



Academic Senate

Fall General Faculty Meeting
August 20, 2010
Minutes

- 1. Call to order**
9:04 AM
- 2. Approval of agenda**
Agenda Approved.
- 3. Approval of May 13, 2010 Spring General Faculty Minutes**
Approved as distributed.

4. Reports and Announcements

Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl noted that because of two Thursday holidays and a need to balance the number of class sessions on each day of the week, Tuesday November 9 will meet on a Thursday schedule. Please check your syllabi to ensure that you are treating November 9th as a Thursday. Note that we have scheduled an Academic Senate meeting for November 9th and will address this at the first meeting of the Academic Senate.

Keith Nainby announced Faculty Mentor Program events. This is training designed to help faculty to serve students who don't have the robust range of educational advantages to succeed. If you already are a trained mentor, this is an especially important year for the FMP to have mentors as involved as they can be. The initial meeting will be held on Thursday September 2nd, from 5:00-7:30pm in the South Dining Room. For folks who might want to be mentors, this is a good time to ramp up involvement. Aspiring mentors are invited to attend on September 2nd, from 5:00-7:30pm as well. If interested, there will be a new mentor training this year, held Friday October 1, from 4-7pm. See or email Nainby (KNainby@csustan.edu) if you have questions.

Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl gave a brief introduction. He noted that this is a hybrid meeting from the past. Traditionally we've had speakers in the past, but last year had the members of SEC talk about what we had been getting from colleagues across the campus, sense of urgency. We'll continue with the members of SEC talking to us about the WASC commission letter as a starting point. They had some good things to say about our campus and indicated we have work to do in the next year. We need to talk about and remind people what does need to be addressed in terms of leadership and shared governance in the next year. The SEC members will introduce ourselves and we will start with Kurt Baker, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

5. SEC Comments

a. Remarks by Kurt Baker, FAC Chair

Baker indicated he is chair of FAC and announced the members of the 2010/11 FAC as follows:

Kurt Baker, Chair CHHS

David Lindsay, Chair-Elect

Terry Jones

Eungsuk Kim

Lynn Johnson

Daniel Afonso

Shradha Tibrewal

As most of you are aware, in July we received a letter from the WASC Commission renewing accreditation of our fine university. This renewal of accreditation is significant, not only because it enables us to stay in business, but because it affirmed something we already knew to be true: we are dedicated educators who are invested in our students' learning and growth. In the words of the Commission and the Site Visit Team: "CSU Stanislaus remains an institution committed to the primacy of teaching" and "the entire campus demonstrates broad engagement and commitment to the success of students."

The Commission affirmed the seven commendations of the University and faculty offered by the Site Visit Team. These included commendations for:

1. The broad engagement and commitment to the success of students. The pride and enthusiasm for working with students is palpable and permeates faculty, administrative, and staff conversations.
2. Its innovative and effective method for conducting its accreditation review.
3. Developing and maintaining a strong faculty development program.
4. Its assessment practices, which have been greatly enhanced since the CPR [Capacity and Preparatory Review] visit ... Specifically, during this period of financial constraint, the University is commended for its continuing investment in the Program Assessment Coordinators, who have worked with their colleagues to ensure educational effectiveness through continuous assessment programs.
5. The emergence of a culture of evidence based on institutional data and disaggregated analyses to ground policy development and decision making.
6. The comprehensive and insightful review of General Education that was conducted since the CPR visit. And,
7. The faculty for developing and employing high impact practices and active pedagogies, especially in engaging students in research, service learning, learning communities, and internships.

Noteworthy is the fact that the Commission scheduled the next review for 10 years from this review—the longest period possible between reviews. This clearly indicates WASC's confidence that we are not only effective educators, but that our processes of self-reflection and evaluation are well implemented and successful.

Along those lines, it is worth mentioning that WASC praised us on multiple fronts for the self study methods we used in the reaccreditation process. For example, they saw our Inquiry Circles as "innovative and effective" and felt that the tasks undertaken by such groups "will advance institutional goals and improve educational effectiveness."

They were also impressed that the practices we engaged in to complete the review seemed to have created an atmosphere that will make day-to-day evaluations of our effectiveness meaningful beyond a site visit or review.

We should celebrate this great accomplishment. Would all those who served as a member of the campus Self Study Team, served on an Inquiry Circle, or provided support to these groups please stand to be recognized for your efforts? We would like to offer special recognition and heartfelt thanks to Diana Demetrulias and her support staff Susan Clapper, Erin Littlepage Prevette, and Randi Esau for their unbelievable dedication and remarkable competence.

At the risk of minimizing the great achievement of these individuals, Baker would like recognize all of us—the real accomplishment is not in the accreditation itself, or even in a successful review process, but rather in what being accredited and the review process reflect—your hard work and dedication to the success of this institution and its students.

In closing, he cited one more paragraph from the WASC [Educational Effectiveness Review] report: “The commitment of the entire Stanislaus community—faculty, staff, and administrators—to maintaining educational effectiveness, program integrity, and overall academic excellence in the face of already significant budget reductions is truly commendable. Students have benefited from extra efforts and commitments of time by the entire University staff. This commitment is noteworthy and praiseworthy.” Ovation.

b. Remarks by Betsy Eudey, Clerk

Betsy Eudey introduced herself as the Clerk of the Academic Senate. She noted that she has a broken finger and some of the minutes will be abbreviated this year.

As a process reminder, when the WASC site team visited with us in early March, at the close of their visit they provided an overview of their commendations and recommendations. In April the Site Team’s official report was submitted to the campus, providing a more comprehensive commentary on their findings, and offering more detail with regard to commendations and recommendations. The campus then submitted a response to the Site Team’s report, and these documents as well as information from our own Educational Effectiveness Report and the Capacity and Preparatory Review were considered by the WASC Commission in determining our reaccreditation status.

Kurt Baker has synthesized the commendations provided by the Site Team and affirmed by the Commission. The Site Team report identified five recommendations for improvement or continued attention, whereas the Commission letter focused primarily on three. While the Site Team’s first recommendation indicated that we should further refine criteria for RPT as a continuation of processes Academic Senate initiated in 2009, attention to this recommendation was noticeably absent in the WASC Commission report. The Site Team’s fourth recommendation addressed General Education, primarily reaffirming information contained in the CPR, EER and GE Academic Program Review and encouraging creative means to maintain the benefits of FYE and Summit amid the challenges of the budget situation. The WASC Commission did not address GE except in regard to program review.

The Commission’s letter focused first on Assessment of Learning, advising the university to ensure even use of direct assessment methodologies across disciplines and within the co-curriculum. Second, with regard to Program Review we were asked to regularly find external benchmarks for

key achievement data, bring in external reviewers, and monitor progress on implementation plans. In Spring 2015 the campus must provide a written report to WASC addressing our progress on these two items, as well as the third I'm about to address. Writing such a report is commonplace and something we were expecting to be asked to do.

The third area the Commission addressed was Leadership and Governance. Specifically, the Commission stated the following:

Leadership and Governance Issues. The Commission acknowledged that the EER was conducted at a particularly challenging time for the institution. The institution faced the impediments of state-wide budget cuts for the CSU system; it joined system-wide expressions of concern regarding the budget; it dealt with recent high turnover of academic leadership; and it needed to trim some student-related services. These held the potential to distract the institution from its evident commitments to student success. The Commission is chiefly concerned that, concurrent with these other issues, the long-simmering tensions between faculty and the senior administration have risen to levels of potential disruption to academic operations. Furthermore, the institution's formal response to the team's report, submitted to WASC on April 29, 2010, while providing general endorsements and role definitions for the concept of shared governance, neither acknowledged the current crisis nor identified specific strategies by which it might be successfully addressed. When combined with the potentially destabilizing impact of ongoing budgetary constraints, including the possibility of reductions in tenured faculty, these matters are of grave concern. While the Commission joins the team in being careful not to ascribe blame to either faculty or administration for the divisive environment that characterizes the campus at this time, it does, however, view the administration to be primarily responsible for fostering a climate of trust and for designing the initiative and circumstances that will provide for a resolution to this problem. The Commission therefore expects immediate, inclusive, and productive endeavors to create a climate of collaborative and effective governance at CSU Stanislaus. (CFRs 1.3, 3.11, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6, 4.8)

In addition to the written report on this topic due in Spring 2015, the WASC Commission has scheduled a Special Visit to the campus in fall 2011 "to ensure substantial progress in matters related to leadership and governance as described in this letter." Such a site team visit one year after the end of a review is not an expected requirement – it is a signal that the WASC Commission sees this as a grave issue requiring immediate attention and monitoring. A site visit that goes poorly will jeopardize the university's accreditation status.

Upon receipt of the Commission's letter, the SEC indicated our desire to work with the President, Provost, and other members of the administration to address issues of leadership and governance, noting that we have attempted to address such issues for several years. We await information from the Administration as to their plans for resolving the problems noted by the Commission, and how we will prepare for the site visit next fall. To date neither the President nor Provost has discussed the WASC Commission's letter with the SEC. The absence of an Accreditation Liaison Officer after Diana Demetrulias' departure challenges our progress on all issues related to accreditation, and we hope that an interim ALO can be identified until such time as a new Associate Vice President of Assessment and Quality Assurance is in place.

It's important to note that while the WASC Commission emphasized three issues, that as part of our next reaccreditation review we will be expected to indicate our progress on all of the items we identified in the CPR and EER as needing further attention, and the issues noted by the WASC Site Team. While WASC expects us to do this, we need to remember that we're engaging in these activities because we felt that they would help us to better meet student needs, support learning, and assess the quality of the work we do.

Overall, the self-study process helped us to better understand what we do well, and areas where we can continue to improve. There are no issues mentioned in either the EER Site Team report or in the WASC Commission letter that we had not ourselves identified as areas of strength and need; however the WASC texts at times emphasize areas differently than we might have. The SEC shares the WASC Commission's grave concerns about leadership and governance, and we look forward to improved conditions and procedures so that we can more effectively address the range of issues that face our campus in general and via governance specifically. Ovation.

c. Remarks by Koni Stone, Speaker Elect

Good morning. Stone began by taking a moment of reflection and thinking of the time she spent on a beach in Eagle River, Wisconsin with her toes in the sand (Slide of empty lawn chairs with lots of sand). She has been blissfully staying away from governance and keeping her "head in the sand" and "flying under the radar". Last spring, she realized that inaction can have very severe consequences. She was hired 17 yrs ago into a department of 7 tenured/tenure track faculty. They worked hard, taught extra classes with extra students and built up the Chemistry department to eight tenured/tenure track with several full time and part-time lecturers. That was four years ago. Today, there are only six tenured/tenure track faculty and two part-time lecturers. The number of students served has dramatically increased and the number of faculty is shrinking. This equation is not balanced! She realized that the Chemistry department and the rest of the University are in dire straights. This is why she's on stage, with a microphone, as Speaker-elect. She's also served on URPTC and that experience really concerned her. As a member of URPTC she read the excellent files that show- cased our colleague's work. Our junior faculty do it all: they teach with insightful approaches, they are involved in service and they have excellent scholarship (including bringing home the bacon) yet they were not rewarded for their accomplishments via RPT decisions or retention letters. That had to be discouraging. The scholarship bar has been raised and we're still using the same resources with no extra funds for supplies, instrument maintenance and repair, or assigned time for research. Our junior faculty are working hard and should be commended for their accomplishments. Ovation for our junior colleagues.

These people are the future of CSU Stanislaus. Scholarship expectations have been elevated and this is reflected in the departmental elaborations. The Academic Senate has passed resolutions reaffirming our RPT process, yet administrators continue to make decisions and put comments in letters that ignore departmental elaborations. How do we assure that departmental definitions of Research, Service and Teaching are used in the RPT process? How do we ensure that the primacy of teaching is reflected in our University RPT process? If we don't do something, the very empty long chairs will represent our once full and vibrant faculty ranks. Ovation.

d. Remarks by Chad Stessman, Chair of UEPC

Stessman read the names of the 2010/11 UEPC members as follows:

Chad Stessman, Chair

Bill Foreman, Chair-elect

Mira Mayer

Vacant, Library

Mark Bender

Vacant, Counseling

Eric Broadwater

Tzu-Man Huang

Kenneth Schoenly

Valerie Lester-Leyva
Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Speaker
Provost James T. Strong, Executive Secretary (temp appt.)
Pamela Contreras, Student Rep.

Stessman noted that we've had a big turnover of UEPC members this year. UEPC deals with Education Policy and has several sub-committees. The key topics last year was the Academic Calendar which was one of the biggest hot button topics of the last few years as was drafting the report on the conversion to a new academic calendar. Our report did a good job drafting a thorough report, taking a neutral approach as a scientific, analytical review. Littlewood served as a good reference to the Academic Senate and the Administration. We all know what happened with that, ultimately a decision was made to convert to a traditional semester. Usually, we have calendars for several years in advance, but we had to quickly draft a calendar for 2010-11. Note that January 3-24 are white days which used to be yellow days in the former calendar.

UEPC generated calendars for up to 2015 and addressed calendar policy to address the loss of winter term. There was lots of campus dialogue about the placement of spring break. UEPC completed reviewing the General Education APR, approved the BS in Health Science with concentration in Community Health Education and Advocacy, and addressed a Registration Priority policy and an Online Course policy.

Anticipated topics for the next year. UEPC will be addressing some but not all of the UEE issues noted next, but will play a major role in that. Because of budget issues, UEE has played a larger role than previously and has generated trepidation for people, as they are worried about UEE and see that decisions are made and classes are opened faster than in the traditional calendar. We would like to see a long-term strategy for Special Session classes including a plan for what classes are taught and by whom. There has to be a formula for how funds can be distributed. Many taught in summer and did the math and it seems there are substantial funds to be distributed, but when we get down to it it's likely that it's not as much as you'd expect. However, we need a formula for distributing funds that is engaged in a transparent process.

We also need defined guidelines for when classes are canceled and who makes those decisions. There are also issues tied to the size of classes, wait lists, and differences between policy and procedure for Special Sessions classes. Beyond these issues, UEPC needs to review the WASC report to see how issues may be tied to UEPC, and the committee will again tackle priority registration.

e. Remarks by John Sarraille, Chair of FBAC

Sarraille named the members of the 2010/11 FBAC. He noted that there is always an accountant on this committee and this year we have two, David Lindsay and Kim Tan.

John Sarraille, Chair

Kim Tan, Chair-Elect

Cathlin Davis

Debra Tavernier

Arthur Buell for Annie Hor, (2) Library/Counseling thru December 2010

Nhu-Y Stessman

Richard Savini

Nael Aly

Scott Davis
David Lindsay, Accounting Representative
Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, Speaker
Provost James T. Strong, Executive Secretary
Bill Foreman, Chair-elect UEPC, ex officio
David Colnic, Chair-elect GC, ex officio
Pamela Contreras, ASI Student Rep.

The duties of FBAC, as described in the Faculty Constitution, are:

- a) Function as one of the University's campus budget advisory committees (see Chancellor's memorandum BA-87-14).
- b) Advise the Administration with respect to University budget policy, planning, and resource allocation, including the development and/or allocation of special funds.
- c) Review and interpret budget requests and budget allocations to the General Faculty by reports to the Academic Senate.
- d) Conduct special studies regarding budget allocations, when so requested by a committee of the General Faculty of the Academic Senate.
- e) Maintain close liaison with the University Educational Policies Committee

Sarraille enumerated four perceived campus problems, together with descriptions of what FBAC has done and may do in this academic year to help ameliorate things.

1. The administration is not sufficiently forthcoming with clear and consistent information regarding university funding, budgets, and spending.
 - FBAC has urged President Shirvani to foster openness and transparency at every level and phase of budget planning and implementation.
 - Possible additional FBAC measures:
 - Utilize the expertise of former and current members of FBAC, who are familiar with accounting procedures, and formulate and submit clear and detailed requests for relevant funding, budget, and spending information.
 - To help insure compliance, make information requests to the administration under the provisions of the California Public Records Act.
 - Seek information and help from knowledgeable third parties.
2. Budget and spending plans on campus are not designed with due consideration of, nor alignment with, the mission and strategic plan of the university.
 - FBAC enumerated the following budget priorities, which were incorporated into a resolution passed by the Academic Senate and forwarded to President Shirvani:
 - Maintain access for qualified students, including admission to campus and access to courses;
 - Retain and appoint sufficient numbers of qualified non-faculty staff to effectively support the core instructional mission;
 - Maintain or reduce the student/faculty ratio;
 - Maintain or increase the number of tenure track faculty;
 - Maintain resources for effective instruction and for fostering research, scholarship, creative activity, professional development and community engagement;

The resolution containing these priorities also asserted the importance of strategizing the budget to align with our mission, and the importance of timely and thorough consultation on budgetary matters with appropriate participation of FBAC, other faculty governance committees and all affected constituencies.

- FBAC will monitor and update its budget and spending priorities and recommendations as needed.
- FBAC made the following recommendations to the President:
 - That the Strategic Plan Working group convene and determine what should now be considered core values of the University and urge that fiscal planning be aligned with those values
 - That the President engage the Academic Senate in a discussion of the program elimination policy.

3. Flaws in the structure of the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) hamper authentic and effective representation of campus constituencies.

FBAC made the following recommendations to the President:

- That at least one faculty member and one administrator serving on the Strategic Planning Work Group also serve on UBAC
- That one of the two co-chairs of UBAC be elected by the UBAC members
- That University staff representatives on UBAC be selected by the University staff
- That UBAC members receive timely information. For example, at least a day or so before a meeting, UBAC members should receive copies of the agenda, the minutes or notes on the previous meeting, as well as copies of any spreadsheets or other financial information to be considered at the meeting.

4. There is a dearth of principles and policies governing how the university should conduct financial planning.

FBAC recommended to the President that UBAC revisit the University's current one-page sketch of a budget planning process, and expand it into something that fully articulates strategic budget planning principles and procedures.

As he sees it at this time, FBAC's game plan is to address the problems enumerated in the manner he's indicated.

6. Remarks by President Shirvani

Good Morning. As we come together today, we look forward with enthusiasm to a new academic year. A renewed excitement about and dedication to our mission to educate the future leaders of our State and our country. It is an important task made especially difficult in these times of political and financial uncertainty. Significant economic adversity continues to face the nation, the State, and the University. Yet, even in the face of unprecedented budget reductions and political uncertainty, all members of the University community must remain committed to high quality and to being a rich learning center for students. It is important for all of us — faculty, staff, students, and administrators to engage in meaningful planning and dialog to find ways to sustain and even enhance the quality of the learning environment for students, while also preparing for the fiscal uncertainties that lie ahead. He knows the faculty will provide strong leadership in meeting these challenges and in taking advantage of the opportunities that will advance our great University.

Certainly, challenges confront us. However, there is much to be encouraged about:

- Administrators and search committees are working diligently to fill critically important senior level positions with the most qualified candidates in a timely fashion. The successful candidates will work closely with faculty, staff, and students to help address these many challenges and opportunities.
- We have been able to protect tenured and tenure track faculty in this round of budget cuts.
- No academic departments or programs have been closed.
- Sabbaticals granted for Academic Year 2010-11 will continue, even though other campuses have found it necessary to not grant sabbaticals.
- New faculty will be recruited in strategically defined areas.
- CSU Stanislaus has been granted full accreditation from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.
- He was pleased to announce last month of our success in securing an \$18 Million allocation from the State for the renovation of Science I, which will provide an additional 50,800 gross square foot academic facility for the campus.
- The recently completed Summer Session was very successful and exceeded expectations, providing nearly three-quarters of a million dollars in new revenue.

Regarding the budget, we all have been focused on the fiscal uncertainty that grips our State and nation. California's looming deficit of nearly \$20 Billion threatens the viability of one of the most productive economies in the world. The State budget process moves very slowly. Even though we have entered a new fiscal year, we still do not know what California's budget will be for this year. This same uncertainty translates to the entire CSU, where fiscal and enrollment constraints continue. As he previously communicated to us, we entered fiscal year 2010-2011 facing a known deficit of approximately \$6 Million. This deficit included approximately \$4.5 Million in additional salary costs resulting from the termination of the furlough program and approximately \$1.5 Million in new unfunded mandates imposed by the State.

Over the past several months the campus spent many hours discussing the potential impacts of further cuts and worked diligently to prepare for implementation of a spectrum of reduction scenarios. He wrote to us and to the rest of the campus indicating that he was hopeful that the Governor's budget proposal to restore some of the funding to the CSU would be supported by the legislature. But, as the budget debate in the legislature wore on, it became clear to him that we needed to take action based upon what we know at this time. We applied the \$1.1 Million in one-time Federal stimulus money to add critically needed courses and sections that students require to progress to degree, which served to mitigate the need to apply State funds for that purpose in Fall 2010. Those savings, along with approximately \$600,000 in new revenue from the recently approved fee increase, enabled us to reduce the cut based upon our current situation from \$6 Million to \$4.3 Million, and to spare tenured and tenure track faculty from reductions.

Shirvani talked about the agenda for 2010-2011. In these challenging times, it is important for CSU Stanislaus to have a good road map to guide the maintenance and enhancement of academic excellence. Given the economic downturn and subsequent budget reductions, it is paramount that faculty and all University stakeholders remain completely committed to student success. We have a strategic plan that was developed by various faculty committees after extensive consultation with many of our constituencies. The Academic Senate approved the strategic plan in 2007. That strategic plan is our guiding framework moving forward. Therefore, he is charging the University

community to concentrate on six key initiatives of our strategic plan. It is critical to assess our progress on these strategic plan initiatives and make necessary improvements. These initiatives are:

- Program Review
- RPT policy and procedures
- Student Assessment (General Education and Graduate Education)
- Student Success (Retention, Graduation Rates, Time to Degree)
- Technology Utilization (Distance Education, New programs)
- Revenue Generation (Self-Support Programs, alternative programs, partnerships)

Three of these initiatives were cited in the WASC Commission letter.

As outlined in the strategic plan, the Provost, Dr. Jim Strong, working closely with faculty, staff, and administrators, will take the lead in assessing and implementing improvements relative to these initiatives. Over the course of the next few months many groups will engage in the discussions surrounding these and other related issues. The faculty, of course, are central to these discussions. From this dialogue, future plans will be formulated and college and unit goals and objectives will be better aligned with the strategic plan and the University mission. Provost Strong will elaborate on this in his remarks.

In closing, he assured everyone that his administration and he are fully committed to broad consultation with all members of the campus community on matters critical to the University mission. The faculty are major stakeholders in this, and strong leadership by faculty members is essential to making significant progress on these six strategic initiatives. While the challenges are substantial, by collaborating together we can ensure that CSU Stanislaus remains a rich learning community, focused on student success and greatly contributing to the social and economic development of the State. Thank you.

Dr. Shirvani noted that he will make a more extensive presentation at his state of the university address next week.

Mark Thompson asked about the 6 initiatives as it sounds like they should be ones that come from the 2007 campus-wide consultation on the Strategic Plan through the Academic Senate, Strategic Plan Working Group, and the Executive Cabinet. He asked the president if these came from a selection process or were they his?

Shirvani said all these 6 initiatives were in the strategic plan. They were mentioned in the WASC letter, one was not debatable which is the student success initiative and two are topics of discussion. We might look at others to add or reduce the list.

Thompson clarified that he was asking if the 6 initiatives the president shared today were selected as the result of the 2007 consultative process or a similar consultative process. Shirvani said that these are the same six from the strategic plan. Thompson asked if the process went through the Strategic Planning Working Group or thru the Executive Cabinet, or was the selection made by the president from the Strategic Plan.

Shirvani stated that no one gave the six initiatives to him and he took them from the Strategic Plan. We are seriously committed to taking the approved plan from 2007 as our basic framework for advancing the university and picking up these six initiatives as a start. He noted that there can be further discussions as these initiatives are not cast in concrete, these are his suggestions.

Brett Carroll said we'll have more time at the state of the university address so is there any chance of changing the time to one in which fewer faculty are teaching. Mid to late afternoon would work better as more faculty could attend. Shirvani asked for a suggestion for a better time. Carroll said perhaps Wednesday, September 8th at 3pm. Shirvani indicated that he would try to change the time of this meeting.

Hejka-Ekins wished a happy new year to everyone. She sees money from UEE and the Sarah Palin event came into the university and wonders if the president will address in his presidential talk where the money will go and how it will be spent.

Shirvani said the money will be given to provost and he will make a decision on how it will be spent. We are facing a \$4.3 Million deficit and his job is to get out there and raise funds which he has already begun. The provost is in charge of the \$750K from summer UEE operations, and he can do as he pleases with consultation with the faculty. The \$200K from the Palin event went towards scholarships. He will answer more extensively at the September 8th state of the university address. Thank you so much.

a. Remarks by Dawn Poole, Chair of Graduate Council

The 2010/11 members of the Graduate Council are as follows:

Dawn Poole, Chair

David Colnic, Chair-Elect

Randy Brown

Robin Ringstad

Shawna Young

Jim Riggs

Natasha Hanley, ASI Senator

Katherine Royer

Andrew Wagner

Peter Nelligan

Tony Perrello

Ann Kohlhaas

Pam Roe, Marine Science CNS

Shawna Young,

Kurt Baker

David Colnic

Susan Neufeld

Provost James T. Strong, Executive Secretary (Temp. appt.)

Assessment has permeated campus activities over the past few years. We might even suggest that assessment is becoming part of the campus culture. Certainly that is an expectation of WASC, and reference to assessment is embedded throughout the Commission's July report to campus.

While WASC recognized progress the campus has made with regard to program review and assessment, the Commission indicated a need for us to continue our assessment efforts campus-wide. The July report articulated the need to adopt more direct measures of student learning at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The report noted, "...in view of the team's findings that the use of direct assessment methodologies is still uneven across the various academic disciplines, the university is advised not to relax its efforts to deploy these critical methodologies throughout all

departments...” The Commission indicated the need for more follow-up on academic program reviews, specifically with respect to monitoring implementation related to recommendations made during the program review process.

Following through on the WASC recommendations related to assessment will be particularly challenging at CSU Stanislaus due to the budget situation. On August 11, UBAC passed the Provost’s motion to substantially decrease faculty assigned time, with the exception of assigned time provided to department chairs. Assessment activities will be severely curtailed if key faculty members—generally Program Coordinators at the graduate level and Program Assessment Coordinators at the department level—are not provided with adequate time to collect appropriate data, analyze the data, and communicate findings with appropriate internal and external stakeholders. The motion passed by UBAC fails to recognize the critical role faculty take in assessment activities, and it fails to acknowledge that assessment activities need to be continuous in order to be effective. We hope the administration re-examines its position with regard to such widespread actions relative to assigned time. Implementing the actions suggested by the motion will all but halt assessment-related activities at the program level and beyond.

An additional challenge with ties to assessment relates to filling the position of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Accreditation Liaison Officer, the position formerly held by Dr. Diana Demetrulias. We’ve had recurring problems on this campus in expediently filling crucial administrative positions with qualified candidates. While the AVPAA/ALO position is currently advertised with a September 1 application deadline, it is likely to be many months before someone assumes the position. It is likely to be even longer before the person who is hired knows enough about our programs, our policies, and our procedures to be able to provide the kind of leadership we need with regard to assessment. It is critical that the administration works closely with faculty to identify a person with whom we are comfortable in assuming such an important and critical role, so that the transition is as smooth as possible.

She is hopeful that the Provost will recognize the importance of both of these issues as we address the long-term quality of our institution.

b. Remarks by Paul O’Brien, SWAS

His SEC colleagues have focused on the campus WASC report and both the positive and negative work that still needs to be accomplished. His State-wide Academic report has a slightly different perspective, briefly detailing some of the state-wide issues that impact us on our campus.

There are three areas of note including: the Early Start and Deliverology initiatives from the Chancellor's Office and the State-wide concern of our vote of no confidence on our campus. He will briefly discuss Deliverology and Steve Filling will discuss the Early Start program and the State-wide Academic Senate resolution on our vote of no confidence.

Deliverology comes to us from England via Sir Michael Barber. In England, this was a program to wring out more efficiencies in the social service sector of the economy. The Chancellor's Office wishes to implement portions of that model, called Deliverology to all the 23 CSU campuses. It has been redefined in the CSU context as "Success to Graduation" with Deliverology no longer being used due to negative feedback.

The goal is to increase the graduation rate of each campus by six percent. Then there will be increasingly higher goals set for graduation rates in the future. Initially our campus had a few short weeks to prepare an initial report which was completed by Ron Nobel, Angel Sanchez and Lee Renner with a three week deadline at the end of fall 2009.

Now each campus must submit quarterly reports to the Chancellor's Office on activities and actions that are being undertaken to achieve the initial goal and to identify actions into the future.

In order to achieve more faculty involvement, the Student Success Committee has become involved in the future planning of this initiative with much greater faculty input than was originally possible.

Each campus will be held accountable on progress to goal as the initiative unfolds.

Our campus was unique in that we enjoy one of the highest graduation rates in the system at 51 percent. Thus for the beginning phase our campus is in extremely good position and a leader in the area. As time evolves and ever higher graduate rates are increased our campus could find itself, like other campuses today, desperately attempting to increase graduation rates.

Our campus has a proud fifty year history of evolving into a campus that has built a culture that has made our graduation rates one of the best in the CSU system. Unfortunately, the current administration has spent the past several years dismantling that system with a growing SFR, elimination of Winter Term, decreasing numbers of tenured and tenure track faculty, and greatly reducing temporary faculty. We will have many challenges in the future rebuilding our campus community.

c. Remarks by Steven Filling, SWAS

Concerning Early Start, this seems to have originated during the last year. In September 2009, Trustee Carter told the ASCSU that, "Faculty have been extraordinarily helpful in dealing with remediation." An indication of that is the fact that 85-90% of students are successfully remediated in 12 months or less. However he believes, "The current strategy addresses current students rather than fixing the problem." Carter also stated his opinion that spending a year in remedial, non-degree-progress work does not do a great deal for self-image.

In March 2010, the Board of Trustees approved the Early Start program. Their comments included references to, "Working with the ASCSU and the Math and English Councils to implement this program. Oddly, there seems to have been very little faculty involvement in developing the program.

In April 2010 the Math Council noted opposition to the program, tempered by some feeling that working with administration provides some channel for input. The English Council issued a strong statement of opposition to the Early Start program, stating that it is discriminatory, financially burdensome, and unproven. The English Council statement also noted that successful alternatives to Early Start already exist on the campuses and have been proven effective.

In May 2010 the ASCSU passed a resolution opposing Early Start as approved by the Board of Trustees, citing some of the same logic put forth by the English Council.

In June 2010 Chancellor Reed issued Executive Order 1048 mandating the Early Start program.

In July 2010, at a special Board of Trustees meeting, faculty brought their concerns about Early Start to Trustee Carter, in remarks at wide variance with his September 09 comments, rebuked faculty for their comments, telling them, "It is your responsibility to make it work." Carter also directed faculty to. "Stop bringing negative comments," and to, "Come to the next meeting with positive comments."

So - what is this Early Start program?

Ideally, it would better prepare students in Math and English before the fall semester of their freshman year. It hopefully would facilitate timely and cost-effective student progress by removing a major roadblock [exactly what that roadblock is was not addressed].

The mandated Early Start program requires that:

- Students who test non-proficient will be required to enroll in an Early Start class before entering a CSU campus in fall [i.e. will be required to attend UEE summer school]
- Each campus will have a plan by November 2010 to begin Early Start
- Mandatory Early Start will launch in summer 2012
- Full implementation no later than summer 2014

The problems with Early Start?

- No significant faculty involvement in program development [in other words, nobody who teaches was involved in program design]
- It is unclear how students will pay for Early Start classes
- The program is based on unsound pedagogy
- The program discriminates against a significant portion of the CSU target population
- The program establishes a punitive barrier to college entry
- It doesn't fix the problem of unprepared students; it puts band-aids [expensive band-aids] over the problem

The other topic he wishes to touch on is an ASCSU resolution [AS-2961-10/EX]: Regarding Board of Trustees and Chancellor's Office Response to a Faculty Vote of No Confidence in President Shirvani of CSU Stanislaus. The unanimously passed resolution states:

1. RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) reaffirm its support for AS-2305-96/FA "Investigation of a Vote of No Confidence," and AS-2819-07/FA "Board of Trustees and Chancellor Office Attention and Response to Faculty Votes of No Confidence;" and be it further
2. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to further investigate the circumstances surrounding the faculty vote of no confidence in the president at California State University Stanislaus using the processes, and in the spirit of, the two above-referenced resolutions; and be it further and

3. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to share the results of that investigation with the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate and notify the ASCSU upon completion of that investigation; and be it further
4. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU encourage the Board of Trustees and Chancellor to work actively, and on an ongoing basis, with campus constituencies to resolve the problems giving rise to the faculty vote of no confidence in President Shirvani at CSU Stanislaus; and be it further
5. RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge the 2010-2011 ASCSU Executive Committee to provide whatever support possible to our faculty colleagues at CSU Stanislaus during the Summer 2010; and be it further
6. RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be sent to the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor of the CSU, the President of CSU Stanislaus and the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate and campus senate chairs.

 To date, there has been no response from the Chancellor or from the Board of Trustees. There has been a response from President Shirvani, who emailed the ASCSU chair asking that the resolution be withdrawn.

There have also been responses from multiple ASCSU Senators, asking how they and their colleagues might best provide support for us. We're soliciting your suggestions on how they might assist.

d. Remarks by CFA President, John Sarraille

Sarraille would like to continue with past practice by asking the following people to stand to be recognized:

- Jake Myers - Vice President, Politics and Public Administration
- Chris Nagel - Lecturer Representative, Philosophy Department
- Dan Bratten - Lecturer Representative, Computer Science Department
- Vickie Harvey - Affirmative Action Representative, Communications Studies
- Steve Filling - Tenure Track Faculty Representative, Accounting and Finance
- Nancy Burroughs - Treasurer, Communications Studies
- Dave Colnic - Secretary, Politics and Public Administration
- Ann Strahm - Probationary Faculty Representative

Would all CFA members here stand for a moment? He thinks it's important that we make that statement for all to see on this occasion.

He noted that Chris, Dan, Vickie and he attended a CFA semester kickoff and leadership conference a week ago.

CFA President Lil Taiz provided them with an overview of what she termed "the landscape for AY 2010/11." You might say that the 4B's are the prominent features on that landscape: BUDGET, BARGAINING, BALLOTS, and BARBERISM.

The BUDGET is of course is a major consideration because, along with other vital social services, funding for higher education is at great risk. He thinks it's incumbent on us, we who comprise the heart and soul of public higher education, to do our utmost to insure that the CSU receives the \$305 million restoration of funding proposed by the Governor and both houses of the legislature, as well as the additional \$60.6 million for enrollment growth that has been proposed. We're hopeful of receiving it, since there's a lot of support for it, but there's many a slip between the cup and the lip. If and when the word goes out asking for your help with some aspect of this struggle, he hopes you'll answer the call. The well-being of the students we serve, as well as the livelihoods of our colleagues are at stake here. Maybe President Shirvani has some good news for us, but the latest Sarraille has heard is that this university has to cut approximately \$4 million in AY 10/11 even if the CSU gets the \$305 million, which would likely mean the "non-reappointment" of many temporary faculty and staff, many of whom, let's face it are long time employees doing work for which the NEED is permanent.

Speaking of our livelihoods and of our working conditions, our contract expired on June 30, 2010 and negotiations for a successor contract have begun. In fact, bargaining was scheduled for yesterday and today. Although those eligible received PPI's up to 3.5% and GSI's of 3 and 1 percent for AY 2006/07 and 3.7 and 2 percent for AY 2007/08, due to failure of the state to fund the CSU at compact levels, we had to reopen bargaining on the 3 and 2 percent GSI's for AY 2008/09 and the 4 and 2 percent GSI's for AY 2009/10. CFA proposed that raises be allotted on a pro rata basis, in proportion to the degree of funding received by the CSU. After protracted bargaining the CSU has not moved off its initial proposal, which was to offer nothing, literally nothing.

The story was and has been the same for SSI's and Equity Raises. 2.65% SSI's were awarded to those eligible in 2006/07 and 2007/08, but the 08/09 and 09/10 SSI's were nixed. Similarly there was one funded year of equity raises which were intended to address salary compression and inversion issues. One bright spot is that our negotiating team succeeded recently in working out an agreement to distribute leftover 07/08 Equity and 08/09 & 09/10 PPI raise funds as a small GSI. Obviously, the gains we can make at the bargaining table are limited by two things: the funding available to the CSU, and our willingness to engage in job actions if and when intolerable terms and conditions are imposed upon us.

At any rate, there's a clear relation between BARGAINING and BUDGET.

Next is BALLOTING. The choice for governor of California is between Jerry Brown and Meg Whitman. You do the math. We need to get behind candidates who will help rebuild the state, not tear things down further. We can't just sit back and allow a few plutocrats to gut the public sector.

CFA is supporting:

- + Prop 24 to close tax loopholes for big corporations
- + Prop 25 majority vote budget

Important races: Jerry Brown for governor, Gavin Newsom for Lieutenant governor.

The idea of support AB 656 (oil and gas severance tax)
Support SB 330 (foundation transparency)

Obviously the third B - BALLOTING bears a strong relation to the first two B's - BARGAINING AND BUDGET.

The final B is "Barberism" - a reference to Michael Barber's deliverology - the latest patent medicine, if you will, being touted by Chancellor Reed and the Chancellor's Office. Proponents define "deliverology" to be a systematic process through which system leaders can drive progress and deliver results. They assert that these methods will enable a K-12 or higher education system to answer the following questions rigorously:

What is our system trying to do?

How are we planning to do it?

At any given moment, how will we know whether we are on-track?

If not, what are we going to do about it?

How can a central Delivery Unit help?

Also please change

CFA has expressed concern that in the current fiscal climate, proposals are being made, in the name of 'deliverology', to solve temporary problems with (flawed) permanent solutions - for example, online remediation that is not effective, early start remediation - pet project of Trustee Herb Carter which would force new freshmen with very low incomes to participate in summer remediation programs prior to their first semester in college, when they may have a critical need to work to make the money to pay their (newly much higher) fees and other expenses. There is also concern that efforts to increase the efficiency of graduation and to streamline General Education will result in deterioration of the quality of the education we provide. These are things that bear watching.

BARBERISM (i.e. Deliverology) is linked to BUDGET and hence to the other B's - BALLOTS and BARGAINING.

We have several "class action" grievances active:

Statutory Grievance: Improprieties in Provost Search

Contractual Grievance: Administration assigned excessive workload in Spring 2010

Statutory Grievance: Non-adherence to RPT criteria and process

Contractual Grievance: Violations of RPT process

We have filed several information requests:

- Information about individuals who underwent RPT evaluation in Spring 2010
- Statistics on workload over the foregoing two years
- Documentation of whether RPT procedures were carried out properly
- University budget allocations for 08/09 and 09/10
- Records pertaining to non-employee consultants
- Documentation of how the federal stimulus funding received by the university was spent.

On behalf of CFA, Sarraille thanks you and he wishes you the very best in the coming academic year.

e. Remarks by Provost James Strong

Good Morning. It is a pleasure to start another semester by speaking with the faculty. The start of a new semester brings a renewal due to the arrival of new students and new faculty and staff and the return of continuing student's faculty and staff to focus on the core mission of the university. Student success. Provost Strong welcomed new faculty who are attending their first faculty meeting. You

have joined a faculty who are committed to providing the highest level of education to students. These are frequently first generation students whose CSU Stanislaus' education will provide them with significant upward socio-economic mobility and change their lives and have a deep impact on their families. There is much to be proud of in playing a fundamental role in such a transformation.

He thanked the faculty for their outstanding work in instruction, research, and service. This faculty's commitment to student success is admirable and is reflected in the WASC Commission letter and other discipline based accreditation reviews and general reviews of the campus. Last year was a difficult year due to the poor economy that resulted in budget cuts and controversial decisions that resulted in conflict that rose to a dysfunctional level. So, the faculty's commitment to academe and in particular students is even more impressive and he thanked faculty for that.

It has been almost four months since Provost Strong arrived on campus on May 3rd. It's been something of a whirlwind but having this time to learn about the campus, faculty, staff, and students has been very helpful in preparing him for this fall semester. He is enjoying being provost and considers it a privilege to serve. Of course this is a challenging time for academe across the nation, and we all know CSU Stanislaus faces many challenges of our own – some of them self-induced – most of them foisted on us by external forces. He has attempted to reach out to as many faculty, staff, and students as possible and in doing so has discovered a wonderful group of people who are passionately committed to students. Provost Strong very much enjoys the beautiful campus which he has explored extensively with Max his canine companion - who has sniffed almost every bush and tree possible – some repeatedly and made a few fat ducks and geese get some exercise. Turlock has been a very pleasant surprise for him and his wife and leaving the kids behind in Southern California has had some advantages as well. He noted that his children are young adults and not small children.

Provost Strong will continue to reach out to faculty, staff, students and administrators and be as accessible as possible. An extremely important role for him is to represent academic affairs to the remainder of the university and to the Chancellor's Office. His role as a liaison and communicator to the various stakeholder groups is crucial to taking advantage of the opportunities and challenges that face the campus. President Shirvani has identified six initiatives from the strategic plan for focus this year relative to assessing where we are and implementing any needed improvements.

These initiatives are:

- Program Review
- RPT policy and procedure
- Student Assessment (General Education and Graduate Education)
- Student Success (Retention, Graduation Rates, Time to Degree, etc.)
- Technology Utilization (Distance Education, New programs, etc.)
- Revenue Generation (Self-Support Programs, alternative programs, partnerships, etc.)

It is necessary to build reasonable process around reviewing progress toward achieving the goals and objectives of the strategic plan and whether modifications to the plan are necessary. Provost Strong's sense is that due to the tumultuous events of the past few years we have not "worked the plan" to the degree necessary and he attends to bring the focus necessary to change that situation. He will be working with all the stakeholder groups to develop specific plans to address these issues – and the key stakeholder group is the faculty. He looks forward to working with the faculty senate and colleges and departments to make substantial progress on these strategic initiatives. He is planning a retreat with academic affairs and other campus leaders in early September to plan for assessment and implementation of specific tactics to enable progress toward the goals of the initiatives cited above.

There are two initiatives sponsored by the Chancellor's Office that we must pay careful attention to. One is closing the achievement gap – this is the program to improve retention and graduation rates. It is an ongoing program and we will be having a campus visit in mid-November from a Chancellor's Office team.

The other Chancellor's Office initiative is the early start program. This program is designed to improve the academic performance of students who need remediation. We are currently working on a plan for both English and Math early start programs. This plan is due in the Chancellor's Office by mid-November 2010.

Two of the strategic initiatives cited by the President were specifically outlined in the WASC Commission letter of July 13, 2010. The commission letter was generally very positive and you should be proud of their recognition of your good work. WASC specifically cited the need to improve the university's assessment of learning practices. The commission noted that a "substantial infrastructure for assessment of learning has been established . . . and that CSUS has created appropriate linkages between assessment findings and systematic program review. However, in view of the team's findings that the use of direct assessment methodologies is still uneven across the various academic disciplines, the university is advised not to relax its efforts to deploy these critical methodologies more broadly throughout all departments." We need to address this criticism and continue to make progress.

A second area of criticism by WASC commission was program review. While stating that "the university has made noteworthy progress in designing and adopting systematic program review for all departments . . . the institution is urged to take the additional steps of regularly finding external benchmarks for key achievement data, bring external reviewers into the program review process, and monitoring implementation of follow-up action plans.

The WASC commission cited a third area for "continuing institutional attention." This area is "Leadership and Governance Issues. WASC has scheduled "a special visit to the institution of fall 2011 to ensure substantial progress in matters related to leadership and governance as described in this letter." Clearly, this area of special attention needs to be taken very seriously by the university and especially by academic affairs and plans and more importantly progress must be made and must be made expeditiously. The WASC commission letter states the following regarding this area of needed attention.

. . . long-simmering tensions between faculty and the senior administration have risen to levels of potential disruption to academic operations. Furthermore, the institution's formal response to the team's report . . . neither acknowledged the current crisis nor identified specific strategies by which it might be successfully addressed . . . these matters are of grave concern. While the commission joins the team in being careful not to ascribe blame to either faculty or administration for the divisive environment that characterizes the campus at this time, it does, however, view the administration to be the primarily responsible for fostering a climate of trust and for designing the initiative and circumstances that will provide for a resolution to this problem. The Commission therefore expects immediate, inclusive, and productive endeavors to create a climate of collaborative and effective governance at CSU Stanislaus."

Provost Strong takes this “area for continuing institutional attention” and the scheduling of a special visit very seriously and it is the most important strategic issue facing the university – not just academic affairs but the university. As the chief academic officer of the university he represents senior administration and takes personal responsibility to acknowledge the problem and provide leadership to assess causes and design and implement a plan to bring about resolution and meet the expectations of the WASC Commission. The WASC commission specifically did not ascribe blame – although they “view the senior administration responsible to be primarily responsible for fostering a climate of trust and for designing the initiative and circumstances that will provide for a resolution to this problem.” He noted the word “primarily” – the commission calls for fostering a climate of trust and creating a climate of collaborative and effective governance at CSU Stanislaus. As you all know, and he has mentioned to you before, it takes two sides to create trust and collaboration. If one side insists on behaving in a competitive win-lose style it is not possible to create trust and collaboration. Threats and generally hard competitive win-at-all-cost tactics will continue an environment of distrust and competition. It took some time to get to this point and it will take time – certainly more than one year – to change this climate. This is a problem for the university. It is not a problem for just one stakeholder group. It is a problem that ultimately negatively affects students because it impedes the university’s ability to manage itself effectively. This problem will take understanding of the causes and behavior change by administration and faculty to resolve. If we keep behaving as we have behaved because we believe what we always believed, and make the assumptions we always made the problem will not resolve. There are two roads that the university can go down relative to this problem. One is for either one or both groups to heighten win-lose tactics to achieve some other agenda focused primarily on disadvantaging the other side. That approach will exacerbate the problem and hurt students and the university. The other approach is to identify the causes, the assumptions, and behaviors that impede trust and collaboration and compromise and make behavior changes. Provost Strong will certainly employ the latter approach and he knows you will too. This is too important not to take the WASC advice to heart and make needed improvements.

Provost Strong plans to work with stakeholder groups immediately to begin to draft a plan of action we can send to WASC in the next 30 to 45 days. A key component of the planning retreat he mentioned earlier will be how to address this issue. It may be necessary to have a half or whole day dedicated to this topic. The first step is to plan the plan. Clearly, we have a tight timed deadline. It is possible we may get some relief from that deadline but he is not assuming such relief. He thinks that bringing some independent outside experts to help us identify causes and problematic behavior and work through solutions is a worthwhile thought; although not without complications and he will explore that with the relevant stakeholders. Provost Strong will keep you posted on this issue and he is optimistic that working together will make the substantial progress WASC calls for.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Paul O'Brien welcomed Provost Strong to campus and noted that he's glad that his dog is also enjoying it. O'Brien has heard many comments regarding the budget this morning, and has heard about the \$1.1 Million in one-time Federal stimulus, the \$750K from summer UEE operations, the \$1.1 Million from winter term savings, and the \$600K from the student fee increases. Nonetheless, the only talk is about cutting Academic Affairs. The president listed 6 items to cover during this academic year and may we suggest that a seventh item be added to the list namely budget transparency.

Strong has no problem with that and supports budget transparency. This is a welcomed suggestion.

Lynn Johnson offered a comment following up on the earlier discussion regarding the 6 initiatives the president selected from the Strategic Plan: The provost has indicated that we all need to examine our behavior and work collaboratively. One way would be to have the Strategic Plan prioritized using an inclusive process, which the Provost has indicated a willingness to do. She regrets that the President is not here to engage in a conversation about this. It would have helped relieve the tension between the upper administration and the faculty if this attempt at collaboration had taken place before six items were laid out. The Strategic Plan is very broad and encompasses many items. To go forward in a collaborative manner, we need to go back to the kind of process Thompson alluded to where suggestions were solicited from ASI, staff and faculty governance as to which areas of the plan they felt had priority. In the past, an ad hoc committee reviewed the recommendations from the various constituencies and forwarded recommendations to the President. This process creates broad ownership of our campus strategy which is not present when the senior administration brings forward its own recommendations, even if the administration later expresses a willingness to consider modifications. She recommends adopting an inclusive approach as it would go a long way to reestablishing trust and communication.

Strong said that the issues related to WASC are all agreed upon. We have to put focus and attention to this immediately but he would be open to what Johnson and Thompson suggested, and he will consider other strategic initiatives. He thinks this is a good suggestion.

Regalado thinks faculty representatives have acted well above board with dealings with the administration beyond the call of duty with transparency. He suggested that the provost review the history of the past couple of years. Does the provost consider faculty not to have legitimate issues with where problems lie with the current climate in the university?

Strong is not sure he totally understands the question. Regalado clarified and asked if the provost thinks that the faculty don't have significant issues as to why we have a climate of distrust on campus. Regalado took from the Provost's statement that the climate of distrust is equal on both the administration and faculty. Regalado suggested that he doesn't see it that way thru his study. Regalado thinks that WASC made it clear that the climate was fomented by the administration.

Strong said that WASC didn't take sides or ascribe blame but administration must resolve the issue. That's what they found and it's in the letter.

Ping Luo welcomed the provost to the campus. He noticed much negativity within faculty and the culture here and wonders if there is any plan to restore the harmony within this community we are working in. We've become fragmented.

Strong thinks a call for action by WASC can be a rallying point to address these issues. Look at the causes and behaviors and focus on those that create a climate of trust and reduce those causing distrust. It takes time, effort, and reflection. It is not easy to do, and may not to be done in a year, but we can make substantial progress and he endeavors to assist and provide leadership.

Thompson wanted to go back to Johnson's comments because he was surprised by the answer. For someone who has been here for a long time, when we went thru the Strategic Plan and picked priorities, it was as Lynn described and we have documentation of a long and inclusive process. For

years we have been calling to go back to the Strategic Plan Work Group to have consultation on the Strategic Plan. We have WASC telling us we have problems with consultation. It is then disturbing to show up at General Faculty meeting and hear six initiatives have been selected followed by comments that urge us to build trust. He thought that the trust level couldn't go lower, and now we're being told there are six initiatives that have been selected with no consultation. The starting place would have been on the selection of the initiatives, not an announcement at the General Faculty meeting. Ovation.

Filling said "to fail to is to condemn to repeat." Regarding external efforts to help us get along. We have had at least four experts here in the last few years and not much has changed. Would the provost commit to getting an expert from AAUP instead of from the Chancellor's Office?

Strong wasn't thinking about the Chancellor's Office and is open to suggestions. It's an idea, not without disadvantages and we have to talk about it. It might be better to put together our own group. We need to discuss how to go about starting it. These six initiatives is a place to start. If faculty thru representatives and colleges think we need others, we're open to that. These aren't written in concrete or stone. We need to go back to look at the entire Strategic Plan as this was simply a place to start.

f. Remarks by Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl

Good morning. As he thinks about our current situation he is struck by a number of incongruities. The Princeton Review has recognized the university once again. The Review indicates that the university has "a dense network of resources including consistent advising, a strong first-year program, frequent and meaningful contact with professors, and supportive staff and administrators." At the same time, discussions are taking place on this campus and in Sacramento that threaten these. Budget cuts and conflicting priorities challenge our ability to maintain this high level of commitment to student success.

The same publication praises the University for being "beautiful and friendly" yet we continue to experience high turnover in many critical positions. The voids that are left create more work and pressure for those who remain. Many who remain feel threatened and are discouraged. Clearly, the work environment for many is not friendly.

The WASC site visit team commends the entire campus for "the broad engagement and commitment to the success of students. The pride and enthusiasm for working with students is palpable and permeates faculty, administrative and staff conversations." At the same time we are engaged in tense struggles about how this university should function to meet the needs of our students. Instead of undertaking actions that are arrived at collaboratively, we are reacting to unilaterally mandated decisions.

The actions taken by the WASC Commission provide another example. The Commission granted us full accreditation while telling us they will revisit the campus a year from now because the "long simmering tensions between faculty and the senior administration have risen to levels of potential disruptions to academic operations."

It is that tension between what makes this university a special place and the real threat to this university that served as the theme for the presentations of the members of SEC. It is a central

component of many of our discussions as well. It is what we as a university will struggle with for some time to come. How we struggle with it is a significant challenge. How and if we move forward are still very much up in the air.

Last year was a very dark one for this university. The academic year began with two committees reviewing the academic calendar, letters going to part-time instructors indicating they did not have jobs, furloughs for everyone, and students struggling to get into classes even though they were paying 32% higher fees than they had planned on. The situation did not improve as the year went on.

The defining moment of last year for him though was the vote of no confidence in President Shirvani. As a member of COC he helped count the ballots. As he walked home after all the counting was done and notifications sent out he felt both satisfied and very sad. He was satisfied that results showed him that the Academic Senate was correct in calling for the vote, but he was incredibly sad that our/his university was in such disarray.

There were some attempts to try to bridge the immense chasm that separated the faculty and the President. For the most part there was little follow through and a number of actions by the administration in the spring reconfirmed the reasons for the vote.

This summer, the WASC Commission told us that we need to come together and that the senior administration needs to take the lead. They told us we need to get our act together and we better do it quickly. Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl has heard the Provost acknowledge that the problems are real and that we need to address it in a serious manner.

Last year, Interim Provost Lujan came to this meeting and read a poem about fresh beginnings. He followed the poem by saying that we should “bring new ideas to the everyday dialogue in our classrooms, committees, and elsewhere. We need to find common ground and Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl will do his best to find it, wherever it is.” The actions that followed were not consistent with those words. Words will not solve our problems. We need positive, consultative, and collaborative actions in order to get sustainable results.

The members of SEC have spent quite a bit of time thinking about and discussing what faculty governance needs to do in order to move forward. Today, you have heard about some of what has been discussed. But to be honest, we are not exactly sure what the best response is. Some people have approached him to remind him that we cannot trust the President or the other senior administrators. Others have suggested that we have another vote of no confidence in the President to make it clear that the situation has not improved. Some have suggested boycotting some or all administrative initiatives. Other members of the faculty tell him that we need to stop being so negative and that we need to be more cooperative. They suggest that we reach out to the new Provost and even to the President. He has been told that some members of the faculty have regular conversations offering their own advice to senior administrators.

We must determine how to move forward as a university. Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl doesn't have the right to move a faculty agenda forward based on just what he thinks. You see, the President of the university is able to direct other administrators to do as he decides. He has been given that authority. The Speaker of the Faculty does not have that kind of power. The power the speaker has and in fact

the power that faculty governance has comes from the large and diverse group of people who make up the faculty.

Faculty governance will only succeed in influencing outcomes if many are engaged. The WASC self study process engaged the whole campus. The results of that engagement are significant. Now is a time that we all need to continue to be involved and to be attentive. We need to communicate with each other. We need to share our ideas and listen to the ideas of others. We need to continue to work with our representatives in faculty governance so that faculty governance can fulfill its role at this university. WASC has reminded us that the administration needs to recognize the legitimate authority of faculty governance. While you certainly can talk with members of the faculty, you cannot mistake getting the opinions of individuals is not a substitute for consulting with the faculty. Faculty governance is the collective voice of all those names that you have seen listed and more that were not. As the faculty has said repeatedly, we are here and we need to be a significant voice in the future of this university.

Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl role was to close the meeting with a pep talk. He was supposed to end the meeting with an upbeat tone so you might all leave feeling better. But he is an economist. His discipline has a reputation of being rather dismal and he thinks it is not in their makeup to be otherwise.

Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl told us why he loves this university and why he thinks it is so important for us to succeed in fixing what is broken even while we have extreme doubts that it is possible.

He loves this place because he gets to work with people who are deeply committed to helping others expand their opportunities. As he listens to people across the campus, he gets a sense that many see their work here a calling. They understand how the high poverty rates, high unemployment rates, and limited resources can create significant hardship for so many in the region. They understand the barriers that so many of our students must overcome just to get into this university so they are committed to making sure these students who want to succeed are able to.

We have much to be proud of. Filling and O'Brien talked about the graduation initiative. Our campus is the leader in the system. We have been recognized for our retention and graduation rates by at least two national reports. Even during such a dark period in this university's history, our accrediting body clearly saw how much we value the success of our students. One of the people from WASC referred to us as a gem of the valley.

We have had successful collaborations between faculty, between faculty and staff, and between faculty, staff and administrators. Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl continues to enjoy working with his colleagues in his own department and cherishes the many opportunities he gets to work with people in other departments. His life continues to be enriched by the conversations, collaborations, and friendships he has with people throughout the university.

So in spite of all the struggles we have and will continue to have, please know that you are surrounded by people who care and are working hard to make this university special.

Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl and the members of SEC wish you the best this academic year. Please keep in touch.

7. Introduction of New Faculty

The following faculty were introduced by members of their departments:

Kilolo Brodie, Social Work - Tenure-track

Renato Alvim, Philosophy & Modern Languages - Full Time Lecturer

Marcy Chvasta, Communication Studies - Full Time Lecturer

Jennifer Sandoval, Communication Studies - Full Time Lecturer

Emily Branscum, Child Development - Full Time Lecturer

Gary Williams, Psychology - Full Time Lecturer

Michelle Gustellum, Interim Director of Child Dev. Center & Full Time Lecturer

James Barrett, Economics - Full Time Lecturer

Katie Olivant, Liberal Studies - Part Time Lecturer

Jeffrey Frost, Anthropology/Geography - Part Time Lecturer

g. **Other**

h. **Adjournment**

11:40 AM