are there areas where staff will be included to take part in these conversations? Rich confirmed that this is a priority and as a Cabinet, we have discussed shifting priorities and expectations. If we are doing this work, we are going to see the benefits in all areas. This is a big part in IEAT 4 (Campus Climate).

Meeting was adjourned at 10:07 a.m.

The next PPPC will be September 20, 2021.

*It is the role of President's Planning and Policy Council
to develop, review and recommend administrative policy to the President.*