

<p>Academic Senate October 2, 2012</p> <p>Present: Avwundiogba, Bice, Floyd, Burroughs, Colnic, Crayton, C. Davis, Deaner, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Guichard, Hartman, Hidalgo, Lore, Jasek-Rysdahl, Johnson, Kane, Littlewood, Manrique, Marcell, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Park, , Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Silverman, Strahm, Strong, , Vang, and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Jasek-Rysdahl for Elaine Peterson, Tony Perrello for Carolyn Martin, Mark Grobner for Marina Gerson, John Mayer for Eric Broadwater.</p> <p>Guest: Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Annie Hor, Linda Nowak, Reza Kamali, James Tuedio, Lauren Byerly, Brian Duggan, John Sarraille, Dennis Shimek, Fernando Beltran, and Ron Noble.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First Reading Item. 10-AS-12-FAC-SEC--Amending the Constitution of the General Faculty, California State University, Stanislaus to Include a Statement Upholding Academic Freedom. Resolution moved to a second reading at the next Senate meeting.</p> <p>First and Second Reading of 11/AS/12/SEC – Resolution Regarding CSU Board of Trustees’ Committee on Educational Policy Sept. 2012 Agenda Item 3, Upper Division General Education and Degree Completion Information (Amended). The resolution passed.</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: October 23, 2012 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p>
--	--

1. Call to order

2:05pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of September 18, 2012

Approved.

4. Introductions

Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Annie Hor, Linda Nowak, Reza Kamali, James Tuedio, Lauren Byerly, Brian Duggan, John Sarraille, Dennis Shimek, Fernando Beltran, and Ron Noble.

5. Announcements

The Stanislaus women’s soccer is the number eight in the nation and number 1 in the region. The Athletics Department is holding a Fan Fest Saturday, Oct. 6, from Noon - 5 p.m. at the Warrior Baseball Field. This is the link to the event:

http://www.warriorathletics.com/sports/2008/9/23/BB_0923085810.aspx?id=931

Mayer said that if you've never attended you should as they have amazing food and cook offs. Mayer also announced the play "The Shape of Things" written by Neil LaBute that starts running this Thursday night and runs for two weeks. The play is geared towards a more mature audience. The Theatre Department had a wonderful event last weekend with a touring group, *Los Valientes*, from the Core Theatre Company in New York. They hope to have them back next year.

Duggan reminded us that the 9th Annual Technology Fair will be tomorrow from 10am to 2pm in the lobby of the MSR building. There will be displays of technology for teaching and learning by staff members, faculty, and vendors. There will be giveaways and door prizes, including at least two Nooks. Look for the Postmaster announcements.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that the annual wine and cheese event will be this Thursday, October 4 from 6-9 at the County Fairgrounds. Contact Melanie Myers at X6648 for tickets.

Marcell announced the 10th Annual Healthy Aging Summit, held at the Convention Center in Modesto, on October 12th. They will provide free medical assessments, health care, and you will be able to talk to physicians.

Colnic reminded us of the conference for Sustainable Futures taking place on October 18 -20. There are evening events on Thursday October 18th and all day on October 19. The events run throughout the weekend.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

Littlewood noted that FAC has had a long standing discussion item on the MPP Evaluation policy that is now moving off their agenda. Other campuses have much more extensive faculty input, so we asked the President for his input on the current policy. President Sheley would like to keep the review process within the administration but welcomes faculty input.

Thompson asked what does that mean and what will happen? How does that move it off the FAC agenda? Littlewood noted that there is no further discussion needed.

Thompson asked why the faculty would not be interested in proposing a mechanism for faculty input. Littlewood said that the mechanism will potentially point people to solicit faculty input, or individual faculty will be able to give their input directly and anonymously.

7. First Reading Items:

- a. 10/AS/12/FAC/SEC – Amending the Constitution of the General Faculty, California State University, Stanislaus to include a Statement Upholding Academic Freedom**

Littlewood moved the resolution, seconded by Filling.

10-AS-12-FAC-SEC--Amending the Constitution of the General Faculty, California State University, Stanislaus to Include a Statement Upholding Academic Freedom

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus endorse the following amendment to Article V, Section 5 (d) of The Constitution of the General Faculty, California State University, Stanislaus:

It shall be the purpose of the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus to promote academic excellence in the university; to uphold and preserve the principles of academic freedom and protect freedom of inquiry, research, expression and teaching both inside and beyond the classroom, as set forth in the American Association of University Professors 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and its subsequent interpretations; to serve as the official voice; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the General Faculty, in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the General Faculty, California State University, Stanislaus forward this amendment to faculty for a vote.

RATIONALE: In setting forth these rights and responsibilities of the General Faculty, at no point does the Constitution reference the important role of the General Faculty in safeguarding and preserving the principles of academic freedom for the faculty it serves. The purpose of this amendment is to remedy this omission in the Constitution.

The American Association of University Professors' (AAUP) 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and its subsequent interpretations provide the most widely accepted and understood statement of academic freedom for higher education. In 1966 the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities jointly formulated a Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities which was formally recognized by the executive bodies of each group. That statement incorporates by reference the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. In addition Section 3561(c) of the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) encourages the free exchange of ideas among faculty, students and staff, and goes on to state: "All parties subject to this chapter shall respect and endeavor to preserve academic freedom in the California State University." Given the recognized importance of preserving and safeguarding academic freedom within higher education, this principle must be articulated within the Constitution of the General Faculty, California State University, Stanislaus and regularly monitored as circumstances generate new interpretations.

Approved by FAC on 9/12/12

Littlewood noted that we might recognize this as a re-introduction of a statement from last year that was not approved by President Shirvani, due to the current contract negotiations. The issue has been resolved so we're reintroducing it.

Filling said that there had been some discussion of putting a statement in the collective bargaining agreement but it didn't happen. There is a statement in the statewide faculty constitution that we recently voted on. This would be an amendment for our campus General Faculty Constitution, and would be sent to the faculty for a vote.

Speaker Grobner said that the vote for statewide resolution is currently happening.

Nagel asked what this amendment will actually do and what is the intent of the words academic excellence in the resolution: "It shall be the purpose of the Academic Senate of the California State University, Stanislaus to promote academic excellence in the university." He also asked if there was an intention for Senate or a particular committee to act in the event of a perceived violation of academic freedom.

A future Senate might need guidance in regards to what this is intended to do.

Littlewood asked if Nagel had suggestions for different wording to replace academic excellence. Nagel doesn't know why it has to be in there.

Tuedio thinks that part of what Nagel is asking for seems to be mentioned at the end of the rationale. There is a monitoring process that is clearly emphasized here. What happens if in the monitoring there is a violation of the principles. There is already a procedure in place and FAC has a role to play in carrying issues forward.

Shimek said that last year when the resolution came forward, and the reason why it was put on hold was that at that time the matter was subject to negotiations between faculty and the system administration. Our administration stated clear support for academic freedom. What he recalls is that he was asked to go back to Long Beach to review the matter of the resolution in terms of the negotiations. After it was resolved, the system took up the issue at SWAS. He doesn't think there's any question about the support for academic freedom, but he'd like to get some clarification from Long Beach about how what we're stating fits with what statewide has done.

Filling said that part of the reason for this is to have academic freedom to speak for oneself beyond the classroom. This is due to the court proceedings of Garcetti vs. Ceballos that public employees have free speech rights only when they're not speaking as employees. An Assistant District Attorney in L.A. made some statements about what went on in the office and was not given a promotion. This resolution is to make it clear that it is part of our responsibility to speak about the university in areas far removed from the classroom. This will make it very clear that freedom of speech is clearly stated.

Thompson asked about Shimek's statement. Does this language comport, or are there specific questions that Shimek has about the language of the resolution.

Shimek clarified that he was saying that for him to be able to give you his best advice, he wants to make sure that the language comports with the statement by general council and statewide.

Marcell suggested maybe changing the word excellence to success.

Filling said that this language is pulled from the language of the statewide statement. It's extremely clear that what's included is speaking to the work of the university beyond the classroom.

Littlewood would like to keep the word excellence under the grounds that you can be successful without being excellent.

Regalado asked if we are basically intending this for just the Stanislaus campus or are we doing or is this part of statewide.

Filling said that we are speaking to what goes on here but it is consonant with what is going on statewide.

McGhee noted that this amendment only applies to our constitution and only our campus. The Statewide Senate put out an umbrella statement and we're formalizing it for our campus.

Sarraille said that it's clear to most of us that this is something that faculty nationwide are concerned about and they are asking Senates at various levels and other faculty organizations to make a statement about academic freedom. This statement is one of many.

b. 11/AS/12/SEC – Resolution Regarding CSU Board of Trustees' Committee on Educational Policy Sept. 2012 Agenda Item 3, Upper Division General Education and Degree Completion Information (Amended)

Filling moved the resolution, seconded by Eudey.

11/AS/12/SEC Resolution Regarding CSU Board of Trustees' Committee on Educational Policy Sept 2012 Agenda Item 3, Upper Division General Education and Degree Completion Information (Amended)

Title: Regarding CSU Board of Trustees' Committee on Educational Policy September 2012 Agenda Item 3, Upper-Division General Education and Degree Completion, Information (Amended)

Resolved: That the California State University, Stanislaus (CSU Stanislaus) Academic Senate reaffirm the faculty's primary responsibility for the curriculum, a responsibility based on the principle of academic freedom, and noted in the CSU Board of Trustees Statement on Collegiality and the American Association of University Professors' Principles Statement on Collegiality; and be it further

Resolved: That the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate object to the lack of consultation in the manner in which the proposed requirement change was developed, formalized and made public as a board agenda item without adequate and timely consultation with, or indeed even notification to CSU faculty governance; and be it further

Resolved: that the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate express deep concern over the disregard for potential impacts to the competitive value of CSU degrees that may result from hasty reductions to unit count without consideration for curricular integrity; and be it further

Resolved: that in the event that the amended proposal passes, the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate strongly urge that:

1. The timelines for review of degrees in the Summary of the proposal be extended;
2. Language be added to an executive order implementing the Title V changes that urges programs to maintain the breadth of the degree by maintaining a strong general education emphasis in the required coursework for the bachelor's degree; and
3. The provisions for chancellor's action to reduce unit requirements on non-complying programs be excluded; and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be distributed to the Board of Trustees, the chancellor, campus presidents, the ASCSU, and CSU campus academic senate chairs.

Rationale:

The Board of Trustees Educational Policy Committee September agenda item "Upper-Division General Education and Degree Completion, Information (Amended)" is a proposal to require, where feasible, all four-year bachelor's degree programs to require no more than 120 semester or 180 quarter units to complete. The item started out as a proposal to eliminate the upper division general education requirement for CSU undergraduate degrees. The initial proposal was put on the BOT agenda with no prior notice to the ASCSU, and no consultation with faculty. After significant concern expressed by statewide and local faculty governance bodies and campus faculty about the lack of consultation and the potentially significant impact of the proposal on curricula throughout the CSU, the BOT proposal was modified and sent to the ASCSU during its plenary meeting on Friday, September 14, 2012.

The CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate is committed to active partnership in shared governance as it upholds the principle of the faculty's primary responsibility for the curriculum, a responsibility noted in the CSU Board of Trustees Statement on Collegiality and the American Association of University Professors' Principles Statements. Of major concern in carrying out that responsibility is the quality of the degree. Because of its potentially significant impact on the nature and content of degrees throughout the CSU system, the proposal to bring all degrees down to 120 units wherever feasible should be thoroughly evaluated by faculty before action by the Board of Trustees.

The Summary in the agenda item indicates that an executive order will be used to implement the Title V changes and also outlines the timeline and provisions for program compliance with the new Title V language. The CSU Stanislaus Academic strongly urges the chancellor and Board of Trustees to consider amending specific aspects of the timeline and provisions presented in the Summary.

The CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate urges that the timelines for compliance with the 120/180 unit goal be extended. The existing timeline does not allow campus program faculty sufficient time to evaluate their required coursework against the benchmark unit level set in the BOT proposal.

We also request that the executive order re-emphasize the CSU commitment to educational breadth by urging programs to maintain a strong GE component. A significant path to reducing units-to-degree outlined in the Summary is a reduction in systemwide general education (GE) requirements. GE has long been an indicator of the CSU commitment to provide an education that goes beyond specific major requirements or career skills. Through GE students are introduced to diverse ways of looking at problems and understanding the world, a skill of lasting value in an interdependent and globalized world.

The CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate also requests that the provision for chancellor's action to reduce unit requirements on non-complying programs be excluded from the executive order. Faculty's primary responsibility for the curriculum is well-established in CSU and AAUP statements. Providing for the chancellor to act to reduce unit requirements for specific degrees is a violation of academic freedom and undermines the principle that faculty, as experts in their field, are best qualified to determine the appropriate level and extent of knowledge needed to earn a university degree.

The CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate acknowledges the CSU's position that moving degrees to 120 units is intended to improve graduation rates, protect academic quality and provide an affordable education. If that action is to be taken, the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate urges that it be done in a manner that allows faculty sufficient time to adapt programs to the new requirements, maintains the breadth of the CSU degree and preserves respect for academic freedom.

Filling said that the basic text echoes the statement we made at our last meeting. Additionally, it suggests that we have some deep concerns about what happens to CSU degrees in the event that the BoT agrees to this proposal that they extend the timeline for review of degrees. We ask for a provision from the Chancellor that unilaterally reduce units. Faculty have the primary responsibility for the curriculum as that is stated in AAUP statement. Note that the Sonoma state passed a resolution that is almost identical to this.

Eudey feels that this is important because the CSU made a commitment to adopt the leap goals, which affirm the value of a liberal arts education. We have all made great efforts to ensure that these outcomes are part of our programs. The CSU had been taking a lead in celebrating the value of a liberal arts education, and we don't have time to engage in this process and do it thoughtfully. They want all programs to be revised for the fall 2013 catalog, which means that all the approvals need to be completed by January 2013. Given the other workload issues we've had, it is not possible for all the steps to take place. We would not do it thoughtfully in trying to meet this timeline.

McGhee noted that accounting firms want people who know more than just accounting. They took people with other degrees and sent them for master's degrees in accounting. They want people who have outside interests and can communicate with the clients. The idea failed because the recruits weren't willing to put in the hours. We need to give students the exposure to different things. These are not academic reasons; they are political or administrative reasons. We as faculty have lived through it and have a better idea of what is needed.

Petrosky moved the resolution to a second reading, seconded by Jasek-Rysdahl.

Speaker Grobner opened the resolution to discussion.

Mayer said that he has always had a concern with statement based, rather than outcome based resolutions. This seems to be condemning actions, rather than focused on an outcome. We should take time reviewing this.

Provost Strong is generally uncomfortable with moving to second readings.

Sarraille said that it seems ironic that folks would be against this. This resolution says people shouldn't act rashly, and to do it in time to speak to the people who are about to act rashly

Filling said that pragmatically, our next Senate meeting is on October 23rd and the BoT meets in mid-November. He discussed this with his colleagues in Sonoma State and feels that acting now will encourage our other campuses to speak up. From his perspective, part of the goal is to encourage other Senates to speak up as well.

Mayer asked what we want to achieve in putting this forward. Condemning those who we want to work with does not seem to lead to the outcome we want.

Johnson is willing to move to a second reading and then have a discussion over the wording.

Eudey agrees that outcomes should be included in resolutions, and she thinks that those are included in the fourth resolution.

Mayer suggests that the changes he wants to see would take more time than we could take now.

Results of the vote to move to a second reading, 29 yes, 14 no, and 2 abstentions. The resolution moved to a second reading.

Filling appreciates Sarraille's comments. He was not the primary author of this resolution and it strikes him that one of the things we need to focus on is accountability and the behavior of the administration that affects all 23 campuses.

Johnson agrees that we'd have a better response if we use language that doesn't immediately offend the recipient. She recommended changing the second resolved by removing the word condemn and replace it with "is disappointed with the lack of consultation"

Also in the third resolved, we can delete the words "and ill-planned".

Thompson said that you can match the language to the action. He's arguing against the proposed change. If we actually condemn it, we should say it

Provost Strong said that point should be made in a collegial fashion. He would encourage the wording to be more collegial.

Kane made a suggestion for the second resolved: “objects to the lack of consultation”.

Regalado agrees with the Provost about the use of collegiality in language but that assumes that the folks at the BoT were not collegial. He thinks our language could be tougher as they have not acted professionally. He agrees with Mayer’s idea of needing more time, but we didn’t create this timeline. Given the lack of appropriate time it calls for us to act immediately.

Filling provided some context to the sequence of events: The last day of August the chair of SWAS got an email 71 minutes before the statutory deadline for the BoT to publish their agenda. Previously, she had contacted several people who were all too busy. There was an avoidance of consultation.

Mayer noted that we have an outcome we want and we object to what they’ve done, but the outcome we want is still better served by a more positive statement. This gives them more fuel about whining faculty. That’s why he doesn’t think moving through a hasty process is the way to go. There is not a need to rush.

Sarraille thinks that we should consider that in a perfect world we would have a collegial relationship with these other groups, but at this point there is an extreme prejudice. At this point we have to consider who will read it, who they’ll show it to, and what they will say about it. If we dispassionately express an objection and list very persuasive reasons showing that we are correct, we give them less to use as ammunition against us. We have to think about fighting in the most effective way.

Thompson said that there was an implication made earlier that condemnation and collegiality are mutually exclusive but that isn’t true. We aren’t the only ones who need to be concerned about our ethos. He hopes that the BoT is concerned about theirs. He thinks this statement might have a positive impact.

Regalado asked Filling a question based on his experience with SWAS. At what point has a positive approach in our objections ever resonated with the Chancellor’s office? Can you point to a time?

Filling replied no. Mayer asked if Filling could you site an example?

Filling listed the Mandatory Early Start Program, Early Start, SB1440, and the Chancellor’s search. There are lots of them and most of the people in statewide are interested in developing positive relationships. They have tried the gentler approach but it hasn’t worked. That’s why this year there was a giant reaction. We spent two days trying to get them to see our point of view. McGhee agrees with the Provost that it’s nice to be collegial, but it is a two way street. If you continue to act politely, people don’t take you as seriously. At some point you might have to get more forceful in your response.

Colnic agrees with the points that have already been made. He finds this very outcome based. We offered three concrete steps that can be taken. The notion that we think about what we want

implies that we are passively stating some desires. Consultation over the curriculum is not a want, it's a mandate and we have to stand up for it.

Strahm likes this conversation because it gets to the idea of civility. It becomes an issue of power, and who gets to define what language is collegial. She is concerned about issues of becoming deferent to power and are we giving up our power in that process.

Petratos suggested using the words "regrets to see".

Eudey thinks that the root of collegiality is shared power. We do not have shared power. The BoT is in many ways disconnected from our daily work. We have a Chancellor's office staff that works as intermediaries who are in the process of creating an edict of what we need to do. What has happened is that they have put items on their agendas that have violated the agreements in place. We are disempowered and we need to assert our power. To her, the most important thing is that we assert our power. She can see benefits to make our statement now, before there's a final decision on who our new Chancellor will be. The earlier our campus speaks out, the earlier the members of BoT have time to think of alternatives and consult.

Sarraille thinks it's more important that we send to them the possibility of alternatives. It's a better way of looking at this situation. Effectively, they have the power. He would be more supporting of providing them positive alternatives. He doesn't think the negativity gets us to the outcome we want. This is the tip of the iceberg. They already showed us the possible dissolution of general education. Sharing our personal stories is more important than sharing that they didn't follow procedure.

Results of the vote on ending the debate, 33 yes, 7 no, 2 abstained.

Discussed the following edits to the resolution.

Resolved: That the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate ~~condem the categorical disregard for consultation~~ object to the lack of consultation in the manner in which the proposed requirement change was developed, formalized and made public as a board agenda item without adequate and timely consultation with, or indeed even notification to CSU faculty governance; and be it further

Resolved: that the CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate express deep concern over the disregard for potential impacts to the competitive value of CSU degrees that may result from ~~these~~ hasty ~~and~~ ~~ill-planned~~ reductions to unit count without consideration for curricular integrity; and be it further

Results of the vote to change the second and third resolved, 26 yes, 14 no and 1 abstention. The amended resolution passed.

Sarraille thinks that under some circumstances it would be a good idea to launch a public relations campaign, but under these circumstances, it's a more necessary tactic to get out there with our point of view. Get all messages out to the Chancellor before the BoT meet, and have the strongest statement possible.

Colnic agrees that the more personal stories are good. He's not sure they are necessary for the resolution, but strategically a multi-pronged strategy is important. Faculty should share their stories with anyone who will listen on why we do what we do and how it will benefit our students.

Johnson thinks that the arguments provide support for the resolution, and we need time to put together our reasonable support for our position.

Filling said that the BoT is mandated to have public comments. Speakers need to sign up 10 days in advance and are limited to 2 minutes. Those personal stories need to be shared at the meeting.

Regalado thinks it's more than just the time factor. His understanding is that consultation was denied and without that, or responding to calls, that is the crux of the outrage. Perhaps if the Chancellor's office had provided consultation we would not be in this position.

Results of the final amended resolution, 39 yes, 5 no. The resolution passed.

8. Discussion Items

a. Academic Resource Center (ARC), 4/AS/12/UEPC Mandatory Advising for Undeclared Students policy

Speaker Grobner said that SEC was asked to hold off on mandatory advising policy for several reasons. This policy would force a hold on all students that are undeclared majors. Students need to be aware and ARC needs to gear up for the influx of students. ARC asked for another term to resolve those issues, and SEC was willing to do so. There is a need to further look at those issues as related to advising. The policy that was passed will be put on hold for 1 term. Comments are welcome.

Nagel said that a large part of the problem he experienced was with pre-nursing students showing up in upper division GE while still freshman and sophomores. This problem was reduced this year. He had a dozen last spring and only 2 this fall.

Marcell said that when we review the two pass registration system, we can also look at advising resources as these two issues are related. Keep in mind that this has a direct impact on the two-pass registration.

Eudey said that one of the major reasons the Senate passed this resolution was to ensure that students had the best opportunity to set their academic goals and therefore support retention and movement towards graduation. Part of that delay is requiring some commitment to think through our processes. That means that all of us may be called upon to give feedback on these issues and work with ARC and Student Affairs to come to a solution. The agreement to put this off for a term adds some workload to us, but its smart workload to help us achieve our mission. We need to stay involved and stay invested with this issue.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that this is an example of a collegial and working relationship. He hopes that this doesn't become a pattern of people dragging their feet on implementing policy. We need to make sure we have a specific timeline to implement this.

Sarraille noted that students receiving good advising is a factor here, obviously there are resource questions. Undeclared students who are drifting without a major are using resources and they may be taking too many units. There's a desire to save money, but the solution involves getting these people advised, which has a cost as well. If we're going to treat this issue seriously we should look at some cost analysis. What is the best way to handle this cost-wise and the effect it has on people.

Stessman noted that this affects the pre-nursing students who aren't taking the right classes. She does a lot of advising for those students even though she's not responsible for them. It's a disservice for the students if they don't get advising.

Crayton noted that the pre-nursing students are getting advising.

Strahm said that Nu-Y Stessman is trying to point out that while it's great that the Nursing program helps the pre-nursing students, that still does not take care of the issue of the students who are pre-nursing that are still not getting clear advising. It's a tremendous problem for people to get their lives together and successfully get through a college degree.

Eudey noted that we have had budget crises, and we have lost significant staffing in Student Affairs, Counseling, and in Financial Aid, which have shifted workload to faculty members and the remaining staff. There is a workload press on a lot of people, and we have not had recognition in shifts in position descriptions. RPT elaborations, new advising loads aren't being acknowledged in the RPT process. The better we provide services to students the stronger they are and the more likely they will graduate. We need more resources, and that's why we need to be advocating for the propositions, looking for grants, etc. We're trying to do the best we can.

Ron Noble added that the pre-nursing students at least have and identified a path. Other undeclared students have not found a path. Pre-nursing know who they are and they think they have a major.

Eudey asked if we are going to be using the two-pass registration, will the second pass be open to everyone or by rank order. Espinoza thinks that they have decided that it will be by priority order in the second pass.

9. Open Forum

Thompson brought up parking moratoriums. The English Department holds three student appreciation events. They invite students, alumni, and families. This year they were denied parking moratorium and he wonders if anyone else has experienced this.

Colnic said that they had a big event for community partners last week, and they were denied free parking for them.

Davis said that the Library was given free parking for the Library Open House which occurred in the evening.

Garcia said that Social Work was also told that there was no free parking anymore. When we're talking about the need to engage with the community, and now we're being told that we can't have parking moratoriums.

Hidalgo inquired about this and someone in Public Safety said that the ones that are most often approved are when the students are less likely to be on campus.

McGhee wonders if they are trying to raise revenues.

Eudey asked who is responsible for the policy decisions on parking moratoriums. Who do we communicate with on this issue? She would like to request that the Provost look into this.

Regalado thinks that this seems to be part of a larger problem about ticketing. Last year faculty started getting ticketed for parking where they used to park before.

Espinoza heard that the campus doesn't actually determine the parking policy. They held a development activity and they had to find a way to purchase passes for the donors that attended. She thinks that the area responsible for enforcing parking is Business & Finance. Provost Strong confirmed that Business & Finance is in charge of this.

Thompson noted that it sounds like we want to only bring people when students aren't on campus? On the other hand, some areas might be able to pay for parking, but others can't. At the General Faculty meeting we heard a lot about community and alumni and emeritus faculty, but we still make them pay for parking.

Provost Strong noted that there are state regulations relative to parking. He will ask Business and Finance about this and about any related policies and send it to the Speaker to distribute.

Strahm asked Eudey about Jennifer Helzer's talk on Wednesday, October 24th titled Engaging the University and the Community. Is this presentation one that is appropriate to bring students to? Eudey said yes, and that this is her talk based on being the recipient of the Outstand Community Service award last year. Dr. Helzer will discuss her community-based research and teaching strategies that reach out to our local partners and community agencies.

10. Adjournment

3:50pm