

<p>Academic Senate January 29, 2013</p> <p><b>Present:</b> Arounsack, Bice, Broadwater, Burroughs, Colnic, Crayton, C. Davis, Deaner, Filling, R. Floyd, Garcia, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Guichard, Hartman, Hidalgo, Johnson, Lore, Jasek-Rysdahl, Littlewood, Manrique, Martin, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Regalado, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Silverman, Strahm, Strong, Vang, and Werling.</p> <p><b>Proxies:</b> Lisa Bernardo for Suzanne Espinoza.</p> <p>Excused: Betsy Eudey</p> <p><b>Guests:</b> Lauren Byerly, Dennis Shimek, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Annie Hor, Linda Nowak, Marge Jaasma, Reza Kamali, James Tuedio and John Sarraille.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First and Second Reading Item: 15/AS/13/AS – Endorsement of California State University Academic Senate Resolution AS-3109-13/AA, Support for the Continued Inclusion of Upper Division General Education Within WASC Accreditation Guidelines. Passed as a Sense of the Senate.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: February 12, 2013 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Cathlin Davis, Clerk</p>
---	---

**1. Call to order**

2:04pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Added item, Endorsement of CSU Statewide Resolution on WASC. Amended agenda approved.

**3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of December 4, 2012**

Approved.

**4. Introductions**

Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Lauren Byerly, Dennis Shimek, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Annie Hor, Linda Nowak, Marge Jaasma, Reza Kamali, James Tuedio and John Sarraille.

**5. Announcements**

Petrosky announced that one of our human resource management students won one of 10 undergraduate awards given by the National Society of Human Resource Management. The award comes with a scholarship of \$2500.

**6. Committee Reports/Questions**

None.

7. **First Reading Item**

**a. 15/AS/13/AS – Endorsement of California State University Academic Senate Resolution AS-3109-13/AA, Support for the Continued Inclusion of Upper Division General Education Within WASC Accreditation Guidelines.**

The resolution was moved by Filling and seconded by McGhee.

**15/AS/13/AS-- Endorsement of California State University Academic Senate Resolution AS-3109-13/AA, Support for the Continued Inclusion of Upper Division General Education *Within WASC Accreditation Guidelines***

**RESOLVED**, That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus endorse the resolution of the Academic Senate of California State University, AS-3109-13/AA, *Support for the Continued Inclusion of Upper Division General Education Within WASC Accreditation Guidelines* [attached].

**RESOLVED**, That this resolution be sent to the WASC President Ralph Wolff, Project Manager for Accreditation Redesign Jessica Worchel, Chair of the Policy and Planning Committee of the WASC Commission Jackie Donath, CSU Board of Trustees, Chancellor Tim White, the Academic Senate CSU, Campus Academic Senates, the California State Student Association and the Associated Students Inc. of CSU Stanislaus.

AS-3109-13/AA  
January 17-18, 2013

Support for the Continued Inclusion of Upper Division General Education  
Within WASC Accreditation Guidelines

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) strongly oppose the proposed elimination of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Guideline described in CFR 2.2a from the Revisions to the Draft *2013 Handbook of Accreditation* (Attached); and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU strongly urge WASC to include the CFR 2.2a Guideline modified as follows “*The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, together with significant study in depth in a given area of knowledge (typically described as a major)*”; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the ASCSU distribute this resolution to WASC President Ralph Wolff, WASC Accreditation Redesign Project Manager Jessica Worchel, WASC Policy and Planning Committee Chair Jackie Donath; AAC&U President Carol Geary Schneider; the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE) president; the CSU Board of Trustees, Chancellor, campus Presidents, campus Provosts, campus Senate Chairs, and the California State Student Association.

**RATIONALE:** *In the Revised Draft 2013 Handbook of Accreditation distributed by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges on December 4, 2012, (<http://wascsenior.org/content/draft-2013-handbook-accreditation>) the entire Guideline to WASC Criterion for Review 2.2a was proposed for elimination. The Guideline for CFR 2.2a, which sets the normative expectation for institutions regarding curriculum, is as follows: “**The***

***institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, consisting of a minimum of 45 semester units (or the equivalent), together with significant study in depth in a given area of knowledge (typically described as a major)."***

*This important guideline is consistent with CSU Executive Order (EO) 1065 General Education Breadth Requirements, dated 2011. As noted in CSU EO 1065, "CSU **General Education Breadth requirements have been designed to complement the major program and electives completed by each baccalaureate candidate, to assure that graduates have made noteworthy progress toward becoming truly educated persons."***

*In addition, Dr. Carol Geary Schneider (President, Association of American Colleges and Universities; <http://www.aacu.org/about/schneider/cgs.cfm>) conveys appropriate AAC&U (<http://www.aacu.org/about/index.cfm>) national perspectives on the importance of upper division general education (personal correspondence, September 12, 2012). In response to the then pending proposal to remove the upper level requirements in the CSU framework for general education, Dr. Schneider strongly urged that CSU not take this action and that CSU campuses work to strengthen their upper level requirements in general education, not eliminate them. Her reasons included the following: 1) CSU charted a course that many others now are pursuing; 2) CSU has adopted Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP), and LEAP strongly recommends a cornerstone-to-capstone design for general education; 3) General education programs should include both introductory and advanced components; 4) There is a LEAP emphasis on Integrative and Applied Learning and that this fourth strand of the LEAP framework explicitly calls for students to integrate their broad learning with their specialized studies; and 5) In an era of global interdependence, CSU students need more general education, not less, to be well prepared for the global economy and for knowledgeable citizenship.*

*The CSU has long prided itself on providing access to excellence. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, educational excellence calls for strengthening general education program and integrating it with the work of major fields.*

Filling stated that WASC meets with Statewide Senate two or three times a year. When Statewide Senate met with them in September, they were very surprised to see general education excised from plan. Statewide Senate has passed a resolution responding to this, as have several other campuses. We should try to maintain some glimmer of a liberal arts education. Filling requested waiver of first reading, seconded by Johnson.

McGhee commended that the whole movement to streamline the education to a few courses to get you in and out is a bad trend. If we're going to change the structure of education it should be the faculty requesting it.

Results of the vote on moving to a second reading passed, 38 yes, 3 no.

The resolution moved to a second reading.

Sarraille stated that this is really kind of shocking, though it's maybe more shocking that he is not shocked. He questioned if WASC is so easily led that they can be easily persuaded to do this.

Petrosky stated that like opposable thumbs, breadth of learning is what separates us from the for-profit store-front colleges.

O'Brien stated that it is shocking that WASC would do this. Typically Wolff speaks to ASCSU Executive Committee 2-3 times a year, and WASC is good at asking for input and providing presentations on things they're thinking about doing. It looks like this was unilaterally done, which is really atypical of how things are usually done.

Results of the vote on the resolution, 39 for, 1 no, 1 abstention. The resolution passes as a Sense of the Senate resolution.

## **8. Information Items**

### **a. Update on UBAC**

Speaker Grobner shared that the committee on the charge has met, but we don't really have any feedback from that group or from UBAC. He asked the body if there was anything to report.

Provost Strong replied that UBAC had a meeting December 19th or so, where they discussed a variety of issues that centered on the current budget situation. At that meeting, Giambelluca passed out information on the pre/post Prop 30 situation.

Johnson shared that she is on UBAC this year along with Stuart Wooley, Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl, and Scott Davis. The faculty on UBAC also had met to discuss what sort of information we would like to start requesting.

Shimek shared that the ad hoc committee, co-chaired by Dennis Shimek and Kurt Baker, which will look at the charge and membership of UBAC, will be meeting for the next two weeks.

Filling asked for the Provost to provide campus financial information for the recent fiscal year. He pointed out that the individual campuses don't have to be individually audited but the information is still supposed to be shared with the campus.

Provost Strong asked for clarification on what kind of information the Senate would like to see.

Filling replied that he would like to see a statement of income, expenditures, etc., the information that would be in the audited report for 2012. Strong indicated that he would request this information from Russ Giambelluca.

O'Brien asked members of UBAC if the information on pre & post Prop 30 will be made public, and whether it was specific or general.

Johnson replied that it could be shared with the Senate, as it was not confidential. It was very general and showed how general division budgets changed.

#### **b. Update on Mandatory Advising**

Speaker Grobner was hoping that VP Espinoza would be here to address this issue. The mandatory advising policy we passed was to go into effect in the fall. ARC said they didn't have enough time to prepare, and asked for a delay. They've put together a proposal, using group advising, and multiple dates and times. It's still on the UEPC agenda. There are large numbers of undeclared students, and ARC still feels they aren't prepared for the number of students who will receive mandatory advising under the policy. They are going to start enforcing mandatory advising. The pre-nursing students will be separately advised. After this round of registration, we'll look at it again and see what we can do next year.

McGhee asked if there is a procedure in place to make sure students know of this mandatory advising. When students go to register and find holds on their accounts there will be problems. He also asked if we make the group sessions more user-friendly.

Grobner replied that part of the concern that ARC had last year was that they didn't have enough time to get to the students. His understanding is that they will get the information out early, with enough lead time to reach everyone.

Sarraille expressed concern about the group advising, which would mean that many of these students are being advised in batches. He asked who is designing the procedures and if faculty are involved.

Grobner replied that while he's been involved in some of the planning, these questions go beyond what he feels comfortable trying to address. VP Espinoza would be able to address the questions.

Bernardo stated that she will pass along the information and request.

The Provost stated that his understanding is that students who have not declared a major are currently advised by ARC. VP Espinoza has asked the Provost to meet with her and some others to develop a plan to better advise these students. The Speaker will also be involved in this.

Salameh asked if it is going to be implemented this spring. Grobner replied that in order to enroll for fall, undeclared students will have to get a hold released. Salameh asked how students will be told of this requirement. Grobner replied that an email will go out.

Bernardo added that typically it's a series of communications in a variety of formats. Salameh asked if a student will be obligated to choose a major, and if there will there be a consequence if a student changes majors. Grobner deferred those questions to Espinoza or someone from ARC. He will request that they send a representative to the next Senate meeting to answer these questions.

**c. Alternative Proposal Regarding Agenda Item #3 (Committee on Educational Policy, Baccalaureate Unit Limits, Proposed Title 5 Changes Submitted by Bernadette Cheyne, Faculty Trustee**

Grobner stated that Trustee Cheyne shared with CSU faculty her proposal on changing Title V. The first proposal was to remove upper division GE completely. The alternative proposal was to set a maximum number of units on degree programs, 120, which is the same as the minimum. Cheyne came up with a third proposal. The trustees vote was for the new limit which will be implemented in the fall.

Sarraille asked whether the effect of the implementation would be that all programs will be 120 units except for a few exceptional programs that get permission to be different.

Filling confirmed this, although there is an appeals process that needs to be completed annually justifying the overage. The change to Title 5 gives the Chancellor the power to deny said overage appeal and mandate reduction of program units to 120. White told the Board of Trustees that he would not exercise that power unilaterally, rather that he would convene a group of faculty to advise him on same. About 80% of our programs are under or at 120 units. The others are disproportionately fine arts and engineering.

**d. Mandatory Reporting of Child Abuse and Neglect – Executive Order 1083**

Shimek distributed a document as an information item, which is an amendment to state law. Essentially what the law now requires is that all faculty, staff, and agents to the university are mandated reporters of what they reasonably believe are incidences of child abuse and neglect. They must report incidents to Public Safety and also within 36 hours fill out a report.

One of the things that will be required is that you take the time to read the document, understand the document, understand the requirements expected of you, then sign the form and send it to the Faculty Affairs office. Within the next two or three weeks, it will be sent out to the entire campus community, including students. There's another document, attachment B, which you should be in a position of to be able to sign saying that you understand your responsibilities. He asks and

hopes that he could get a statement from the Senate on your support on implementing this document.

McGhee noted that based on what is written here, he doesn't think he could sign a document saying that he was fully trained to do this. What legal implications are there, and what is reasonable and what is direct? When we talk about legal responsibilities it makes him a little nervous. Just reading this, he doesn't consider himself to be trained.

Shimek appreciates the comment. He's read the document many times. We're asking that you read the document, understand it. He thinks that we should use good judgment. Most of the cases will be pretty obvious and likely be sexual issues. There may well be other cases that you aren't sure of. That's why we're saying you should call the police department with the information you have so that they can investigate.

McGhee noted that some of us don't believe spanking is a problem but someone else would see it as a problem. If they see it and report it, and I don't, am I in trouble? Granted if you see a child being sexually abused, that's obvious, but other things require interpretation. We don't want to be responsible because we didn't report something that we didn't think was important.

Shimek said that you are not going to be held responsible. They law is asking you to make a reasonable judgment. At a minimum let the police department know what you have observed. Shimek has been appointed as the Mandatory Reporter Coordinator for counsel on campus.

Sarraille noted that as CFA president, when something like this comes along he sees potential problems for faculty. He compared this document to what he read on the Chancellor's website the wording of the law and what the executive order states. When reading the law that has been passed, it says that people who regularly come in contact with children and the people who educate such people, those folks are mandatory reporters. Then in reading what the Chancellor's office said, we have just decided that every single employee of the CSU is a mandatory reporter.

Sarraille checked the UC website and found that they took the law and created a draft policy which they put on the webpage and asked the university community to comment on it. If you go through it, what you find is that they say the typical faculty member, even though they may teach students under 18, is not a mandated reporter. They're saying by default a faculty member is not a mandated reporter. It troubles him that it is being interpreted differently. He doesn't want the faculty of the CSU to be treated unfairly. The average age of the undergraduates of UC is 3 years less than students in the CSU. It is difficult for him to stand up and object to something like this. This is not just about child abuse. there are penalties; there are jail sentences, up to 6 months for conspiring to hide information. On the other hand, if you read the policy, people are encouraged to err on the side of being accusatory. If they give a report on something that is determined to not be abuse or neglect, they can't be punished but they can be punished for not reporting. It crosses two systems. He doesn't know who the go-to person is. Our union met and conferred with someone at Long Beach. Evidently, they let this one go. He doesn't know what recourse we have at this point, but wanted to mention these concerns as a CFA representative.

Shimek thinks that Sarraille raises some valid points, and issues that are pertinent. He was not a part of the review of this at Long Beach. He will bring these questions to the general council. He has the same interest in representing employees of the CSU and doing the right thing. To the extent that issues are raised, there may be changes. The law is pretty clear. It says a mandatory reporter is a teacher. Can there be some refinement on that point? He will contact some of his colleagues at UC and get some information from them.

Filling noted that Garcia and Floyd are mandated reporters, can they give us some information.

Leyva said that she's a mandated reporter. She's curious why we're supposed to contact campus police instead of CPS?

Shimek said that the campus police will forward information to appropriate agencies.

Garcia would feel uncomfortable with being handed this document and being told that this is the training. There should be real training. Faculty in the Department of Social Work provides this training to their students.

Nagel said that since his duties don't bring him into contact with children, as listed in the statute – Higher Education employees who are in contact with children on a regular basis or those who train those who are in contact with children on a regular basis. It seems that he could sign this and forget the whole thing because he doesn't come into contact with children, or he could be concerned that this shifts liability to faculty without training.

Johnson said that the reason why we may be coming into contact with children is because we may have 17 year olds in our class.

Shimek said that is one element of the concern. As he reads the law, it talks about one's professional capacity. It could be an incident that occurs off campus but you are acting in your capacity as instructors.

Martin would think that most of those people are already mandated reporters. She asked whether those already trained would have to go through the training again.

Shimek said there are a number of people who are already trained; they are already meeting the obligation of the law.

McGhee stated that what happened at Penn State bothers him tremendously. It does also bother him that our knee jerk reaction is that we are responsible for everyone in the world. It's a bad environment for people who aren't really trained and don't have expertise. Taking a seminar one time won't give him the expertise. People at the Child Development Center should fall under this. There are a lot of subtle implications. Do emancipated minors count? He doesn't trust people, in hindsight they go on a witch hunt. People may be always worrying that if they don't do something they'll get in trouble. He is unsure why staff people, unless they're involved directly with children, are they listed in this policy.

Regalado is also pretty uncomfortable with this sweeping mandate. He agrees that we have to act responsibly. Penn State wasn't just a problem with the community but also the police department was complicit. It's parallel to the proposals for gun control, like arming teachers. He doesn't know the difference between someone who is 17 or 19. In the spur of the moment, if you're concentrating on your teaching, and you see something, what if you report something that was not a problem?

Shimek would hope that you capture all these comments in the minutes. We will look at the questions that you ask and come with answers.

O'Brien requests that our statewide senators find out what other campuses are doing.

## **8. Discussion items**

Giambelluca brought two documents to share with the Senate that might help track what happened with the budget. The first document is a set of working notes that he uses to help keep track of where everything is. In June we were facing one set of circumstances; in December we see some differences. He gave an overview of where we are since the start of the fiscal year.

The first document is what was shared with UBAC. Giambelluca stated that this is a very complicated situation. The top section shows our budget starting the year in July 2012. In the middle of the previous year we were given a mid-year cut. Our understanding was that it was temporary, but we were told it was permanent. The mid-year trigger reduction was a little under \$2 Million. In addition, there are adjustments to benefits and to COP revenue interest assessment, imputed by the state. We had a fee increase, and we set aside a third of that. We also receive funds every year in the form of a state university grant that goes to financial aid. If Prop 30 didn't pass, there was a promise that we would have an additional trigger reduction of \$4.9 Million. Everyone was so sure it would not pass we made the reduction. With all these adjustments, we had a net reduction of \$6 Million. The other side of that revenue from tuition. Our expected net increase in the General Fund base was \$5 Million.

As we looked at the year we were planning this budget of \$86,963,374 Million. After prop 30 passed, there was a lot of scrambling. We resubmitted our budget with all new numbers. The bottom of the page shows what happened after we did that. The state did not relieve the mid-year reduction. The benefits cost still remained and our state university grant dropped. The state also rolled back the tuition increase. Our tuition essentially remained unchanged. The overall budget is now \$87,593,174 Million. That's the general difference between the two. The net General Fund budget is about \$600,000 larger.

McGhee asked what the reason was for the reduction in state financial aid. It appears to be a back door cut.

Giambelluca stated that it's an allocation we receive every year. It balances tuition received and handed out to campuses. The first number anticipated a larger set aside from all the campuses.

We often benefit from this; we get more than we set aside. The second case, we didn't have a set aside, so the number went back to a more typical allocation.

Johnson asked if it is a direct result of not having a 9% tuition increase. Giambelluca replied that it is.

Sarraille inquired about the \$135 Million we got as a result of prop 30. He asked for clarification on this: we get our cut but we have to give back that much in reduced tuition. There's another \$125 Million that the Governor added on.

Giambelluca stated that the Governor has not added on. This new \$125 Million is part of the new budget proposal. We would have received \$130 Million but we're only getting \$125 Million. This was explained in the President's update. In addition, some of the \$125 Million is earmarked, such as \$10 Million for technology. This is part of the Governor's proposal. If it goes through the whole process and is in the final budget, then we will look at what might be done.

Colnic asked for confirmation that we were looking at a potential \$5 Million dollar trigger cut which we avoided, but we also avoided tuition increases, so we wind up with about \$630,000 more.

Giambelluca then shared a second document, which uses a presentation format used consistently in the past. This spreadsheet is a greater depth look at our campus. The numbers that tie it together with the other document are the general fund allocation and tuition. Giambelluca shared that his office has been working with this very fast and trying to keep up with the changes from the Chancellor's office.

In August what is listed is the general fund operating budget for all the campus divisions, including the contingency reserve. Below the grey line is the mandatory budget activity. The yellow highlighted places, \$2.2 Million of unallocated general fund and \$16 Million financial aid, are the two big changes. The other budgets have not changed.

Financial aid is something that is a rebate back in tuition. Giambelluca referred to President Sheley's remarks: *the notion is to proceed very carefully because it is not clear whether or not this number will sustain itself in that budget.* We know that there are some things we anticipated in August that we cannot do. There are also mandatory things that we have to do to avoid legal problems.

Filling asked if when we thought through what we're not going to do in August, we didn't think about what was mandatory. Giambelluca replied that the administration is checking those to see what to restore.

Johnson asked for clarification that what this is actually showing us is that at this point our budget is not really changed except a reduction in financial aid of \$1.6 Million, and that we still have that much more, but we may have budget items that we must allocate that money to. We can do anything we want.

Giambelluca replied that If we add that \$1.6 Million to the \$630,000 it totals our increase in budget which has not been allocated at this point. Those changes would have been there whether we got that \$2.2 Million or not. The \$2.2 Million was an additional amount.

Thompson asked, from the worst case scenario, what is the difference now, if prop 30 hadn't passed. Giambelluca replied that under the second scenario we would have kept \$4 Million and that \$2.2 Million would have disappeared completely. The tuition would have stayed in place. We would have been more like the top scenario shown on the first handout.

O'Brien inquired about available UEE funds.

Giambelluca replied that he tried to give just general funds, as we should talk about UEE as a separate entity. Campuses were told they could use UEE balances to address deficits. He did not come prepared to discuss those today and deferred to the Provost.

McGhee stated (with the request for confirmation) that the difference between prop 30 passing and not passing is that the university has \$600,000 more to spend this fiscal year. We really have to follow our anticipated expenditures.

Giambelluca replied that what we have is a better sense of stability. Prop 30 wasn't a windfall for CSU or UC. There was no language about making allocations to CSU.

Sarraille stated that if 30 had not passed, we were promised that CSU would be cut \$250 Million and as our percentage of CSU is 2.2%, that would be a \$5 Million cut.

Johnson stated that the financial aid dropped by \$1.6 Million, and asked if that is also directly because of the fees being reduced. Giambelluca replied that yes, that's the tuition rollback.

Thompson asked about a focus on hiring, and whether we are anywhere else than where we were. He asked if there are searches in place or are we waiting.

The Provost stated that he is recommending that we hire new faculty. He shared that he is close to making those decisions.

O'Brien asked if Giambelluca could give the Senate an idea of what the University has in unallocated cash reserves, and what would have happened if Prop 30 had not passed and we needed to cover the \$5 Million trigger cut.

Giambelluca replied that the campus took that trigger cut, so as a campus we would have been in good shape. It would have certainly meant tangible evidence because this budget's pretty tight.

Tuedio stated that the reduced financial aid number would have meant that the financial aid payout would be less.

Giambelluca affirmed this, but also stated that the students are paying less too.

Tuedio noted that in the November column the fees have been rolled back, and the \$2 Million was not committed.

Giambelluca stated that it was committed as part of our budget submission.

Tuedio noted that we're calling it unallocated money.

Giambelluca replied that he is calling it unallocated. The CSU doesn't look beyond a certain level. It's very clear from the Governor's budget that he's not looking to cover the losses that are not made up by Prop 30. He is not intending to take us back to previous levels. Our challenge now is that this is the new base. That money should be allocated on the basis of some set of priorities.

The Provost stated that we should assume the 2 million from this year is essentially one time savings for this year. Giambelluca stated that it is what is permanent and therefore available.

The Provost asked if there is a plan for it if we don't spend it this year. He asked if it would be available for next year as a reserve. Giambelluca stated that it would be the sort of resource that will be looked at by UBAC.

McGhee noted that we basically we have \$3.1 Million dollars that we're not sure what we're going to do with. Giambelluca stated that without it we're not going to be able to meet real contingencies.

McGhee asked if this would recur each year. If we didn't spend the money, in 4 years we would have \$4 Million dollars. If we don't spend the money this year it would be available the next year because we would have it in reserve.

Johnson noted that if we keep that money and don't use it, it is going to grow, and we would have a larger and larger balance.

Giambelluca stated that President Sheley would probably look at contingencies for one time money. The \$800,000 will be allocated out to something that's a priority to the University.

Salameh asked when the last time that we took out reserves. Giambelluca stated that a few weeks ago they used reserves to repair a boiler that we had no plans to need to fix.

Grobner raised the question asked at a previous Senate meeting regarding the savings from winter term.

Giambelluca stated that he was not prepared to talk about that. Eliminating winter term was a huge change and teasing out the change to give you a full picture is difficult, as it was when he had to invent a semester system. He has to impute how many students might have taken winter term, and then impute dollars on that, and then come through and say how much of that has been tuition increases. What he is trying to do is determine how much our revenue has gone up. When he made the projections, it didn't include other factors. He will be able to show that we have indeed covered at least these amounts that he had projected and he will share that with the Senate. He also noted that the winter intersession brings in money that is above and beyond. He projected a lot of savings from cuts of temporary instruction.

Filling asked Giambelluca to consider a thought question: what would you do if a Dean came to you and said I stayed within my budget, and you don't need any more information?

Regalado noted that he raised the question if the cutting of winter term had reached projections, and would be fine with Giambelluca returns to discuss it. Loss of the winter term led to loss of some classes as well. Regalado noted that it merits much more time than Giambelluca's able to give us now.

Giambelluca stated that he fully expected to see additional revenues. He would like to include in his handouts the two years in-between. He also noted that this isn't a static world and he must find a way to factor in over-enrollment, budget cuts, etc. He plans to relate it to headcount of FTE, which would be "apples to apples," and could be discussed. He stated that he would share where his office is in the process and how long it might take, so that the Senate can then tell him what they want him to do.

## **9. Open Forum**

A faculty member raised the issue of faculty welfare in the light of potential school shootings. She asked if there is a formalized training available that tells faculty what to do in a situation, like a person with a weapon. Giambelluca stated that they are preparing a plan.

## **10. Adjournment** 4pm.