

<p>Academic Senate November 9, 2010</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Baker, Bettencourt, Bice, Burroughs, Contreras, Cotton, C. Davis, De Cocker, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Grobner, Held, Jasek-Rysdahl, Keswick, Manrique, Marcell, Marshall, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Noble, O'Brien, Pahal, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Provost Strong, Regalado, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Silverman, C. Stessman, Strahm, Stone, Wallace and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Lynette Richmond for Dawn McCulley,</p> <p>Guests: Lauren Byerly, Halyna Kornuta, Richard Torres, Dennis Shimek, and Deans Jaasma, Moore, Nowak, and Flores.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Second Reading of 7/AS/10/SEC/UEPC Resolution Official Program Limits. Passed unanimously by voice vote.</p> <p>Second Reading of 11/AS/10/GC Dissertation Policy Resolution. Passed by voice vote.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, November 23, 2010 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by: Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1. Call to order

2. Approval of Agenda

FAC has asked us to remove item 8.c. Conflict of Interest Guidelines from the agenda so that they can review it some more. Otherwise no changes

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of October 26, 2010

Minutes are accepted as distributed.

4. Announcements

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee was brought forward last time as an information item, and the President sent out some information about it via an email to the campus community. The group met today for the first time, and talked about how they would communicate with the campus. They're trying to set up a website to post meeting minutes, agendas, etc. so that all can see what is being discussed. Provost Strong thought that the meeting went well. Jasek-Rysdahl said that once there are regular notes, they will be shared by the four members of the TRPC.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that in the UBAC report it was recommended that a committee be formed to consider the possibility of college reorganization to address budget issues and maintain pedagogical sense. President Shirvani supported the recommendation and has worked with COC to develop the committee. Jasek-Rysdahl listed the names of the faculty members on the committee which includes someone from each college.

1. CBA, David Lindsay
2. COA, Stephen Thomas
3. CNS, Ian Littlewood
4. COE, Susan Neufeld
5. CHSS, Keith Nainby
6. CHHS, Harold Stanislaw

The ad hoc Reorganization Committee was formed following a UBAC recommendation, and they will get feedback and information from the campus community.

Stessman noted that the CIS faculty have asked UEPC to consider discontinuation of the major and minor in CIS. As part of the policy, UEPC is holding an open forum to let people express opinions and do fact finding. The open hearing will be held on Thursday, November 18th, 2010, from 2:00-4:00p.m., in MSR 130. If you cannot attend and would like to provide written input, you may submit your input to Chad Stessman, via email at CSUS.CIS.DISCONT.UEPC@gmail.com. Correspondence can also be given to a UEPC member or can be mailed to UEPC to the attention of Randi Esau, at MSR 368.

Because of the committee's desire to receive candid input, all correspondence will be held in the highest confidence. Unless specifically indicated in the letter or email that it can be shared with the public or further permission is granted by the writer, only official committee members and support staff will see the contents of the letters. Only generalizations and/or quotes that cannot be attributed to the writer will be included in any reports. Committee members will not discuss specifics of letters with anyone other than fellow committee members, and all non-public letters/emails will be destroyed in a timely manner.

You can submit your comments to committee members:

Chad Stessman (Chair, 2010-2011)

Bill Foreman (Chair-elect, 2010-2011)

Mark Bender - CHSS

Eric Broadwater - COA

Pamela Contreras - ASI Student Representative

Maryann Hight - Library

Tzu-Man Huang - CBA

Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl - Speaker of the Faculty

Judith Keswick - CHHS

Mira Mayer - COE

Kenneth Schoenly - CNS

Halyna Kornuta - Executive Secretary

Randi Esau - Recording Secretary

Stessman asked everyone to share this information with anyone that might have feedback to share. Please let them know about this, in particular alumni or potential employers. Stessman has tried to contact some, but may not be able to reach all who should have input. UEPC wishes to make a well informed recommendation.

Jasek-Rysdahl said this is an important issue as faculty have control over the curriculum. We should take this seriously, so please attend or provide feedback as you can. Please pay attention to this and look at what is going on with this. It's not something that should be quiet and left for others to deal with.

Nagel asked when was the last time that we discontinued an academic program.

Poole indicated Vocational Education. Cognitive Studies was considered and retained, but French was discontinued.

Nowak noted that we should be careful when we talk about eliminating a program. This is the elimination of a degree, and the program is not being eliminated as it is taking the shape of a concentration. We need to be clear when using terms.

Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that those attending the AAUP conference on shared governance will be himself, Koni Stone, Provost Strong, Dennis Shimek, John Sarraille and Dave Colnic.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that last week he learned that Trustee Farar will be visiting our campus next week. He's working to discover who is meeting with the trustee. Please let Jasek-Rysdahl know what information

should be shared with the trustee. As he gets ready for the meeting, he'd like input on what he should provide or get from the meeting.

Pahal said ASI will discuss SB 1070, which highlights racial profiling and discriminatory aspects. The discussion is tonight at 5pm. ASI will be voting on a resolution that stands against the discrimination and racial targeting of SB 1070 this upcoming Tuesday, November 16th at 5pm inside the Carol Burke Student Lounge.

SB 1070, known as the "Papers, Please" law, would require ALL people in the state of Arizona to carry proof of citizenship and allow law enforcement officials to arrest anyone through "reasonable suspicion". Groups across the nation are standing up in opposition to this law and demand that such laws not be enacted in their own states while urging their local, state, and national leaders to stand-up against the discrimination of minority groups and people of color.

Pahal expects a large turnout, especially given the campus demographics. This is important for ASI to do. They will try to notify congressional and state leaders including CSU and CSSA. NPR recently discussed the prison industry and their role in writing the law. As student leaders, they feel it's a nationwide issue. He's asking anyone to wear a blue ribbon next Tuesday, November 16th in support of this.

McGhee announced that tomorrow at 10:30am there will be a "raising of the flag" ceremony honoring veterans. The American Legion will be here, and there will be meetings with veterans for about two hours after that.

Petrosky said that MOM was happy to hear from the Society of HR Management. They were informed that their student chapter with 172 members is the largest in the country. They're larger than the University of North Carolina which came in second place.

Contreras said that she attends the City Council meetings on the second Tuesday of the month and reports on ASI and CSU Stanislaus. If you have things you'd like her to announce, please let her know.

Jaasma has a handout about winter intersession. The first page lists approved courses and the second is a description of how the fees have been assessed. If you read the President's email, there was an indication of scholarships to make up the difference between UEE and stateside costs. They have capped all fees so that no student will be paying more than stateside fees.

McGhee asked about students who currently have financial support for stateside, are UEE fees covered by that program? He's told that 100 students are attending school because their parents are disabled vets and they get fee waivers. These students don't have to pay fees for stateside, so if this is not covered they would be subject to fees. Jaasma said to have them contact the UEE office and they'll check into this.

Sarraille asked how what the average student pays per unit in the fall/spring compares to what will be charged per unit in the winter intersession. Jaasma said that a student who takes exactly three units in the winter intersession pays less than a student who takes exactly three units in the fall or spring, and indicated that she did not know the answer to Sarraille's question.

Garcia said there was a lot of discussion when we removed the winter term. At what point will there be a report that describes what the winter intersession will look like. Jaasma asked if it should come out of UEE or a faculty committee. Jaasma said that she can generate such a report if this body would like one. Garcia said he doesn't speak for the body and just asked the question.

Pahal said that at the President's forum that the President had indicated that there would be a lot of classes offered, similar to what was offered before. Is this the entire list? Jaasma said this is all that Dean's submitted. These are the submissions received.

Filling said that on the second page regarding fees, it says "*if a student registers for 6 units the UEE cost is \$1,650, however the student would not be charged that amount.*" That is tied to unit charges and not what UEE spends. Jaasma said she doesn't know what UEE spends at this time. Filling said the cost is tied to the price, not to the expense of teaching.

Silverman asked if we can develop some questions and send them to Dr. Jaasma so she has time to gather the data.

Cotten asked how many course proposals were submitted and what were the standards used to approve them. Jaasma said they included all that were submitted by the Deans. Deans sent forward requests, and she's not sure how many they received.

Cotten asked what course were submitted to Jaasma from his college? Jaasma noted that Jim Tuedio could answer that question.

Eudey's understanding is that there were some Deans that encouraged or discouraged proposals due to the impact on FTES for spring as the winter intersession won't count towards the FTES. As Inner Pahal indicated at open forums the President promised many courses would be available but faculty didn't think so. This is partly due to FTES as the summer and winter doesn't count. We're currently low on FTES. There may have been intentional encouragement to limit offering too many courses during the winter intersession to avoid reducing the campus FTES. This may have served some of the purposes and undermined what winter intersession might be.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that this is an important issue and we should send questions to Marjorie Jaasma and copy Jasek-Rysdahl or I. Pierce. If you haven't asked questions please send them forward as these are critical issues.

Regalado followed up on what Pahal said earlier. They claimed to offer almost the same number of courses in the UEE format for the winter intersession. The President said that several times and Regalado is curious how the President could make such a claim before anyone submitted any courses. It boggled his mind as well how that claim could be made with no information.

Regalado announced that the Phi Alpha Theta will have a fundraiser at Fat Cats. There will be several bands including his own which will open up the evening at 7pm. The event is on Monday, November 22nd beginning at 7pm.

Pahal mentioned that the Planning Commission approved building a bowling alley across the street. This will be a family oriented venue with a sports bar. This should be voted on by City council in December or January. The plan is to have it open in the next 2-3 years.

Regalado had a query about an earlier announcement indicating that the UBAC recommendation for the creation of a committee. Is that the same as the UBAC resolution that was sent out by the Academic Senate? Jasek-Rysdahl noted that these are two different things. The recommendation mentioned was by UBAC to form a committee to examine the feasibility of saving money by reorganizing the colleges. That's all the Reorganization Committee is meant to do. They are not charged to come up with a proposal, but are charged to investigate it.

Pahal noted that a senator-at-large position has opened up. Please have students contact him at aspresident@csustan.edu or come by his office. Strahm asked if that included graduate students. Contreras said yes, as long as they're not in their first semester and have above a 2.5 GPA.

Strong asked if the Reorganization Committee recommended by UBAC would decide if the reorganization makes sense, but the committee is not precluded from making a proposal. Jasek-Rysdahl said there are two options - they will find out that it doesn't make sense, or may develop a proposal. If there is a proposal then there will be another process that follows. Strong said that there is a reorganization policy to follow and the committee was formed using that policy.

Jasek-Rysdahl welcomed guests Lauren Byerly, Richard Torres, Dennis Shimek, and Deans Jaasma, Moore, Nowak, and Flores. He introduced Halyna Kornuta the new AVP of Academic Affairs & Accreditation Liaison Officer. Kornuta acknowledged how many faculty she has already met and that she is looking forward to meeting everyone.

5. Committee Reports/Questions

Regalado is curious if the UBAC resolution from the October 12th Senate meeting has been responded to from the administration. As you pursue the Ad Hoc Trust Restoration Planning Committee, a response from the President might prove to be helpful. There are some similar principles in the UBAC resolution that might save a lot of time.

Jasek-Rysdahl said we haven't heard anything from the President, and is not sure it was sent to the President as it's on the FBAC agenda for tomorrow. Sarraille said that FBAC will meet tomorrow, and we haven't heard anything from the President in any venue even addressing the question of when UBAC will meet next.

Regalado is wondering what the purpose of the ad hoc TRPC is if this is the kind of response we will get from the administration on important issues.

Jasek-Rysdahl will check to make sure the resolution has gone to the President in the first place.

O'Brien addressed the SWAS issues, and said that Filling and he are coordinating notes to send to everyone. CFA gave an extensive report and bargaining is contentious. Although, they did note that the system had a remarkable change after November 2nd. Before the Board of Trustees this week is a 3% salary increase for employees, and we have to see how that moves forward.

Filling added that they met with the Vice Chancellor for HR and the CFA folks jointly, and they announced that they had no intentions of ending the FERP program. Please convey this to your colleagues.

6. Action Items

a. Second Reading of 7/AS/10/SEC/UEPC Resolution Official Program Limits

Stessman offered highlights of changes. Two Senate meetings ago he discussed this resolution, and was asked to get additional information from Institutional Research. He's added a sentence indicating "*the normal unit load is 15 units but students can take up to 19.*" There is a typo and the 19 needs to be changed to 18. Note the change of the unit limit to 18 from 19 from the last version. Also note that we've added back in the statement about summer as follows "*The maximum for which a student may enroll during the summer term is 10 units.*" They've discovered that they have no control over units in a self-support per term, but can limit the total UEE courses applied to the degree.

The rationale is that under the 4-1-4 calendar students could take 37 units total, and if we don't increase that number of units students are limited to 32 units maximum, 5 units less. They can take more if they get special permission and enroll at the beginning of a class. They realize that the higher load may be more of a burden on students, but thought this was a fairness issue that they didn't need permission for this number of units before. The 18 unit limit is because if students take 120 units to complete a degree, in 4 years they have to take 15 units per term. At 16 units they can't get behind and only would have one additional unit to complete, and they can catch up with the 18 units. They recognize that they can do more with special approval.

Looking at the GPA data, from the previous 4-1-4 system, students taking excess units in spring and fall were higher than others with a B to B+ range, while others were in the B to B- range. That's not necessarily what will happen as we move forward, but he hopes that people would consider this resolution with changes.

Sarraille said he was basically in favor of this resolution. He remarked that to get enough information about the distribution, when relating the grades of students who take various unit loads, it would be better to quote the variances along with the average GPA's.

McGhee clarified that this continues to be the limit in the summer, but students can go over with authorization in any term. He wants to confirm a procedure to get over the limits. Stessman said yes, it's all possible with the chair's signature. McGhee said these are young adults and they need to manage some of their stuff themselves. This takes a middle ground of what is expected of us and them, and it can be a good learning environment to help students mature.

Garcia is concerned about the second paragraph. With regard to the 5000 level courses, he thinks that the language is problematic if referring to graduate students. Regularly graduate students take more than 12 units now; it's typically 15 units for full time graduate students.

Poole said when the resolution first came out she looked at the graduate catalog. This resolution is amending the undergraduate policy.

Eudey noted that one concern raised last time was the need to provide good advising for our students for academic planning. She is in support of the resolution, but we as advisors can help students plan for the future whether or not they're taking over 18 units. Knowing that students will have this opportunity, whenever advising we need to talk to them about future semesters. Keep in mind that we have more responsibility to help our students to make those important decisions.

Silverman wants to add evaluation criteria to measure the success of this approach. Perhaps something along the lines of, "one and two years from now we should review the GPA scores to see if they have changed drastically downwards so that we might revisit this resolution. He's proposing an amendment putting in criteria to measure the success of this resolution. Silverman noted this would be a third resolved that would say "If this GPA one year from now and two years from now drops below 3.2 for students taking 17 units or more using the same measure as here, then perhaps we need to revisit this resolution." Seconded by Petrosky. Nagel said 17 wouldn't be the maximum under this change, so do we mean 19 or more? Silverman agreed -- we can compare the GPA under current system for 19 or more against the new system with GPA of 19 units or more.

McGhee said we meet criteria for two semesters for 16 units or less. This doesn't allow for a natural variation for what is happening. To change the policy that was just adopted, starting where we are doesn't give a natural range of motion. Perhaps setting a 2.75 or 3.0 GPA would give some flexibility to show a

trend rather than slight movements up and down.

Petrosky said the flexibility is still there. The trigger isn't to change it, it's to revisit.

Davis asked if we have to say we revisit this if it hits a certain number, but instead say that a year and a half from now we'll check on it. She agrees that we can see if we're causing difficulties, but does not agree with setting a GPA number.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked if we're willing to change this to say we will revisit this to check GPAs. Stessman prefers to say in a year or two UEPC will look at the data again and decide.

Peterson said it should be a 3rd resolved that says: *In 2 years UEPC will review the GPA's of students taking more excess units and the opinions of faculty and students regarding unit caps to see if this should be revised again.* Silverman agreed with this revision, as did Petrosky.

McGhee suggests this should be reviewed every two years. This should be an ongoing policy. Maybe for conditions over time, a continual review every two years may be a better approach. This is not necessarily a change but allows for better follow up. Silverman did not accept this suggestion.

McGhee thinks it would be a better approach to amend the resolution to have the review occur every two years. C. Davis seconded.

Peterson thinks it would be a mistake. She has been on UEPC, and there are lots of things to do. If there aren't any problems we shouldn't have to review it. People can always bring problems to UEPC, but to constantly have it on the agenda could be a problem.

Voice vote on the proposed amendment from McGhee failed.

Sarraille said in the second resolved it says the maximum for which a student may be enrolled in the summer term is 10 units. Is that an absolute maximum or the same as the 18 units in a regular term? Stessman said that is the policy for limits without permission with the understanding that we can go over with special permission.

Baker noted that the prior strike out indicated additional units in the summer may require approval. Why was that statement stricken rather than just remove the winter term? Stessman noted that the "Additional units in the summer term require the approval of the major department chair on an Add/Drop form and should no longer be stricken out. All agreed to that change.

Amendments from Peterson and Baker were clarified and reviewed. The amendments passed unanimously by voice vote. The following resolution on official program limits passed unanimously by voice vote.

07/AS/10/SEC/UEPC Resolution Official Program Limits

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approves the below revision to the Official Program Limits that are currently listed on page 25 of the 2009/10 University Catalog; and be it further

Resolved: That the revised Official Program Limits be effective beginning with the spring 2011 semester.

The normal unit load is 15 units but students can take up to 18. "A student who wishes to register for more

than 18 units for fall or spring semester must obtain the approval of the major department chair at registration on an Add/Drop form. The maximum for which a student may enroll during the summer term is 10 units. ~~The maximum for which a student may enroll during a winter term is five units, and during summer term, 10 units.~~ **Additional units in a winter and summer term require the approval of the major department chair on an Add/Drop form.** Enrollment for approved excess units is permitted beginning the first day of class. Units taken for Credit by Examination do not count toward excess units; however, concurrent enrollment courses, audited courses, and courses in which a student is making up an incomplete grade are all counted as part of the student's total course load, making them applicable to this regulation.

Resolved: In 2 years UEPC will review the GPA's of students taking more excess units and the opinions of faculty and students regarding unit caps to see if this should be revised again.

When courses in the 5000 series are included, a program normally may not exceed three courses or 12 units in fall or spring. Students with outside responsibilities are advised to reduce their study loads proportionately."

Rationale: Currently, students are allowed to take up to 16 units per fall or spring semester without seeking additional approval of the major department chair. With the removal of Winter Term, the University Educational Policies Committee recommends increasing the number of units to 18 without students needing to seek additional approval of the major department chair. Other CSU campuses on a 2-semester system allow students to take up to and including 18- units without additional levels of approval.

Senate approved 11/9/10

UEPC approved 9/23/10

Revised 11/2/10

b. Second Reading 11/AS/10/GC Dissertation Policy Resolution

Poole noted there were two slight changes in the policy based on discussion. The first in section two was some discussion on how this would apply if the program didn't require a dissertation, or if it required something other than a dissertation. The additions and strike through indicates that this only applies if a dissertation is required. If something else is required a different policy would need to be established to guide it. The other issue is on number 7 regarding composition of the dissertation committee. Exceptions to the committee could allow someone with a doctoral degree to serve, and if the committee was larger than 3, what % could not have a doctoral degree. The change indicates that the program director can approve no more than one exception to the membership criteria regardless of the size of the committee. There wouldn't be any other leeway beyond that. Those are the only changes based on the discussion.

Strahm still has a problem with number 7. While being reflective, she has tried hard to figure out a way to find that acceptable. For her, she really doesn't like the notion of diluting the value of her PhD or anyone else's in the sense that the people who evaluated her dissertation and said she was acceptable to be a member of their club all had PhD's. She's thinking to herself if she were to continue here and get tenure and be in the position of evaluating someone who applies for a position; she would never hire somebody to be her colleague who doesn't have their dissertation being given to them from other people who have doctorates. She wonders how many people in this room have departments who would consider a person coming to them with a PhD granted by people who don't have one.

Sarraille said normally you'd want only PhDs on a committee, but he is aware of eminent researchers in his field who do not have PhD's, but who would be qualified. There should be some room for some exceptions.

Garcia observed that #12 speaks to co-authorship, and a dissertation cannot be co-authored. He thinks it

should be unnecessary because by definition it should be an independent undertaking. He wonders if it's there to ensure that if a program decides that there is an alternative to a dissertation, it would guard against co-authorships. He raises this due to precedent. There is language that indicates theses cannot be co-authored, but alternatives to a thesis could include a project that is co-authored.

Regalado asked last time about compensation for committee members. He has concerns that at the doctoral level it is required to have 3 members on a committee. At a research university members are compensated. At a teaching institution as we profile ourselves, we don't have the resources for a doctorate and cannot provide the compensation to those serving on a committee yet it's required to have 3 members on the committee. It seems not to be unreasonable to turn down committee membership. Poole said that's not a dissertation policy issue, that's a program issue. A program can have the resources to offer compensation.

Sankey said that dissertations in the sciences often do have co-authors, with dissertations written in papers. Poole noted that this issue would be governed by another policy. If the dissertation was not offered, but instead papers were offered, that would be under a different criteria. Sankey said they have discrete papers bound in a dissertation. Dissertation is authored by them, and the papers are co-authored. Garcia said that is his concern, if this is the policy then people will look to this to guide the decisions.

Eudey noted that there is time for a new policy to address alternatives to be developed. If by some stretch of the imagination we offer another PhD then we can create a policy which includes different alternatives that don't get matched to this policy. She thinks that we need a thoughtful policy to speak to alternatives if and when we get programs for which that is appropriate. Currently we have one PhD program and can take some time to think about an alternative policy.

Marshall noted that we just learned from the Chancellor's Office about opportunities for joint doctorates, perhaps including nursing. How would this policy apply to this? Poole said it will cover that and that there were members of the nursing faculty involved in drafting this policy and they are comfortable with it.

McGhee said we have different experiences of what a dissertation is supposed to be. It's hard to write something that doesn't cover everything. In his area, a dissertation is an original new piece, and you couldn't use something that you already had a written paper on. It depends on which area you're in as to what is a normal situation. This might be a policy that needs to adapt each time we get a new doctorate program since each has its own unique characteristics. We may not be able to write a general rule now because we're all different.

The following Dissertation Policy Resolution passed by voice vote.

11/AS/10/GC—Dissertation Policy

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate endorses the Dissertation Policy; and be it further

Resolved: That this be effective for spring 2011 upon approval by the President.

Rationale: On October 7, 2010, Graduate Council approved the Dissertation Policy, the first such policy on our campus. Although CSU Stanislaus currently offers only one doctoral program, it is anticipated that others may be offered in the future. As such, while EO 991 mandates some of the dissertation requirements within the Doctor of Education program, this policy is broad enough to encompass programs that may be developed. The policy ensures rigor in the dissertation across campus doctoral programs.

Approved by the Academic Senate 11.09.10

Approved by Graduate Council 10.07.10

7. First Reading Items

a. 13/AS/10/UEPC Resolution Two-Pass Registration System

Stessman moved the motion, seconded by Eudey. Students will continue to use the established priority system in its normal order as noted in the resolution, and sign up for up to 9 units initially. They will work through all of the groups in terms of priority, and then after the post-baccalaureates are registered, we would go back through the list again to sign up for additional units up to the set limits. This would begin in fall 2011 and a review would begin starting in spring 2012 to see what impact it's had. Subsequent reviews will be every 2-3 years. The rationale for this isn't well written. This first came to UEPC from the Math Department because of a stats class for sophomores who couldn't get enrolled in the class because they were low on the priority registration list. UEPC looked at the registration order.

John Mayer came to UEPC wanting to get student athletes higher priority, and suggested a system from Sonoma that includes a two-pass and priority registration to members of specific groups. There is a committee that votes on who gets priority and in what order. UEPC had a lot of debate on this, to change to priority by group. UEPC liked this idea because it maintains our established process but gives the average student a better chance to get important classes that may be filling up. He thinks this is a fair alternative to other alternatives they were considering.

Routh moved that this be tabled because Mayer cannot be here today and he is an advocate for this issue. He moved to hold off until the next Senate meeting when Mayer can be here. Nagel seconded. Voice vote was inconclusive so it was moved to a hand vote. Hand vote was 21-16 to table it. This resolution will return to the next meeting as a first reading item.

8. Discussion Items

a. Regular vs. Summary Notes for the Academic Senate

Eudey noted that we're bringing this to the Senate because we have near verbatim minutes and there have been questions to whether this is desirable. We want to ask for pros and cons for continuing to do it this way. Some have liked our very detailed minutes as it captures the flavor of the conversation, in the absence of roll call votes for certain issues. The minutes provide records of activities and recommendations to the Senate that some can use in RPT files or track the concerns raised. Others have suggested more abbreviated minutes would make the workload easier and make it more likely that folks will read the minutes. Some felt that maybe more members of the Senate will be comfortable in speaking out at the meetings. Given that there is no institutional requirement to do it one way or other we are asking for your input. Note that most committees do not offer verbatim notes, and we want to see what people's preference is.

Eudey noted that in several months she will not return as clerk as this is her 3rd year, and there is no assigned time offered for the investment of time. It has sometimes made it harder to recruit a clerk.

What is your preference, and do we want this level of detail? Does it provide a more useful record than more summarized minutes? Does it limit discussion because of the officialness of the record? Is it an appropriate use of the Clerk's and Executive Assistant's time to produce?

Sarraille said he felt perhaps entitled to speak because he has been clerk twice. We verge now on recording enough to completely reconstruct the meeting, word for word. We may not need that much, but it's not very helpful to have minutes that only note who moved and seconded items and if they passed or didn't. He has seen minutes that are extremely disappointing because you can't tell what ideas were expressed. Two weeks after a meeting, when we approve the minutes, probably people don't read them because it's too much of an investment of time, but as Speaker he has gone back and researched the minutes of meetings that happened

years before, trying to discover what the issues were and what was said. It is important that minutes carefully convey the gist of what was said about the issues.

Nagel thinks that a problem with summary minutes is not having the content of what people may or may not agree on that accurately summarizes what happened at the meeting. Besides the historical memory value of the minutes, it could be contentious what the minutes say in a summary content.

O'Brien is in favor of regular minutes for all of our colleagues who aren't here. There may be a burning issue on the agenda that they want to see what happened. It's more for them than us. McGhee agrees, we may remember what was said, but others may get a flavor of what was discussed, the ebbs and flows, and a summary does not do justice. The more detail leads to more transparency and gives more of a sense of what they are looking at.

C. Davis is conflicted. She was asked to run for clerk and said no because of the workload. She noted that in the past when there were prior discussions and Nagel was able to go on line and find the minutes. We can go online and immediately find the information.

Keswick thinks it's great as a new person to read about prior people's arguments. It helps her to make a decision for a second reading. She thinks the exact words really help.

Garcia said perhaps we need to figure out how to give workload credit to others.

Eudey likes the verbatim minutes as well and also reminded people that they can also share ideas in other formats, if comfortable sharing input on this or other topics during the Academic Senate meetings.

Sarraille wonders if technology can help. He's thinking of a recording microphone to talk into so we would have an audio transcript of the meeting. As part of the workload issue, maybe we should try to also consider technological things to help with the workload.

Strahm is speaking to the "uncomfortable saying thing" issue. We're here representing our departments not just ourselves. She has a problem with some idea that it's okay to sit in a room of people and saying something but not wanting it written down and saved. This is the body that ostensibly makes decisions for ourselves and students, and we should be willing to go on the record.

Kornuta isn't speaking for or against detailed minutes, but there is a need to walk through and think about how much we want to be recorded. Some of her classes have taken to using the Livescribe pen. This is a pen with a recording device and camera in it. As you write it records what people are saying and takes notes. You can turn it on and off. You write on a piece of paper with squares, and download to a computer and comes out as PDF page. You point to where they spoke and bring up the conversation from that point. Acoustics are a problem in this room, but it might work in other settings. It's a good tool for some to use, and is just over \$100 or \$150. It works on Apples and PCs.

Sarraille said it would be nice if the Livescribe pen could write it down for us.

Silverman said that the newest windows office Word software has voice recognition capability which will type into Word document whatever you speak into it. However, it works only for people with a good American accent. The voice recognition software may also have difficulty with many speakers because for best results it is trained to work for one specific speaker and does have problem to understand another person. There is speech recognition software that can be used without training, but Silverman has not tried that software. (Dragon software).

Nagel would like to ask the SEC to look into getting assigned time for the Clerk. Jasek-Rysdahl also indicated the need to look into new technology.

b. Additional RSCA Funds

Jasek-Rysdahl offered a little background on this topic. The President sent an email about raising money for research and distributing it through the colleges instead of using the Leaves & Awards Committee. The Provost created an ad hoc committee including 5 of the 6 Deans, some staff, including Julie Fox and Nancy Lewis and three faculty members, John Sarraille, Marjorie Sanchez-Walker chair of LAC, and David Lindsay chair of RSCAPC.

Sarraille distributed a draft of the first criteria to develop a process for how the additional \$100K from the President should be distributed. Sarraille is asking for some input and reactions from the Senate.

Jasek-Rysdahl said SEC talked to the Provost about this, and told him that we wanted to bring this to the Senate. SEC thought that anything that the committee came up with should come to the Senate. If this process is institutionalized, it needs to be evaluated. At this time this is a onetime process for this year. If it becomes a regularly funded item, we will need a more detailed process.

Sankey asked where the funds came from. Jasek-Rysdahl said that the President responded that the money came from Foundation funds to use as his discretion. The President also noted that these are people who are non-discriminatory, but he did not give more details. Jasek-Rysdahl can ask again.

Flores said that it was discussed in his college to use the funds for reassigned time for research. He asked if we will be able to defer the funds to the fall semester as it seems a short timeline.

Moore said as far as the dates go, the understanding is that the President would like to see the money used as soon as awarded. In the committee meeting yesterday they talked about how long the calendar should be. Initially, they looked at a period from February 2011 to the end of 2012, but they thought that was too long. They ended up with a December 31, 2011 deadline to use the funds.

Flores asked if it could be used in the fall semester. Moore said yes.

Eudey has 2 concerns about this. The December 31, 2011 date noted in #4 is if awards are made by February 11th which is several weeks into the spring term. All assigned time would have to happen in fall 2011, and this is not the best distribution in her college. If we're not taking it this year then the deadline should go to June 2012 to allow for assigned time. Many projects take longer to get under way, and we're not technically working in the summer. We should have 1 academic year to use these funds. Eudey was also concerned with how funds are allocated according to FTES – how does this fit with cross-college research Library and Counseling faculty etc.

Silverman wondered if members of the committee to manage the new RSCA funds can think about introducing more transparency into the process of evaluating the proposals, giving feedback to the person who submitted the proposal. He's raised this question, because the "regular" RSCA (Leaves and Awards Committee) did not in his experience offer much transparency in their process.

Garcia would like to go back a bit. Why are we even looking at this process, and why this committee? Why not use the traditional faculty governance process to look at this through LAC?

Jasek-Rysdahl said that the President would like to use the colleges to give them the ability to distribute the

money. Some members of the faculty think they would like the colleges who know more about individual needs to have more control as opposed to LAC. He asked Provost Strong if he had more insight on this.

Provost Strong said that the email speaks for itself, and he doesn't have anything to add.

Flores said from the COE point of view because they went thru accreditation, one element for improvement was for scholarship and research opportunities in the COE. It's perceived, especially with the current economic situation, that there may not be support for that for COE. He appreciates having those resources available to support their scholarship and research.

Eudey would prefer to be using LAC using different criteria for the money to be fairly distributed to people. She hopes that this committee could give it to LAC to distribute the funds. SEC did ask that this committee bring the criteria to the Senate in the hope that this group would work on this with collegiality.

Sankey wondered if you can find out where the money comes from. Jasek-Rysdahl said he will ask again, as she is not the first person to ask this question. He will forward the answers he gets to this group.

Sarraille said that it's uncertain when the AdHoc committee on Additional RSCA funds will meet again. It seems that what the draft report and the email messages indicates is that they'd like this to be finished now and this be the plan. If this body wants the committee to meet again and answer the questions that have come up we should indicate that in some way to them.

Jasek-Rysdahl said this is why we're doing this now, to get feedback to give back to the ad hoc committee as they move forward. That's what we talked about to the Provost in SEC.

Sankey would like to hear back from the committee the next time we meet.

Moore asked if we can be more specific about why it should be under the current process, as opposed to being a funding opportunity that can be developed in a unique way by colleges and by the faculty of those colleges.

Eudey explained her viewpoints. One reason that the people making their proposals can identify why it's important for a College to do this is that this was not targeted money that was given to the University at large for a specific reason. There needs to be an opportunity to best serve the intellectual needs on campus and it should not be based on the FTES of a certain College. She would like it done at an institutional level as opposed to Colleges competing for these funds. She doesn't think that the most fair way is to distribute the funds based on the enrollments of Colleges. LAC would allow more flexibility to allow some of the funding to go towards things that RSCA can't do.

Poole said there is knowledge at the college level that it is difficult to be present in a committee that is representative of the entire University. She prefers giving the Colleges some authority to make decisions once a formula is made by the committee on how to it should be distributed. Perhaps there could be some funds made available for cross-college proposals. She likes the idea of giving colleges flexibility within the college.

Garcia says that's the point of the original question. Would it be helpful to look at this to understand why we should do this through processes different than the traditional process, to articulate the strengths and differences? He sees a pragmatic issue and that is faculty workload. This plan is dependent on faculty doing this when we are already overloaded. Another committee and another set of priorities adds to an incredibly chaotic semester.

Sarraille says it is very much a question of logistics. It's awkward dealing with this the way it was tossed on the table. The idea of the colleges having a say in how the awards are distributed is laudatory, and there might be insights there that aren't being represented in LAC. There may be reforms of the LAC process that should be proposed. It really is a question of trying to determine where the decision is made and trying to balance efficiency with fairness to have a process that is successful. He thinks that there has been a failure in this instance for the parties involved to make the right kind of effort to make it all work smoothly with a minimum of inconvenience to all involved.

Flores has been on the RSCAPC previously, and a few from COE have been funded. Each dept. is asked to develop scholarship elaborations, and we need to focus research around elaborations since it's been evaluated on that basis. He's thinks that this is best done at the college level.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked if there was a chair of this committee. Moore indicated that it is Dean Goodwin. Jasek-Rysdahl will ask her to come to the next meeting to discuss this.

c. Conflict of Interest Guidelines (Referred by FAC)

Returned to FAC for further discussion, and may return to the Senate at a later date.

9. Open Forum

Filling wondered if the Provost asked if UBAC is scheduled to meet this year. Strong said not yet. He hasn't spoken to Russ Giambelluca, but he has not indicated if they have scheduled a meeting yet.

Contreras said that tomorrow the Board of Trustees will be voting on a 5% fee increase for spring 2011 and 10% for fall 2012, and if that passes they will be lobbying for a buyout. Pahal does not believe that the 10% will be taken back, and that it will become permanent. ASI will be fighting it, and the student trustee will be asked to vote against it. ASI is trying to get a bus or two filled with students to attend a rally.

Strong said the strategy with regard to the 10% increase for 2011-12 is that it would protect the \$106 million in stimulus funds which is one-time money. This gives us a position to plan for it. We don't want to be held to a higher enrollment target midyear. This is an attempt to stabilize an unstable budget situation and put the ball in court of the legislature. If you think it's not fair to students, buy it out and give us time to plan.

10. Adjournment

3:55pm