President’s Planning and Policy Council
Notes
February 8, 2021
9:00 – 10:30 a.m.

Guests: Kirsten Olson, Chelsea Benté, Scott Pérez, Mike Gravagne and LaSonya Davis

Welcome
Interim President Richard Yao welcomed the Council members and guests. He stated Kaia Tollefson will navigate the chat feature for questions and comments. For voting purposes, the raise hand function was used.

Policy Review
SA.19.001 – Policy on Student Health Services (SHS)
Mike Gravagne stated that this policy was adopted from EO 943. The main change is around the language under the Athletics and Pharmacy sections as CSUCI does not have these services. We are one of two CSUs to use a third-party vendor for SHS.

Toni DeBoni stated that the policy may seem to contain more procedural information. Since the language is taken from the EO, the thought was to keep the information available in one spot.

Greg Wood made a motion to approve the policy; Helen Alatorre seconded. The policy was approved.

SA.19.002 – Policy on Student Mental Health Services
Kirsten Olson stated that this policy is based on EO 1053; changes are campus specific. There is no co-pay or fee for the services; they are funded by mandatory student fees. The training program is continuing; Jill Huang is the training coordinator. CAPS clinicians are considered faculty and represented by CFA. CSUCI pays for licensure; all clinicians must keep credentials up to date. Titanium is the system used for all notes and calendaring. Students are entitled to their records if they so choose.

Robin Mitchell asked if services were available 24/7, especially on weekends. She stated that students have difficulty getting services, especially those students of color, who wish to see someone who looks like them. Kirsten said that there is an increase in students who need services. The way we reach out to students is evolving, especially those of color. 4/5 clinicians identify as people of color; 2/5 identify in the queer community. While the clinicians may not appear as diverse, they also have physical disabilities. Our ratios are good by accreditation standards; 1 clinician to 1200 students. We see 11-13% of students.

Rich agreed that this policy is in force now and that the ratios are a baseline. We are one of the four CSUs who are within the ratios. He suggested we assess the need and reserve clinician time for those who do need high intervention. Nichole Ipach agreed that there is a demand for this type of service. We need to work on these challenges.
Helen Alatorre asked if the 24/7 services applied to alumni and if the calls are handled by our CAPS team or a third party. Kirsten indicated alumni are covered and that a third-party vendor, Protocol, is used. When calls come into CAPS and get voice mail, there is an option to press 2 to access 24/7 services. Protocol picks up within 3-4 rings.

Cindy Derrico added that the contract is with 24-hour service and that the policy could be updated to include alumni where appropriate.

Colleen Harris asked about expectations regarding call backs/phone counseling. Protocol reports back to CAPs daily; voicemails are checked daily first thing in the morning by the Clinical Lead. Nancy Gill stated that it may be confusing for students who think they will be speaking to someone right away. Kirsten confirmed that they do speak to someone in real time. If phone counselors at Protocol are concerned, they immediately call Kirsten directly.

Greg Wood asked about annual reporting. Kirsten confirmed that they do numerous reporting throughout the year and include services offered.

Mitch Avila made a motion to approve the policy; Nichole Ipach seconded. The policy was approved.

**AA.11.008 / SP.14.006 – Policy on Subrecipient Monitoring**

Scott Pérez stated the policy contains current terminology and federal regulations which were updated in August 2020. The policy states that CSUCI will provide the required monitoring. This policy only applies to federally funded grants and contracts; all awards and programs are monitored. Language was changed from “Faculty” to “Investigators”; there no longer is a Senior Research Officer. Federal Regulations do not apply to consultants or procurement of goods or services. Language also includes guidance from the CO as to what their expectations are. Financial services reviewed this policy and did not have any changes. This assessment is done alongside BFA to make sure they are comfortable with controls and procedures.

Dr. Yao suggested reaching out to Scott with additional comments/questions.

**New / SP.03.031 - Policy on Misconduct in Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities**

Scott Pérez stated that this policy is an update from a 2003 Senate policy; most revisions conform to the current federal regulations.

Mitch stated that this is not normally assigned to deans as a function and suggested language that is coordinated by AVP Faculty Affairs.

A few acronyms need to be updated; RIO (research integrity officer) needs to be Director, DO (deciding officer) should be Provost. This suggests committee formation to carry these items out.

Ysabel Trinidad stated that in 2003 we did not have an internal auditor. We need to include a review to include this role as an independent view. If there were a case that would need to conduct an investigation, we would also include University Counsel.

Rich referred other comments be sent to Scott.

**New / SP.19.01 – Policy on Academic Integrity**

Chelsee Benté stated that this policy aligns with EOs 1037 and 1098 and addresses issues that arose where students were trying to retake courses for credit. It was originally passed in 2002. This also outlines the role
of the Dean of Student’s (DOS) office. Greg Wood stated that this policy has been passed through Academic Senate.

Robin Mitchell asked if CSUCI had an honor code; she suggested including language that outlines there is one and references this. Mitch asked why the guidelines were added to the policy. The DOS office has ability to track and discipline these students. It is a function of Academic Affairs to provide guidance on creating assignments that are designed to reduce academic dishonesty. Cindy suggested more Faculty training.

**Updates**

**FY 2021-22 Budget Planning Update**

Ysabel Trinidad thanked the campus community for handling one full year of budget planning in the fall semester; we are starting 2021-22 planning with a balanced budget. BFA’s commits to enhance transparency and communication and will continue to distribute budget briefings and post on the website.

Barbara Rex mentioned the State had strong reserves when it entered the COVID-19 Recession; State expenditures are now growing faster than revenues.

GI 2025 (5th year) was a large focus of the 2021-22 budget request; the CSU requested a total incremental expenditure of $556M. The Governor’s Proposed Budget of January 2021 included $144.5M ongoing increase, $225M one-time increase.

The Governor will issue the May Revise; the President will approve the budget in June. The CO will give the final allocation in July.

Due to time constraints, the Inclusive Excellence (IE) Action Plan will be presented at the next meeting on March 8.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.