

<p>Academic Senate September 28, 2010</p> <p>Present: Baker, Bettencourt, Bice, Burroughs, Colnic, Contreras, C. Davis, De Cocker, Drake, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Grobner, Hauselt, Held, Jasek-Rysdahl, Keswick, Manrique, Marcell, , McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Noble, O'Brien, Pahal, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Provost Strong, Regalado, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Silverman, C. Stessman, Strahm, Stone, and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Cathlin Davis for Andrews, Jasek-Rysdahl for Bender, Dave Colnic for Cotten, Mark Thompson for Marshall, Trish Hendrix for Dawn McCulley,</p> <p>Guests: President Shirvani, Carl Whitman, Brian Duggan, Kristina Belanger, Susan Clapper, Tom Abrams, Dennis Shimek, Peggy Hodge, Neil Jacklin, Lauren Byerly, Deans Goodwin, Nowak, McNeil, Moore, Flores and Tuedio.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First and Second Reading of 05/AS/10/GC/FBAC/UEPC Change of name from Department of Nursing to School of Nursing. Passed unanimously by voice vote.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, October 12, 2010 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by: Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. Call to order
2:00pm

2. Approval of Agenda

The resolution under item 6.a should read 05/AS/10/GC/UEPC/FBAC to be consistent with what was sent out. Agenda approved as amended.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of September 14, 2010

The date on the minutes should read September 14, 2010. Minutes approved as amended.

4. Announcements

Duggan reminded all that next Wednesday, October 6th; the 7th annual CSU Stanislaus Technology Fair will be held from 10 am to 2:00 pm in the lobby of the MSR Administration Building. Brought to you by the Office of Information Technology and the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning, this event will give the University Community a chance to see innovative technologies for academic efforts in the classroom, the office, and home. The Technology Fair is free and open to faculty, staff, and students. Selected faculty will demonstrate technology used in their courses, and staff will have displays as well. Representatives from various companies will be attending. Door prizes for faculty, staff and students will be given out at this event.

Marcell reminded all that RSCA Week Presentations are the week of October 4-8, 2010. They would like more submissions from faculty to share their Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities. Faculty can display your photos, slides, exhibits, and three-dimensional work. Go online and see how easy it is to show your work.

1. Go to RSCA Week on the CSU Stanislaus website: <http://www.csustan.edu/events/rsca/>

2. Click on: the "Submissions" link

Invite your students to participate as well as this event provides a learning opportunity for students.

2. Sample undergraduate and graduate assignments are available at:

<http://www.csustan.edu/events/rsca/Assignments.html>

C. Davis indicated that UIRB is preparing a workshop describing the process. Graduate Students are

welcome as well as faculty. If you have people doing research, please remind them to use the most updated version of the forms. Please replace versions on hard drives with new ones. Note also, that phone numbers and room numbers may have changed.

Pahal and ASI will be in the quad the week of October 7th informing the student body about the lack of support for the CSU. ASI will have pictures of legislators with grades assigned to them indicating how well they're supporting Higher Ed. Pass this information on to your students.

Eudey announced that the Chancellor's office is supporting a Faculty Learning Committee to assess integrative learning in General Education. They will have up to 12 faculty members to participate in a learning community this academic year sponsored by funding from the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning. Participants will meet monthly from October through May, develop an assessment rubric, and utilize the rubric to assess integrative learning goals. Participants will also share the outcomes of the learning community project during a presentation to faculty members in a spring forum and will receive a small stipend upon completion of the project.

The learning community will be co-facilitated by Betsy Eudey, Susan Marshall and Lynn Johnson. There is a call out for representation from faculty for engagement in the Faculty Learning and Practice Community. Please respond to Ximena Garcia at MXGarcia@csustan.edu by noon, on Friday, October 1.

Pahal announced that he is working with the Hunger Network to set up a food pantry on campus. A survey showed students are skipping meals because they can't afford groceries. The Hunger Network is working on a business plan now. As soon as it is ready, they will seek a discrete location on campus to house the food pantry. He will keep us informed. They're trying to get it set up this semester, and it's looking good. He went to Fresno State and UC Berkeley to learn about their food pantry programs so we can try to help our students.

Jasek-Rysdahl reminded all of the Taste of the Valley Wine & Cheese Tasting event on Thursday October 7 at the Assyrian American Civic Club. Contact Ag Studies if you want tickets or want to get involved.

Jasek-Rysdahl welcomed guests, President Shirvani, Carl Whitman, Brian Duggan, Kristina Belanger, Susan Clapper, Tom Abrams, Dennis Shimek, Peggy Hodge, Neil Jacklin, Lauren Byerly, Deans Goodwin, Nowak, McNeil, Moore, Flores and Tuedio.

5. Committee Reports/Questions

Sarraille offered an addendum to the FBAC report. It appears that for the second time the President's forum has been scheduled at a time that conflicts with the FBAC meetings. Since often these forums include announcements of fiscal details, Sarraille is concerned about the scheduling. He asked for support in trying to get the events separated from each other. Sarraille sent an email to the President's office making this request.

Shirvani asked if 3:30pm would be a better time and wants to make sure everyone else is okay with the change in time. Sarraille said that 3:30pm is not quite late enough since FBAC meetings end at 3:30pm and they still need to allow time to get to the meeting. He suggested 3:45 or 3:40 would be better. Shirvani indicated that if the later time was okay with others he will change it. Agreed.

6. First Reading Items

a. Resolution 05/AS/10/GC/FBAC/UEPC Change of name from Department of Nursing to School of Nursing

See also the Report from the Ad Hoc Committee and A Proposal to Change the Department of Nursing to a School of Nursing. C. Stessman moved the resolution and Poole seconded. Stessman read the resolution as follows:

Be it Resolved: *That the Academic Senate endorses the Proposal for the Department of Nursing to change their name to a School of Nursing; and be it further*

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

Rationale: *On September 8 2010, Faculty Budget Advisory Committee concluded that the potential fiscal effects of the change were that there might be improved access to research grants, increased opportunities for donor funding, and some minor costs associated with changing the name in publications and flyers - costs which would be absorbed by the Department. Accordingly FBAC passed a resolution to the effect that it finds the proposal acceptable from a fiscal standpoint.*

Approved by UEPC 9.23.10

Approved by FBAC 9.08.10

Approved by GC 9.02.10

Jasek-Rysdahl noted this is a first reading and there is time for questions and discussion. O'Brien said that to him it looks fine. Since the chair of Nursing is here she might want to say something about it.

Hodge appreciated that it went through committees, and hopes to receive the support of the Senate. She's open to any questions.

Marcell asked if Hodge could clarify how the change would improve funding and research perspectives.

Hodge said within the discipline "School" is the standard. It's not that the mention of School that improves it, but being known as a department decreases the possibilities available to them. Being referred to as a "School" gets the program to a level playing field with other campuses.

McGhee motioned to waive a first reading and move to a second reading. Seconded by Strahm. O'Brien supports waiving the first reading as the document has gone through many meetings and has been seen multiple times. It seems like a second reading is natural.

Nagel said that generally we don't move to a second reading unless there is urgency for doing so because of process and procedures. One might think there wasn't urgency here.

McGhee said that if we wait until the next meeting we'll be in mid October and this could slow them down in the progression of filing for what might be useful for them. He would like to help Nursing move ahead with this.

Sarraille said we should ask if there is a sense of urgency. Hodge noted that the sooner the better to have something off their to-do list. She would love to have it move forward but understands that there are procedures to follow. She would appreciate it moving forward.

Eudey said that this proposal has been around a long time, and many things need to be updated if a change is made. She encourages a second reading. We all are working with deadlines coming up. It takes time to change websites etc. she thinks this will benefit nursing and the university. Overall she supports going to a second reading.

Hand vote supported moving to a second reading. Jasek-Rysdahl entertained comments for the second reading. McGhee spoke in favor of it. His wife is an ER nurse, and he sees the need for as much support for the nursing program and nursing students as we can provide. Anything that can move us forward and add our contributions to the profession would be helpful. Voice vote approved the resolution unanimously.

Congratulations were offered to the Nursing program.

7. Discussion Items

Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that we would allot approximately 25 minutes per topic.

a. Early Start

Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that SEC brought this item to the Senate because the Department of English offered a resolution. Math may also wish to speak on this. This garnered discussion at other universities and at the system level. Some SWAS Senators may wish to share more information as the Statewide English Council is on record opposing Early Start. Our English Dept. does not necessarily oppose Early Start, but opposes the mandatory nature of it. We wish to discuss today the implications on this campus.

O'Brien said this is extremely contentious in SWAS. Trustee Carter came to a meeting last week and spoke to the group for 90 minutes. This is something the Chancellor wants and it is EO #1048 in the Senate packet. Trustee Carter basically contends that the CSU has been working on remediation for 20 years and it's time to move forward with it. O'Brien would like the Math and English voices to be heard.

Thompson reminded all that the first remedial writing course is what we now call first year composition. From memory, it was in 1898 at Harvard. Students have always come to universities not prepared to write at the university. This is not a new CSU system phenomenon. The CSU has a history of demonizing admissible students who need developmental writing courses. They have had sanctions placed on them, EO 665, and now EO1048, both threaten students with disenrollment. The Senate should be concerned that the BOT has made a summer proficiency activity a de facto admission requirement. Faculty are to be in control of admission requirements. This is a new burden and it's discriminatory toward these students who need the most help as they come to the university. Early Start was opposed by SWAS and the English Council. Other English Depts. have prepared resolutions against the mandatory nature of Early Start. These EOs fall out of the sky. If development of the program falls under the scope of university governance, English would like to know more about that.

Jasek-Rysdahl read from the English Department resolution the 2 resolves as follows:

Resolved: *That the CSU Stanislaus Department of English oppose the mandatory nature of the Early Start Program (ESP), and be it, further*

Resolved: *That the Department of English urge the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate to adopt a resolution in opposition to the Mandatory nature of the ESP and to disseminate that resolution to the CSU Board of Trustees Chair Carter; Chancellor Reed; ASCSU Chair Postma; campus Presidents, Provosts, and Senate Chairs; the President of the CSU English Council; and the Chair of the CSU Mathematics Council.*

Jasek-Rysdahl said this is what is prompting this discussion to ask the Senate specifically if we want to do something. Is this something we want to pursue? We're not taking action today but we want some feedback.

Nagel asked whether SEC has discussed this in their meetings. He remarked that he thinks it would be appropriate for the Senate to have a resolution heard before it. He suggested that UEPC or SEC should offer the resolution. Jasek-Rysdahl said SEC has discussed it, and decided to get feedback on it from the Senate.

Eudey supports an Academic Senate resolution. Such a resolution can be of benefit for some students to have remediation before starting classes but should not be a condition for enrollment for many reasons. These students haven't had time to test due to their life circumstances. Many students need to work during the summer before the fall semester. She'd like to see Early Start offered us an opportunity but not make it mandatory. She's not opposed to the Early Start options, but is strongly opposed to the conditions prior to starting.

McGhee wonders what the financial implications are for students who may need to work before starting college and how many will be disproportionately hit if they have to attend summer school. It may be counterproductive if you want to get these students up to speed but they don't have the money. He doesn't negate the fact that they need to be prepared.

Noble said they have to engage in an activity before they enroll. Admitted students needing remediation will be required to do so as it's tied to enrollment not admission. O'Brien said Math and English are in the eye of the Early Start storm. How many freshmen are we putting in jeopardy if we put students in this program? Could we find ourselves 400 students short? Noble said that it's too early to tell, but this shouldn't affect the pool. We have to send proposals to the Chancellor by November, and we still need to see what other campuses have to offer. Next summer will be the test summer. It's too early to tell how it will affect our admit pool, but students would be admitted and required to go thru Early Start programming. At this point, the English and Math plans look pretty good.

Strahm said the Early Start program feels classist. As a poor, white student who finished high school testing at fifth grade, it foists the responsibility for the problems in K-12 onto a student and makes them financially responsible for something they didn't cause. She worries about the idea that a student can be disenrolled because they don't do something immediately in their first regular semester.

Filling said one thing motivating this is Carter's strong advocacy, which initially had to do with deleterious effects of non-credit semesters on self-images of incoming freshmen. He thought that our current systems like what Math and English are doing fixes the current students and not the underlying problem. But that problem is not something occurring in the CSU. We're the recipients of the problem, which originates in the K-12. The Early Start initiative may be well intentioned but it is fundamentally misguided. This is a requirement *after* admission to do something. Others are suggesting that online programs are okay. Filling's intuition is that is because other campuses are looking at the onslaught of people to remediate and part of problem and reason for the November review date is because it's intended to be a system wide decree. Students can be remediated at any campus and any other CSU campus will have to accept that remediation. Bakersfield experimented with Math remediation in Summer 09 and it was an abject failure. Success rate on closing exam was 38% when usually it's at 70%. Online remedial math may not work without some tweaking to the process. We have no data for online English remediation.

Thompson wanted to be clear about what Noble was reading. Sure you can be admitted but if you are not eligible for GE composition, you can be sanctioned under EO 1048. If you don't do proficiency activities you will be disenrolled or not allowed to register. It's not technically an admission requirement, but a way to prevent matriculation and it ends up being the same thing. The issue of non-credit classes, we don't have any non-baccalaureate credit English courses at Stanislaus so we don't contribute to that stain on the system. In a larger view, many English faculty are receiving invitations to a developmental education summit by McGraw Hill. CSU was not on the invitation, but many believe this is a cooperative venture. We are sending up a pedagogically sound proposal, and it would be unfortunate if it were not accepted at the Chancellor's Office. Maybe the Chancellor's Office and book publishers have their own vision of how to support students.

Silverman asked if there was a study to see the effectiveness of the program, for students who are and aren't in the program for English. Can we see the effectiveness based on studies? Jasek-Rysdahl said that this is a pilot. Thompson said that we'd be tracking students in different directions for success rates. English sees this as an opportunity to pilot things talked about for a few years, and is not necessarily dying to implement this. He looked at a stretch model at ASU, stretching over 2 semesters. CI and Fresno have implemented that as well. There is a lot of documentation and internal research at campuses and publications on this model. The proposal also includes directed self-placement. Other campuses in the system have internal

literature and research on these programs.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked if we want something to come back from SEC or UEPC on Early Start. We haven't heard anyone opposing the English resolution. Marcell acting as the devil's advocate asked what would happen if the Senate was in unison with the English Dept. What will it mean if we say we don't buy into this? Will the Chancellor's Office do something different, and what are the ramifications?

Nagel said in terms of refusing to participate, that's dangerous. CFA council has been fielding calls about this, and it's a bad idea from a faculty rights perspectives. CFA suggests that we do our work and grieve later. Refusal seems not the right way to frame this.

Tom Abram said that he first heard about this at the Math Chairs meeting, and they had a committee member from the Early Start Task Force from Northridge there. They stressed that we want to do something and be involved because if we don't do something it will be determined for us. The Math Dept. has been able to develop something and submit it.

Sarraille said that this was not the product of shared governance - that there was no significant input from faculty. Curricular experts haven't blessed EO 1048. Academics have an obligation to point out that this is wrong. Every Senate in the CSU should make a statement. He agreed with the caution that faculty should not refuse a direct order from supervisor, which might make them subject to discipline. However faculty should resist this in the appropriate ways. Those who must work on the implementation should try to minimize the damage. Our faculty have done that, but nonetheless, if we implement this, there will be damage to students.

Regalado asked how far away we are at having a resolution. Jasek-Rysdahl said we could bring something forward for the next AS meeting or we could send it to a committee to have them look at it some more.

Strahm thinks of this body as scholarship what we would do in our fields; a resolution offers new information to our leadership. We tend to develop myopic views when not exposed to new material, ideas. Resolutions from multiple campuses with different student bodies allows our leadership to learn new things. It would be nice to have a straw poll of what the sense of the body is to do that.

Filling noted that CFA said unit 3 employees [faculty, counselors and librarians] are contracted to do the work as described in the position description. This does not mean we have a duty to participate in hair brained schemes that make things worse - we are contractually obligated to engage in teaching and other activities, but those other activities do not have to include participating in badly-informed projects.

Eudey thinks we can move forward in two weeks in support. Jasek-Rysdahl did a straw pool. A majority was in support, so SEC will work on this.

Garcia echoed Strahm. Our obligation is to come back with quality information. The rationale for doing this has a vague but powerful statement. Early Start is likely being discriminatory on disadvantaged students. We need some hard data on this, and we need to provide that information to students. The student voice on this issue is important, and we can only weigh in with good information.

Stone worries about the mandatory nature will force those who depend on financial aid and summer work to the junior colleges. We get many transfers who didn't get their 4 year experience here. They're having a harder time in her Dept. with transfers so this may solve one problem and create another. Some will not get financial aid for remediation. Noble said there is supposedly a financial aid component with a year-round

Pell option. It might be different at each campus, and there might be cost variations campus to campus.

Thompson cited some information on the EO 1048 on pages 5-6. Financial aid information is there regarding eligibility as follows:

D. Financial Aid Eligibility

- 1. Matriculated students who are required to enroll in remediation during the summer immediately after high school and immediately preceding the fall term shall be classified as “early entrants.”*
- 2. As authorized in the August 12, 2002 letter from the U.S. Department of Education and reaffirmed by the Office of the Chancellor on May 5, 2010, “early entrant” students are eligible for all federal Title IV financial aid if they meet the following conditions:*
 - a. The student has been admitted to an eligible degree or certificate program for the fall term;*
 - b. The student is not required to take or complete any coursework or acquire any additional credentials before enrolling in the fall in the eligible degree program;*
 - c. The student, after being admitted to the eligible program enrolls as an “early entrant” in the summer term immediately preceding the fall term;*
 - d. The courses these students take in the summer term are not courses that they transfer into their eligible program in the fall. Rather, the students take courses in the summer term that are part of their degree program, either as required courses or elective courses, or are eligible remedial courses;*
 - e. The summer early entrant students are identified/coded differently by campuses from other students who are enrolled in the summer term but who are not admitted to an eligible degree program; and*
 - f. The students are otherwise eligible for Federal Title IV student financial assistance.*
- 3. Students who meet the conditions of 1 and 2 above may be eligible to receive Federal Title IV student financial assistance for their enrollment in Early Start summer courses. If they are eligible to receive federal financial aid, all Title IV regulations apply to them. For example, their efforts during the summer must be considered in the school’s measurement of satisfactory academic progress, and to the extent that any of the regulations do not allow individual treatment of students, they must be treated in the same fashion as other eligible students in the consideration of loan and other aid.*

4. Pell Grant Eligibility

- a. Students who meet the conditions in 1 and 2 above may be eligible to receive Federal Title IV Pell Grants for Year-Round enrollment, e.g., summer, fall, winter/spring, provided they meet certain unit and academic progress requirements:*
 - 1. The student must have a Pell eligible Expected Family Contribution (EFC) and meet Title IV eligibility requirements;*
 - 2. Summer will be the leading term of the Pell Grant award year;*
 - 3. To receive a Pell Grant for the winter/spring term(s) that would result in the receipt of a second Pell Grant award, the student’s enrollment during this period must advance the student beyond an academic year’s worth of units (typically 24 semester units or 36 quarter units);*
 - 4. During the term in which the student receives funding from a second Pell grant award, the student must be enrolled at least half-time; and*
 - 5. Additional guidance regarding awarding two Pell Grants in an award year will be forwarded to campus financial aid officers at a later date.*

Thompson also noted that on Page 2 of 7 in the EO 1048 notes the membership of the implementation team is as follows:

Membership of the Implementation Team will consist of:

- two provosts or vice presidents for Academic Affairs;*
- two vice presidents for Student Affairs;*

- *one institutional research officer;*
- *one enrollment services/admissions officer;*
- *three faculty (the Statewide Academic Senate, the Mathematics Council, and the English Council will each be asked to recommend one member);*
- *two students (the California State Student Association will be asked to recommend two members);*
- *one dean of Undergraduate Studies/associate vice president for Academic Programs; and*
- *one assistant vice chancellor appointed by the EVC/CAO.*

Thompson noted that since faculty are not the ones approving the campus plan, there is not consultative representation. The English Council is not sending a representative. There is very little faculty input on the implementation team. It's important to hear voices bubbling up from campuses to support faculty working on this. He appreciates that the Senate is amendable to getting a resolution from SEC.

McGhee said with year-round Pell is it spreading a dollar amount over 12 months or adding more funds. Noble said there is now a 12-month Pell that will expand the budget. Noble was concerned about this as well.

b. Governance/Leadership

Jasek-Rysdahl noted the Provost refers to this as WASC item 3. Last Friday Jasek-Rysdahl sent out feedback on the survey question about steps to take to build trust between administration and faculty. He used a Too Fast survey product. The survey was sent out to 425 email addresses and we got 101 responses. Some said it went to their junk mail, and some didn't get messages and dealt with it in other ways. This is a discussion item that SEC is looking for direction on. We held 2 forums last week with 20-25 people reacting and providing input. This is in response to WASC item #3 on the issues of tension affecting this campus for some time.

Thompson asked if Jasek-Rysdahl could generalize points from the forums. Jasek-Rysdahl has not had a lot of time to look at them, and would rather speak after others.

Regalado asked how comfortable some will be when still working their way to tenure. He feels that some may be quieter on this issue than may otherwise be. He's not sure how useful this discussion would be under these circumstances.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked how we can move forward. A suggestion is to look at this some more. Do some follow up questioning, assign this to committees to continue to address this and follow up with one response. It could be that we will want to continue to ask some questions if that would be more comfortable for some.

Garcia acknowledges what was said and that this may come from a position of privilege. He's thrilled to see the Provost and President here. He thinks this is powerful information and would love to hear more discussion. The forum he attended had a focus less about trust and more about shared governance. Attention should be on breaches of shared governance that have led to lack of trust. If there is no focus on shared governance, trust will not exist.

Sarraille said that is a theme that arose from the responses and the forum. The question was about trust, but many made a point that it may not be as much about trust, and it may to a large extent be about following proper procedure and policy and the established principles of shared governance as we know them. Jasek-Rysdahl said that in first forum he wondered where the term trust came from, and he discovered that the question was couched in the language from WASC. Maybe that's not the appropriate question to be asking. Shared governance and its violations may be where we should be focusing.

Regalado wondered how many of the comments gave the impression that they were comfortable with the

relationship between faculty and the administration. Jasek-Rysdahl said that he hadn't analyzed the data, but can't think of any that were.

O'Brien noted that #40 and #88 were positive comments. Poole said some people's comments suggested that part of the problem was faculty governance. When talking about the comfort with the relationship, that group may not be comfortable because of some actions of faculty and not the President. Nagel counted 7 such responses. Sarraile counted 8.

Jasek-Rysdahl said many also didn't respond and it's difficult to know why. Of the many responses, it didn't seem many were comfortable at all with the relationship between faculty and administration.

Provost Strong added input to address the charge in the WASC letter that says "*While the Commission joins the team in being careful not to ascribe blame to either faculty or administration for the divisive environment that characterizes the campus at hit time, it does, however, view the administration to be primarily responsible for fostering a climate of trust and for designing the initiative and circumstances that will provide for a resolution to this problem. The Commission therefore expects immediate, inclusive and productive endeavors to create a clime of collaborative and effective governance at CSU Stanislaus.*" The Commission is returning in fall 2011 to assure progress is being made. WASC has charged the administration to foster a climate of trust and it would behoove all of us to circle back to that charge as we will see WASC coming shortly. We need to prepare a plan to address the charge.

Thompson would like a clarification: is there an implication in the comments from the Provost that governance is not at the heart of our task.

Provost Strong suspects that that is an issue that needs to be resolved. He's trying to make the point that we have a specific charge from WASC that we need to address. How we do it is part of the process and that's what we're trying to decide. SEC made it clear they wanted to work to create the plan and determine the appropriate process and actions to make the situation better. Provost Strong is in agreement with that. He's been talking to Dept. Chairs and College Deans in smaller groups asking the same question that the Senate asked and what should we do at this point? We need to take a reasonable time to decide what to do but need to do something. We need input to do this together, and it's not going to be easy. It's clear from the comments he read that there is a lot of emotion involved and this is going to be a difficult challenge.

Filling said he doesn't think this is about doing something for WASC. It's about doing something for the university. He has spent 16 years on campus and it's time to have some healing begin. His interpretation of what WASC says is don't do stuff because we tell you to, do what makes sense to help you succeed and explain to us how that happens. Take the focus off WASC and figure out how to make our institution fully functional again.

Thompson followed up on the language as it's an interesting intersection: improving relations coupled with a very minute focus on specific words. He'd like to emphasize that the "*administration is responsible for fostering a climate of trust.*" Is that what the administration thinks they will be achieving by having the President's dinners and meetings? Could this be seen as *fostering* a climate of trust but we may end up with the same climate and situation we have now. This is not addressing what WASC wants us to, but it could be characterized as *fostering* a climate of trust. Yes, there is a lot of emotion in the responses to the survey, but those emotions are grounded in factual references. He agrees with Garcia that this is important data and not just a bunch of emotions.

Eudey noted the same point that emotions affect the way we engage in the process. The reason we have high emotions is because of the conditions we've been living under. We need to take into account the emotions

and the root causes that has led to this. It's very interesting the ways many people are articulating how they're experiencing the campus. One quarter of the faculty on campus expressed their sentiments. Even if it was only 2-3, it would still be upsetting. Reading 100 was upsetting as it makes the task before us so large. This continues to bother her that we have language speaking to WASC as opposed to people trying to make things better.

Dean Moore wants to go back to what Filling said. The focus on the language from WASC is what we have to respond to and this can become the process. However that manifests itself on the campus with the people invested in success is what we report back to WASC. That's how we move forward; we take a positive step forward.

Sankey said we could set up a scientific study to address not just trust, but more specifically, shared governance. We could test the hypothesis that the university has improved shared governance this year. For example, make a detailed list of characteristics that good shared governance looks like. Be explicit. For example, are the recommendations by RPT committee followed? Are the recommendations of the Committee on Committees followed? Then we could test the hypothesis the university now has good shared governance this year by examining the actions this year. This is a testable hypothesis. Be very explicit in your criteria. Then test it. Instead of going to workshops/forums to talk about trust, decide what trust means, for example, it means good shared governance. And then clearly set up a test to see whether we have good shared governance this year.

Regalado understands that people are working hard, but are there any areas that you might be able to speak to with regard to administrations role. What in the administration can be improved upon to make it possible to have a better relationship with faculty?

Strong said we need to communicate frequently and in depth. We need to listen to understand more where the problem comes from. There is a need generally to have de-escalation. He agrees with Filling that the bigger issues are the problem. WASC has identified and we need to address that. We can use the WASC framework as a call to arms to take actions that will make it easier to resolve the problem. If we take actions that make it more difficult things could get worse. If actions and behaviors de-escalate, things will get better. Communication and transparency are steps in the right direction. Misperception of behavior and action has occurred. There have been mistakes. Once people are locked into a position and an emotional dimension develops, people tend to see stimuli that supports their perception and ignore others perception. Research findings in psychology and conflict resolution show this. He thinks we have a difficult situation and we are going to have to put some serious effort in for a period of time. He's concerned that we can't depart from what WASC has asked us to do without a really good reason. We can work positively on a problem and be congruent with what WASC has asked us to do. We cannot ignore what WASC has charged us with.

Garcia is a Social Work researcher so he is both scientific and emotional. For him, it's disheartening to hear that communication is the centerpiece. He's in favor of dialogue and critical reflection, but to him it has less to do with communication and more to do with following established policies and procedures. We have a wave of empirical evidence of breeches of policy and procedures. We have the evidence. We have to follow policies and procedures. We can talk about it but we have to start doing it.

Sankey said that we should note what we expect to see with real faculty governance in place and give deadlines to see if it happens. Make it explicit. We need to test out the process and be clear about what we expect to see. With good governance procedures in place, then we can say this is the evidence we found. Do this with all governance committees to test it.

Sarraille said we've already done the equivalent of that, and we can demonstrate that. We documented many things that have not happened the way they should have, for example administration failures to adhere to policy. We have lists of these things. We can test whether things are improving by noting whether the frequency of these violations diminishes.

Filling said that the Provost has expressed intent to make things better and he has been acting on that intent. Based on our experiences from the past 5 years and the responses to the survey, he wonders if we can get better unless the President takes center stage on that effort or if he's willing to do so.

Jasek-Rysdahl said if it were easy we wouldn't be having this difficulty. He asked about steps, but got responses without some of this although there are some specific things that must happen. He also read much despair and doubt in the comments. The Provost recognizes and continues to work with us. Our colleagues and students are impacted by this significantly. Even freshmen know about the tension on campus.

c. UBAC

The faculty members on UBAC sent out information about the process of UBAC and the outcomes of the UBAC recommendations. They asked us to bring it to the attention of the Senate to draw attention to find out more about what we should do about the makeup, procedures, or the recommendations of UBAC. We have all four 2009-10 UBAC members present here today and they're open to your questions.

Eudey asked if we have a committee in place right now. Sarraille said we are not meeting with UBAC right now. We were dismissed as we have done our work for 2009-10 and completed its final meeting. It is unknown what the fate is of UBAC for the future.

Filling said we were told that we were done and would not be called on. Garcia said this is not new. For the past three years with his connection to UBAC this is how we operated. During a crisis we are asked to get information together, rush to act, and then we are put on hold. Members are always here, but no meetings or discussions are called until we're in the crisis mode.

O'Brien said the first meeting with Provost and the general faculty he talked about a new type of budgeting technique. He asked if that was implemented and how did it work? Strong said the Responsibility Centered Budgeting hasn't been implemented.

Poole doesn't see the UBAC issue separate from our problems with governance and leadership in general.

Sarraille agreed with Poole. However, we do have very serious economic problems, and the fact that UBAC is functioning as it is creates a special concern to him, which he feels responsible to deal with, as chair of FBAC. Much is at stake. Great damage could be done to the institution if we don't act with the best sense of fiscal responsibility and attention to the core mission. Maybe that we need to pick certain aspects of "the problem" and begin with those.

McGhee has been on UBAC for four years. UBAC to him is the only committee that crosses all boundaries – students, staff, faculty, and administrators. UBAC has all of the components of the university. There are some basic processes from budgeting theory that would lend itself to this committee functioning better if it were ongoing thru good times and the bad times. Budgeting is an ongoing process not a knee-jerk process, and there is much work to do now even without actual numbers. As an accountant, he doesn't need numbers to make decisions. The process is important. This is something that needs to be followed and looked at year round. He doesn't like going to meetings year round but for the benefit of the institution it's a process that needs to be done. This is about strategic planning and implementation of goals and objectives and not just about dealing with shortfalls. Shortfalls should not be the driving component.

Garcia doesn't know if enough information is out so that we all can grasp how dysfunctional UBAC is. More information needs to get out so it's not just another example of policies and procedures being overlooked. This year scenarios were developed and plans were approved which are driving budget decisions. UBAC is so dysfunctional that he would discourage anyone from having acceptance of the recommendations. For example, last year with the budget planning process there were a number of faculty, students and staff that voted which compelled the administration to write a minority report because they didn't agree with what came out of it. It is not coincidental that the makeup of UBAC changed dramatically to create a change in power so that faculty was outvoted on every single issue. The things that came out as recommendations did not have the blessing of the faculty members on UBAC. It's the result of the way UBAC was constructed. Sarraille noted that he went along with one recommendation.

Thompson is not hearing any dispute of anything, and it's the same picture from the past several years regarding UBAC as well as the BCC. The UBAC report from faculty and staff was that this committee was dysfunctional. If one believes that good communication is key to building trust, is there dispute that UBAC agendas were essentially uninformative and meaningless? Is there dispute over the lack of minutes? Is there dispute that faculty issues were not included in notes even after they were re-raised? Is there dispute that corrections were not made? Is there dispute to the accuracy of Garcia's reporting?

Filling said Garcia was restrained as he left out other antics, including something that shames us. When ASI elected a new Student Body President, he was told he could not be a member of UBAC although the ASI President is ex officio a member. The new Provost was included as ex officio member and co-chair upon arrival late last spring, and it is untenable that the student representative not be accorded similar treatment. Shenanigans destroy credibility. Budgeting theory requires a same set of shared goals, ideally developed with full participation by campus constituencies; however UBAC went from a budget committee to an advisory group to President Shirvani. We do need the other people on campus to head the same direction. This is not easily fixed, although a start would be to implement the suggestions of prior UBAC members.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked if there is any point in us bringing this up again. Have we banged our head against the wall so much that we're done? Does the silence in this room mean that we're in agreement that we need to push forward?

McGhee said we must push forward. When we stop we might as well dig our grave.

Marcell said that regarding the UBAC we need to know what the end game is. Where do we want to get to? In his mind we need to be part of the process but it has to be a process that serves us. He recommends to SEC to come back at another meeting with suggestions for us.

Jasek-Rysdahl Said the end result could be that we're ignored but we should still make our point.

Strong said his recollection is that faculty voted for a number of the recommendations, and a number were unanimous. Maybe there is some misremembering. He thinks the faculty voted for a number of these UBAC recommendations. These are not outrageous, and seem reasonable to him.

Filling heard a NPR story on Kim Jung Il, who was also elected unanimously, and is not sure about the significance of unanimous assent to policies. Attention should be paid to the alternatives. Members of UBAC prepared a list of recommendations that were ignored. This is perhaps a good starting point for SEC.

Sarraille agreed with Provost Strong that there were non-controversial recommendations approved unanimously by UBAC. However in many areas that the faculty members of UBAC felt were key, they

received little or no support from the rest of the members of UBAC. Sarraille said he guessed Garcia was speaking of the proposals that the faculty viewed as key.

Jasek-Rysdahl said SEC will look at UBAC's recommendations and bring them forward for action even if they may be ignored.

Eudey encouraged people to talk to SEC. Based on comments on a couple of items it should be known that comments can be given to SEC if people are not able to make comments in this setting. If you and others that are not present have comments for SEC, please find a venue to let us know so that we can be informed.

Routh said regarding the WASC item 3, there could be a tangible step like some sort of shared governance committee created. Could we have a pseudo summit to discuss shared governance and sign off on it? Jasek-Rysdahl said it was discussed with examples of when shared governance has been violated or ignored. Routh said administration and faculty; hopefully President Shirvani would hold some discussion on this.

Sarraille said ostensibly that's a very good idea from a certain standpoint, but he would argue against it because it is written down in a number of places. Governance policies have been established. There is an extensive set of SWAS papers, and extensive literature on this has been hashed out by AAUP. We have our own codes on campus. The people involved in this at the core; they have to be familiar with that. This is required reading. We would be getting into the discussion of what "is" means. He doesn't think it would be productive. We have to keep in mind that there has been a great deal of extra workload on people dealing with what we perceive as attacks on shared governance and faculty. We have bent over backward to produce things and document things and spent a lot of time achieving things. Folks are at the stage where they have to say we want to make progress, but we have to pay some attention to not allowing our time to be wasted anymore.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that idea has been offered in many forums. There is an AAUP conference with workshops on shared governance coming up in Washington D.C. It was suggested that we send a delegation that includes the Speaker, the Provost, and the Speaker-Elect. This is not the same as a summit but it will involve governance and administration learning from AAUP. Sarraille noted that he will also be attending as CFA President.

O'Brien asked if the group will report back what happened. Jasek-Rysdahl said they would.

8. Open Forum

Manrique said SEC will again look at the lack of parking privileges for retirees. Jim Hanson was unable to get permission from Public Safety to park and watch a softball game on campus. At least 16 campuses have such policies. Most retirees don't live close by and some have health reasons so this would be greatly appreciated by retirees.

Filling said if anyone is interested in the Foundation Board, the quarterly meeting is tomorrow in MSR 390. Meetings are by statute open, so feel free to attend.

ASI will continue holding voter registration booths in the quad. Pahal noted we're competing against Humboldt State and the losing President will have to dress up as the other campuses' mascot.

9. Adjournment

3:55pm