CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES January 24, 2006	REPORT FROM AD HOC COMMITTE ON COLLEGE (ALS) RESTRUCTURING
Present: Afonso, Bargetto-Andres, Dauwalder, Davis S., Deaner, DeKatzew, Janz, Jensen, Kim, Lawson, Manrique, Minor, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, OíBrien, Peterson, Petrosky, Routh, Sarraille, Stone, Tavernier, Weikart, Werling, Zarling **Absent:** Brown, Davis, Garcia, DeCaro, Nelson, Petratos, Regalado, Riedmann, Sankey, Schoenly, Senior, Sutherland, Tan, Thompson **Proxies:** Garza (Jacobs), Helzer (Mantz), Neufeld (Shawkey) **Guests:** Calhoun, Carroll, Demetrulias, Jaasma, Littlewood, Murray-Ward, Novak, Ramos, Shirvani, Sundar, Wendt **Recording Secretary:** Diana Bowman	Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, February 21, 2006 2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room Minutes submitted by: Scott Davis, Clerk

1. Called to order at 2.41pm.

2. Agenda approved.

3. Minutes of 12/6/05 approved with an amendment to spell correctly the name "Salisbury."

4. Announcements
a. Speaker Petrosky reminded the body that the next meeting of AS will be 2/21.
b. The Speaker offered a correction to the *Modesto Bee* article of 1/24, which claimed that AS would vote on the College Restructuring issue today.
c. The Speaker reminded faculty that the Winter faculty evaluation period is 1/26 to 2/1, and asked faculty to be timely.
d. The Speaker announced that Instructional Institute Day will be February 13. There will be morning and afternoon sessions surrounding the keynote speaker Dr. Susan Rice and lunch. Please RSVP with Ximena García at ex 3216.
e. Afonso announced that Thursday and Friday 1/26-27 the Music Dept presents "Opera Scenes," 7.30pm in Snider Hall.
f. Davis announced the WASC Self-Study Institutional Proposal draft is out and available for public

comment. Please direct comments to any member of the Team or to selfstudy@csustan.edu by 3/1.

5. Questions about reports
None.

6. Information Item
a. Final Report: Ad Hoc Committee on College Restructuring

Speaker Petrosky thanked the Ad Hoc Committee, chaired by Ian Littlewood, for their prompt and diligent attention to the issue of splitting ASL into separate colleges.

Littlewood summarized the report by describing three parts. Part 1 details the charge to the committee and the approach they took. Part 2 details the different options and how they chose it. He directed Senate attention to the three bulleted items (p 3) which outline the three main criteria for evaluating the models. The committee took the last of these as the most important: academic freedom of association. The committee recommends the University adopt the model outlined in appendix B. It would split ALS into four colleges (similar to the original Shirvani proposal). Three colleges would be smaller, with a clear focus, and the fourth would be a larger, more diverse college. Part 3 details issues that the committee recommends to campus attention, including issues surrounding the implementation of the split. They recommend 2006-07 as the year of transition.

Sundar asked where campus support was least and most strong during deliberations. Littlewood observed that the process started with a fair amount of campus apprehension, but it quickly decreased, and by the end nearly all departments supported the idea of restructuring. Within that rubric, the model outlined in Appendix B was most favored. Novak added that going into the last, and well-attended forum, the committee was inclined toward an alternative that yielded four equal-sized colleges (given in Appendix D). At the forum, it was clear that some departments wanted some other arrangement. The committeeís final recommendation was based on that feedback. Littlewood reiterated that the criteria of department right of association tipped the balance from D to B.

Zarling observed that the report didnít seem to address issues like faculty governance, which is now largely tied to the current college structure. What reallocation needs to be done? Littlewood pointed out that implementation was outside the scope of the committee, but noted that the report recommended campus attention to the issue. Zarling continued, asking how we could go forward without knowing what the details are going to be. Wendt replied that the committee determined that shared governance issues were ultimately implemented by the body responsible for it. Since that body has yet to be, the committee felt it inappropriate to confuse the main issue of the split with it. We alert the campus about this and other issues, and hope that the faculty affected by the change will take responsibility for working that out. Speaker Petrosky underscored the claim that implementation issues, including reorganization of governance, were outside the bailiwick of the committee. The Committee on Committees would be involved in AS/GF committee reorganization. Further, this report is going before Graduate Council, Faculty Affairs Committee, Faculty Budget Advisory Committee and University Educational Policies Committee, and their comments will come here.

Sundar asked how the authority and responsibility of chairs would change in the new configuration. Shirvani replied that the intention is to decentralize as much as possible, to the deans and then to the chairs. They will have more authority and more responsibility, at both the college and department levels.

Sundar noted that deans have not had a history of longevity here, and asked if, with three additional deans, whether we would need a standing recruitment committee for deans. Shrivani replied he hoped that would not be the case, and added that his hope was that with a national search we could attract seasoned deans, builders and visionaries, with a desire to stay here. Sundar asked also for the criteria for the position to be revised to make it more conducive for long-term residence. President Shirvani gave his assurance that the position descriptions for the four deans would be similar to those from other institutions listed in the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Adjourned at 3.05pm.