

<p>Academic Senate February 8, 2011</p> <p>Present: Baker, Burroughs, Contreras, Cotten, Davis, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Grobner, Held, Jasek-Rysdahl, Keswick, Manrique, Marcell, McCulley, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petrosky, Poole, Regalado, Sarraille, Silverman, Stessman, Stone, Strahm, Strong, Werling</p> <p>Proxies: Akwabi-Ameyaw for Hauselt</p> <p>Guests: Lauren Byerly, Dean Goodwin, Dean McNeil, Dean Moore, Dean Tuedio, AVPAA/ALO Kornuta, David Tonelli, Dennis Shimek, Marge Jaasma, Ron Noble, Chuck Gonzalez, Brian Duggan, and Michael Igoe.</p> <p>Whitney Ragsdale, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>3/AS/10/RSCAPC/GC -- Amendment to Policy on Human Subjects Research passed</p> <p>8/AS/10/UEPC/GC -- Pre-Health Professions Certificate Program passed</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, February 22, 2011 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:  Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	---

**1. Call to order**

2:04pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Jasek-Rysdahl inserted item #7, discussion item on RSCA Policy for Additional Funds. Copies have been placed at your seats. This is just a discussion item today. This moves open forum to #8, and adjournment #9.

The agenda was accepted as amended.

**3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of January 25, 2011**

Accepted as submitted.

**4. Announcements**

Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that a UBAC announcement from the Provost and Speaker went out last week. Key points from the memo are that the committee will have regular meetings, minutes, an agenda, and open meetings. There are still some areas we are working on with administration addressing committee membership and chair structure, but they are ideas we're continuing to work on and with the agreed upon changes and a different attitude it may work better than in the past.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that earlier today we were notified that Isabel Pierce's mother-in-law passed away, and she will be out today and much of the week. Keep Isabel in mind. As more information is available from her about arrangements we will let people know as appropriate. Whitney Ragsdale is here today taking notes in Pierce's place.

Petrosky announced that the state Human Resources games will be held at UCSB. The campus team who were champs last year are prepared and packed. They will try to make it two years in a row.

Strong wanted to point out that no decisions have been made about budget cuts relative to the campus. We don't yet know what we're dealing with. Those who went to the President's talk on Friday heard that. The Chancellor's Office is telling us that they expect we will maintain enrollment levels not quite at 339K FTE, which means for the campus, 7000 FTES, but instead somewhere around 325K which is essentially the 6869 target we've had. No additional fee increases have been approved beyond 10% next fall. That puts us in a constrained area in terms of what they are expecting us to accomplish and funds available. The wild card is whether the taxes pass in June. If they do not pass, there will be more serious cuts. Exactly what the level will be at campus is unknown. The budget cutting process on the campus will be a consultative process between faculty, staff, and administration. We need to focus on data and make data-based decisions and exercise good judgment. One size doesn't fit all. We need to identify priorities while the fundamental objective is to serve students and their interests. Will be an important process and he is sure there will be disagreements and so forth but we have to get the issues on the table and debate the priorities and decide what to do. We need to evaluate what we are currently doing, the costs to do them, what is necessary and nice to do, and make some decisions. Nothing has been decided yet and we will engage in process to make decisions. UBAC will be an important vehicle, also the departments, colleges, and divisions as we identify priorities and plan for some stormy waters.

Filling said he is glad to note that this is data driven although he confesses that the last financial statements are 2007-8. Is there a possibility to get more recent data to drive decisions? Strong asked which data? Filing said that the Chancellor's Office says the last financial statements available for Stanislaus are 07-08. Strong will find out. He doesn't know more about which statements are available but will look into it and get back to AS.

O'Brien announced that he got a call from Lee Renner to be the faculty rep for hiring a new veteran's advisor on campus. We were happy to do it, to have someone to meet needs for the population. O'Brien noted that there were lots of good candidates and the top person we selected is here today. Michael Igoe. He is a graduate of the Air Force Academy, and did graduate work in Human Relations at the University of Oklahoma. Last week a group of people system-wide went campus to campus to see what we're doing. O'Brien and McGhee went representing veterans. O'Brien introduced Igoe to let him give his report on the visit. It's good to have him here for veterans and hopefully someday they'll have space on campus to call their own.

Igoe thanked us for having him and passed around his card. He noted that we are pioneering a lot of things for veterans and the visit last week was a combination of needs assessment and consideration of how we are doing as a vet-friendly campus. It was an honest and open look at what we've done and where we're going. The visit gave good goals to work toward. It was a great visit. He's in the Advising Resource Center, MSR 180, 664-6767. Jasek-Rysdahl welcomed him to campus. Ovation.

Regalado noted that he met Igoe last Christmas, as he was in the community feeding the homeless. Regalado indicated that Igoe made a good start. He offered congratulations and welcomes him as well.

Marcell announced that the Kinesiology Student's Club seminar series includes a talk tomorrow at 7pm in the Fieldhouse Annex about nutrition.

Jasek-Rysdahl introduced David Tonelli, AVP for Communications and Public Affairs, who started Feb 1. He indicated that we hope we will get to know you. He also introduced a new senator, Suzanne Espinoza, VP for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, who also started Feb 1<sup>st</sup>.

Espinoza said it was a pleasure to be here. She is getting to know people and hopes to know all of us. If

there is anything she can do to help you, Student Affairs is at 360 MSR. She said it is a pleasure to be here. Tonelli echoes Espinoza's comments. He's now on day five, and looks forward to making acquaintance of everyone in the room. Jasek-Rysdahl admitted that he didn't know where student affairs was, and went to old office. Nobel said he should have known that.

Jasek-Rysdahl introduced our guests including Shimek, Jaasma, Kornuta, Noble, Moore, Tuedio, McNeil, Gonzalez, Duggan, Leguria, Byerly, and MacEntire.

## **5. Committee Reports/Questions**

Regalado was curious about the university protocol for governance with regard to consultation. In open forums the president and provost are disseminating knowledge and that is all well and good, but does that fall under the definition of consultation as a part of shared governance?

Jasek-Rysdahl said that at the Trust Restoration Planning Committee consultation they have discussed how to make that more formalized instead of the informal process you've talked about. An open forum isn't consultation, and coming through more formal channels is consultation. Forums are a way to get information, in his opinion, but thru this committee we are trying to work on making that more formal and regularized in addition to a plan to share with other people including the Dean's Council, Senate, and others.

Eudey believes that we must use formal processes in addition to open forums. There are many ways to engage in information sharing, but that's not the same thing as consultation.

Regalado said it comes from definition of what we consider formal consultation. A major concern even prior to this academic year in that we get a lot of information but does that fall under that definition in terms of how we operate?

Strong thinks consultation is an important part of the academic community and it can take many different forms and where it's called for in policies obviously that makes it more formal and we need to follow the policies we have and engage in consultation on that front but we can also engage in consultation in many ways. There is not one way. We need to use numerous ways to consult but where consultation is called for in policy we should engage in that.

Filling point out that consultation necessitates two-way information. Open forum are not a great for two-way communication when it's reporting and not discussion. Jasek-Rysdahl doesn't see it as a substitute for consultation.

Moore said an open forum is an exchange of information. It's pretty clear and people have echoed some things he was thinking about. We should not preclude consultation as such based on policies, but it is a part of the process and an important part of shared governance and transparency.

Sarraille noted as a point of order that the open forum is #8.

## **6. Action Items**

### **a. Second Reading 3/AS/10/RSCAPC/GC -- Amendment to Policy on Human Subjects Research**

Jasek-Rysdahl reminded us that this is a second reading of this policy amendment, and opened the discussion to the senate for statements in favor or against.

C. Davis noted that since we last saw this they revised #4 under rationale to reflect the discussion from the

last AS meeting, and it is now more general. There was a large discussion about why some protocols come to UIRB when they might not need IRB review. IRB was more concerned about what to do when they come than why they come. We do get some for approval that don't fulfill the categories of the policy and the revision to this policy has created a way to quickly handle those and not hold up someone's research. Other than that, nothing has changed.

Eudey says she likes it.

Voice vote on the resolution. Unanimous approval of the policy revision.

#### **b. Second Reading 8/AS/10/UEPC/GC -- Pre-Health Professions Certificate Program**

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that the proposal includes some additional information from last time including the MOUs. This is a second reading, up for discussion.

Grobner noted that the revisions include the removal of the MCAT statement and inclusion of the new MOU with the signatures.

Voice vote. The resolution passed with four abstentions and no nays. Congratulations were offered to Grobner.

#### **7. Proposed Special RSCA Policy**

Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that RSCAPC finished this on Friday, and did some final editing over the weekend. He was asked to put on the agenda as a first reading today, but on short notice we decided to bring it as a discussion item. It will come to full senate on February 22<sup>nd</sup> as a first reading and see where it goes from there. As background, in fall the President announced that \$100K in additional RSCA funding was available. An ad hoc committee was created, and started to develop a distribution process for the money. Many including some members of Academic Senate wanted this to go through a different process, utilizing RSCAPC. Consultation requires following a particular process. We worked with the administration, and this went to RSCAPC. Jasek-Rysdahl informed David Lindsay, the chair of RSCAPC, in January that we would deal with this quickly. RSCAPC met twice already to work on this, and this is their draft policy. The senate will be asked to approve or disapprove of this. If approved we will move forward. What he heard in the discussions in RSCAPC is that this is a onetime deal. The money is a one-time deal. If there is a regular process, RSCAPC will be asked to develop a regular policy. This applies only to the money for this year that was announced last fall. This is all this is for, nothing beyond that. This is not replacing any policy, just dealing with the \$100K this year. He then opened things up for questions, comments.

Sarraille has been trying to jot down thoughts on this. He thinks this recommendation we're getting from the RSCAPC seems to be about the same as the recommendation from the ad hoc committee that was assigned to come with a way to distribute funds. As far as the Senate goes, the idea here is to use a college-based process instead of throwing money to LAC and fundamentally if the Senate has a reason to want to try a college-based process they should approve a resolution to follow the recommendations of the RSCAPC. It might be an interesting experiment, and it's not a whole lot of money involved, a test case to see how well a college process works. He has concerns about college constitutions and bylaws that don't have checks and balances and a committee structure that is optimal. Performing this kind of function might be a test run and help people to get the bugs out of their colleges in going through the processes. Although RSCAPC may think this is a one shot, he's not so sure that was the President's intention. When Sarraille served on the ad hoc committee, some of the members mentioned that the President had said he wanted this an annual thing and to have annual augmentation of monies distributed this way, and the President intended to empower the

colleges. From the sound of it he would expect that this would continue and the President would continue to want the colleges empowered to distribute money.

Jasek-Rysdahl was at RSCAPC meeting and no other members are here, so he will try giving information from the committee meeting. In terms of one time, maybe more will be available in the future, but RSCAPC thinks this needs to go back to committee if that happens. There are some differences between this and what was before. For example, under policy in the second paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence, if the dean chooses to amend the recommendation from the college committee, he/she will meet and confer with the committee with a rationale included. This is intended to encourage collaboration with deans and faculty. That was not in the draft policy from the ad hoc committee. There was something added to follow protocols. Also new is a statement that strongly urged the committee to give priority to probationary faculty. There may be other changes, but he's not sure what they are.

O'Brien asked how this will come to the senate. Will there be a resolution? Jasek-Rysdahl said they would try to expedite this. We didn't get it early enough to be a first reading this time. He expects there will be a resolution attached next time.

O'Brien is reading this for the first time, and noted that are a lot of dates noted in here starting after policy, i.e. April 4<sup>th</sup> a committee established, 18<sup>th</sup> proposals due, funded by May 30<sup>th</sup>. This all seems really tight. We're discussing this now here and we'll take this back in our departments. Given these timelines he's intent when this comes up at next meeting for a first reading is to ask that the second be waived. He's mentioning this now so that we have time to think about it. He knows it's not done often, and people don't like it, but if people think it's positive we should go ahead with it.

Silverman objects. He'll start with some background. There are four ranks in the life of the professor at the university, Assistant, Associate, Full, and dead wood. The policy described here concerns him greatly because there is a clause which to him is equivalent to helping full professors to move to dead wood. The sentence is in the policy paragraph line five, when the committee is "urged to give first priority to probationary faculty." This is trying to move full professors to dead wood category. He would recommend modifying the sentence to say they "will be required to treat all faculty equally regardless of religion, nationality, sexual orientation, and rank." He doesn't want this to be interpreted as an attack on junior faculty. He's basically saying that there in fact may not be sufficient amount of funds to satisfy this vision that we have where people who are qualified can get research funds for their projects.

Marcell wanted to share that last time we discussed this he and Sarraille suggested having a proposal base where larger sums could be applied for by having this at the university level instead of the colleges. Diving this by 5 or 6 colleges, that's \$20K at most per college to distribute, which could be down to \$750-5000K per award, which makes it hard for junior faculty to establish a research base. Was any consideration of that made? Jasek-Rysdahl said not aware of it being discussed at RSCAPC. Jasek-Rysdahl will share these notes and comments with RSCAPC before our next AS meeting.

Moore echoed O'Brien's desire to move the process forward. One of the key goals the President brought to us was to get the money to colleges and faculty in an expedient ways to have money to do the research they wanted to do. He hopes we do put urgency behind it. We've lost so much time. We had the money in fall, and now we're into the spring semester and still haven't figured out how to distribute the funds and that's most important.

Strong said it's important that distribution be thru the colleges. He appreciates the work of the committee in bringing forth the policy in a rapid fashion as Jasek-Rysdahl alluded to. We used an ad hoc committee, and

then the SEC and Strong met about the issue and decided to refer it to this committee. The RSCAPC got together and brought forth the policy in a very expeditious fashion and he appreciates that. He supports the policy that will be a resolution next week.

Eudey understands that it's valuable to get the money out but also want us to be comfortable with the process that is put in place. This money is apparently for the sake of research productivity, but we're not clear how an increase in available funding may influence RPT reviews. What will the expectations be for those who do not get funding? There are many who are concerned with how our primary focus on teaching is supported by these research funds. Clearly research can and should increase the quality of our teaching, we've addressed this via our EER, but we haven't talked about how this funding facilitates this. I am concerned about college-based funding instead of using the centralized process we currently have. As Marcell indicated, college-based funding limits the funds available to any one faculty member and suggests that research funding needs are directly correlated with college FTE distribution. I don't think the policy addresses the needs of interdisciplinary scholars as college-based distribution doesn't provide clarity on projects that involve faculty from more than one college. I am also concerned that colleges won't appropriately know how to evaluate library and counseling research and may not privilege them. I am also concerned that those going up for full professor may want funds, and didn't apply for RSCA initially to give probationary a chance and now want to try for this funding since it is extra funds not initially available. I am also bothered by a process that requires six colleges to develop new committees and processes when we already have a university-wide committee established to do this kind of work. When faculty workloads are as stretched as they are, and service is being devalued, I do not see the benefit to adding a duplicative college-based committee. I would prefer this was LAC reviewing, and without a convincing rationale indicating why not to use that process I will vote against it.

McGhee wanted to address some concerns about the policy the words to "strongly urge" funding for probationary faculty. Perhaps a two-fold approach with a pool that might be directed toward probationary and one for non-probationary faculty who are not quite at deadwood. There could be a problem of bias because in his college there are five probationary faculty. When you get in a situation when you have a strongly established college with almost everyone has gone through probationary status, you wouldn't want this weighted just to one or two faculty. Maybe be need some more flexibility in the statement.

Strahm appreciates the conversations since this started. She likes the conversations it has instigated because it shows the complexities of the field. The cross-college issues, and all sorts of things were new to her and she likes that we're taking time to consider this even though she knows some people want to get policy through. Through this discussion we get to see the inner workings. Why are the library services and counseling services folded in and not on their own? Jasek-Rysdahl cannot give an adequate answer, but it may be because it's such small amounts if not folded in, but he's not sure.

Akwabi-Ameyaw was curious about the usefulness of the last sentence given the fact that this is one time funded enterprise. If one-time and Deans are encouraged to use leftover funds for RSCA, what are we talking about? Jasek-Rysdahl said this came up because sometimes people get grants and for some reasons don't spend all they were awarded. The question of what happens with that money was addressed via this statement. Instead of going back to the President, the policy says that it stays with the colleges, and because it was initially allocated for research it should stay for research.

Marcell followed on with questions about this sentence. Does this address a situation when the college distributes less than was allocated and keeps it, or only what's leftover? Jasek-Rysdahl said there is some final report due in 2012 where you indicated how funds were used, and if you aren't going to spend all of the money this statement indicates what happens to the money. For example, you might have submitted a

proposal because you had a plan, and it depended on additional funds and these fell through and you're not able to use the money. In this case the money is not returned to President and stays with college. Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that the committee can likely address this more clearly next time. Jasek-Rysdahl said it's not about unallocated money, as the colleges should plan to distribute all of the funds. It's about what to do if all the funds aren't used as intended. Marcell indicated that this wasn't fully clear by the statement.

Akwabi-Ameyaw asked how you "encourage" a dean. Strong says it happens all the time. Jasek-Rysdahl can't answer that, but will be sure RSCAPC gets the question.

Eudey noted that this is a discussion item today so that there is lots of time for conversation to continue in departments and colleges before this comes to AS for a first reading in two weeks. O'Brien isn't the only one to suggest that this might be an issue for which we might waive a second reading, and if there is a chance this will occur it's especially important for you to come to the meeting next time knowing what your departments think of the proposed policy. It is very important to consult and come back with as much information as possible. If you are unable to attend next time be sure to have a proxy who knows what your department's interests are.

McGhee always leery of a situation we do once, and are told don't worry about it being replicated in the future. Once it's done once, there's a wider spot there, and we might not go in another direction. Careful consideration will be placed on this because if it continues, the policy we come up with now if not a complete bomb might be adopted by default because we're in a rush and seems to work, will get entrenched.

## **8. Open Forum**

Eudey asked about the status of the Strategic Plan Working Group.

Jasek-Rysdahl said SPWG hasn't met for a while. We perhaps met last in November. This needs to be gotten to again.

Strong said he'll call the group together and schedule a meeting.

Sarraille, speaking as CFA Chapter president, noted that he learned the administration is attempting to satisfy a request that the chapter made for information, and has sent a message to department chairs to get information off approved course proposal forms. On behalf of the CFA, he apologizes for the workload added, but it's information he feels is needed to pursue a grievance in process. He would like to ask you to do the best you can to get the information, and please pass this along to your chair. Do the best effort to get the information. Whatever you can do to help CFA with this will provide some data to help analyze the workload situation here more carefully.

Regalado has a query for the student representatives. At a prior meeting you raised an item involving the use of Chartwells and kicking up their fees to student groups using facilities. He is curious where that stands. ASI was going to look into it or bring some more information to senate. Contreras said it went to ASI senate, and is being worked on. They took some concerns to Chartwells. She's not sure the status, but knows there have been a lot of complaints.

## **9. Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn at 3:00pm.