

<p>Academic Senate December 9, 2008</p> <p>Present: Bender, Bice, Black, Carroll, Cogan Bailey, Colnic, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, Deaner, deVries, Dunham-Filson, Eudey, Filling, Flores, Garcia, Hauselt, Hejka-Ekins, Hight, Janz, Johnson, Jones, Kavasch, Keswick, Manrique, J. Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petrosky, Russell, Senior, Silverman, Sniezek, Tan, Thompson, Tuedio, Werling, Young</p> <p>Proxies: Johnson (Brown), DeKatzew (Cotten), Johnson (Petratos)</p> <p>Guests: Dean Nael Aly, Lauren Byerly, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, Dean Roger McNeil, Susan Marshall, Dean Gary Novak, Rosanne Roy, John Sarraille, Armin Schulz, Dean Carolyn Stefanco, John Sumser, AVP Ted Wendt</p> <p>Diana Bowman, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>WASC Report</p> <p>22/AS/08/FBAC—Budget Priorities Resolution, APPROVED</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, January 20, 2009 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	--

1. Call to Order at 2:35 pm
2. Approval of agenda-Add as a Discussion Item 22/AS/08/FBAC—Budget Priorities Resolution. It will be 6a). Agenda approved as amended.
3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of November 25, 2008-For future clarification, add S. Davis to “Davis” comments in minutes to differentiate Scott from Cathlin Davis.

Page 8, will clarify comments, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph

4. Announcements  
Armin Schulz reminded faculty about Instructional Institute Day to be held on Friday, Feb 6<sup>th</sup> in the FDC. Dr. Sheridan Blau of Columbia University will be the speaker, addressing Performative Literacy. Schulz encourages all to RSVP so breakfast and lunch can be ordered.

John Mayer announced the performances of A Christmas Carol, Thurs-Sat at 8, and Sunday at 2. The Jazz Ensemble performs tonight.

Provost Covino announced that Carl Bengston, Dean of Library Services is leaving us for a job at Cerritos College. A celebration for him is upcoming. Covino met with Library faculty to discuss future plans. Covino has asked Carl Whitman, our CIO, to serve as Interim Director of Library Services and then to discuss with library faculty directions and plans for the future.

Thompson asked about difference in title from Dean to Director. Covino responded that it seemed more appropriate in the interim for Carl Whitman to be a Director, but Provost Covino is not hanging a title on that position for the long term. Covino said that the search process will be part of the discussions with the library faculty this spring.

John Garcia announced that UBAC is holding an open forum tomorrow from 10-12 in Carol Burke Lounge.

CFA will host a celebration for Armin Schulz on Thursday Dec 11, 3-5pm in the FDC. Thompson noted that this is Armin’s last academic senate meeting. Thompson thanked Armin for coming to the meetings even though his attendance isn’t required here. Thompson noted that Schulz wears different hats at different times, related to faculty development, URPTC and other roles. On behalf of the faculty, Thompson thanked Schulz for all the times he attended. Schulz was recognized as a great resource, and Senate has appreciated the comments and perspectives Schulz was able to give us. Schulz received a standing ovation from the senate and guests.

Schulz thanked the senate and noted that he hoped to see us on Thursday. Schulz also indicated that the fiction book club is still at 4:30 that day.

Thompson announced that SEC sent 20/AS/08/SEC out to the faculty in paper form, and that it should have been in faculty mailboxes. Thompson also sent out a mid-year report to the faculty in paper form. Thompson also indicated that SEC is reviewing a list of the 66 items that Vice Provost Diana Demetrulius had identified in the WASC Site Team report, and is looking at those items to identify to whom items should be referred for action.

5. Questions about Committee Reports

None

**Meeting highlights of the December 3, 2008 Faculty Budget Advisory Committee Meeting include:**

- **Budget Issues**

Filling and Garcia gave FBAC members an update of UBAC developments.

- **Budget Priorities Resolution**

FBAC members reviewed the 2006/2007 and 2005/2006 budget priorities resolutions. They decided to focus on fewer priorities than in previous years as some priorities were considered more important than others in the current environment of budget cuts and structural deficit. Members did not want to totally eliminate the priorities from previous years and so a rationale was added to reference the budget priorities developed in the past. Members agreed on the Budget Priorities Resolution under item 6 a).

- **UEE Pilot Special Session Policy**

Members continued to discuss this draft policy. Due to lack of time, this discussion will continue at our next meeting.

**Meeting highlights of the December 11, 2008 Graduate Council include:**

**1. Master's Degree Course Substitution Procedures**

The Council continues deliberations for clarifying past procedures for substitution of courses in approved master's degree programs. When the Council finalizes the procedures, the determination of whether they are considered guidelines or draft policy that would be forwarded to Senate for approval will be made.

**2. Graduate Education Assessment**

The Council is currently reviewing university-wide graduate education assessment data. The Council is also in the process of reviewing and revising the graduate education assessment plan. Following examination of the assessment data and affirmation of the assessment plan, the Council will begin the development of the graduate education strategic plan.

**Meeting highlights of the January 8, 2009 University Educational Policies Committee Meeting include:**

- **Course Proposal: SW 2010 Introduction to the Social Work Profession.** Social Work Department Chair Dr. Margaret Tynan met with the committee to discuss the proposed lower-division GE course, and the changes that developed in response to suggestions from the GE subcommittee. The discussion will continue at the next scheduled UEPC meeting with representatives of the Department of Sociology who have expressed reservations regarding the course.
- **Upper Division Writing Proficiency Catalog Revision.** The UEPC will contact the University Writing Committee regarding the background and intent of its suggestion to introduce a CR/NC option for WP courses.
- **Program Revision: Bachelor of Arts in Child Development, Minor in Child Development, Liberal Studies Concentration in Child Development.** Dr. Rita Asher outlined the program revisions for the group in a first reading. UEPC suggested further consultation in the interim preceding a second look on January 22.
- **UEPC Statement Regarding Budgetary Process.** In its December meeting, the Academic Senate requested the UEPC revisit its statement regarding the impact of budgetary issues on educational quality, with an eye toward softening the somewhat derisive tone of its original language. After further tinkering-by-email by the chair and the Vice Provost, an emasculated version was finalized and approved, and will be presented to subsequent meetings of the SEC and AS.

**6. First Reading Item**

**a. 22/AS/08/FBAC—Budget Priorities Resolution**

Note: in error this was originally added to the agenda as a discussion item when it's intent was to engage in a first reading. Jim Tuedio moved to move current 6a out of discussion and into a first reading. Seconded by Bret Carroll. No discussion. Approved unanimously.

It was MS Tan/Carroll:

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty of California State University, Stanislaus affirm the commitment of the CSU to public access to affordable high-quality instruction, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Faculty's major priorities for institutional budget allocations are those essential to the academic mission of CSU Stanislaus, including:

- maintain maximum possible access for qualified students, including admission to campus and access to courses;
- retain and appoint sufficient numbers of qualified non-faculty staff to effectively support the core instructional mission;

- maintain or reduce the student/faculty ratio;
- maintain or increase the number of tenure track faculty;

RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate, the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee, and the faculty members of the University Budget Advisory Committee should serve as the Faculty's representatives in the budget planning process and should participate in all budgetary discussions and decisions through the entire process of budget planning, allocation, and re-allocation of the university budget, including the apportioning of its budget among specific university divisions, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the University Budget Advisory Committee should continue to function to advise the administration on fiscal decisions, and be it further

RESOLVED, that any major change affecting the instructional mission be made only after consultation with appropriate faculty governance committees and include open and consensual processes that consider the viewpoints of all affected parties, an analysis of the costs and benefits, and the effects on CSU Stanislaus as a whole, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the priorities above shall apply to decisions made during 2008 and 2009.

RATIONALE: The faculty of CSU, Stanislaus want to affirm our budget priorities, which can contribute to strategic planning and everyday budget decisions. The first two resolved clauses deal with priorities for the institution, and the next three involve procedures to ensure faculty input in decisions related to the budget. FBAC has provided statements of faculty budget priorities as follows:

10/AS/07/FBAC  
 21/AS/05/FBAC  
 20/AS/04/FBAC  
 17/AS/03/FBAC  
 24/AS/01/FBAC  
 1/AS/01/FBAC.

Discussion:

FBAC distributed copies of 22/AS/08/FBAC as well as the 2005/06 and 2006/07 resolutions regarding budget priorities to have as reference. FBAC has prepared a budget priorities resolution for many years, and does so on a continuous basis. At its Dec 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, FBAC looked at the prior budget priorities to determine what to send forward to SEC and Senate this year. Tan noted that because this year we have the budget gap/structural deficit and budget cuts, FBAC decided on only a few bullet points rather than the longer lists from prior years. In our current priorities, FBAC decided on the four bullets that you see before you. The rationale actively references previous budget priority documents, so that after 2009 we can come back to the priorities stated in previous years, even if only four are offered for this year.

Carroll said that it's important to act on this topic on a regular basis. He asked why it was decided by FBAC to reduce the bullet points instead of changing the order of priorities. Tan said that when FBAC looked at the 06/07 priorities that some bullets in there were of lesser priority, for example, RSCA funding for assigned time (06/07 #4) or the bullet related to equity raises, and in times of budget problems we may need to make these a lower priority, they do not disappear, they just become lower. Salaries and incentives are also a lower priority in these budget times. Library acquisitions also moved to a lower priority because they had heard from Carl Whitman that part of the Clearwire money will be related to improving some of the library services, for example the computers in the library and some software. The next bullet about supporting academic equipment and computer replacement and fully funding RSCA also dropped to lower priority for them. What was left were the most important budget issues given the climate. FBAC members were in consensus, and got some feedback from others.

Peterson supports the resolution. She believed that the longer list makes sense when we thought we had more resources than we thought we had. The old list was not ranked. We can't do all of these in this budget climate, and this new resolution makes clear what we see as most important. She believed that this is the kind of information we need to have going to our administrators.

Carroll asked if there was prioritizing in this list, Tan said all were important. C. Davis indicated that FBAC took out the statement "no relative ranking implied" that was used in prior years, so this is now a ranking and they are presented in order of priority.

C. DeVries spoke against the resolution. In a budget crisis we should not be redetermining what our mission is, and shouldn't say that one part of the mission takes priority over another. The university system offers an education and people are engaged in disciplines. In a crisis we stop being a university. DeVries would like to see it be amended to include all the points because they are necessary and are all important to a university, or we should drop the resolution.

O'Brien likes the condensed list, it's short and to the point and hones in on the key elements rather than having a laundry list. He likes the shorter version and thinks we can go back to a longer version in the future.

Garcia says that the logic in reducing the list can be found in the rationale, it's important as stated. These narrow priorities will help with everyday budget decisions. This is useful to FBAC and UBAC, giving more direction to their deliberations.

Tuedio falls between the two comments. He is troubled that there isn't a bullet for maintaining RSCA activity, since it's like we're stripping back our interests in supporting faculty engaged in research at a time when we're just beginning to make significant progress and if we pull back it will be hard to reinstate. It sends the wrong signal to leave it off the list. If it's not a priority we need to make it

clear to faculty that we're not supporting RSCA. What we're doing is sending a damaging signal to the university.

Tuedio continued that if you do follow the priority, this could have implications that we're not ready to endorse as enthusiastically as it seems. Maximizing enrollments could take money from other areas. I think we mean something different from that, and we might want to revisit the term maximum in the first Resolved clause. Regarding SFR, what we're after is not getting into the habit of collapsing sections down, but there are times when this is an efficient and effective way to meet student needs in a tight budget. Tuedio is concerned that the resolution is so strong against how to manage our SFR. Not as troubled by wanting to keep tenure track faculty, but it's another area that when we make these a priority, we are losing ability to attend to faculty research support.

Carroll falls in the middle, thinking Tuedio and DeVries make good points. Maybe you can put all other bullet points in, say that money ought to go to these things first, and then move down the list. He would be more comfortable with a list that looked like that.

DeVries says that an ordered list is not sufficient and that we need to look at how this impacts the department, the college, and the university. One research trip may be worth funding over other priorities, but in other cases canceling a trip is more important over other priorities. A prioritized list is not really fixing the problem.

Sarraille pointed out that the 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet doesn't refer to class size, it's independent of class size, so it wouldn't affect the flexibility of combining sections. It might actually help with concerns over the first bullet. If you maintain the SFR, you can't open up the floodgates for lots and lots of students without increasing the numbers of students to service them.

Covino noted that our latest word from the system is that our 09/10 targets were targets for 07/08, and 08/09 which is 7090 FTE. Further the chancellor has said that campuses are discouraged from enrolling more than 1% above the target and those enrolling more than 2% of that target will be refunding the fees for those students. It limits access campus by campus.

Tan indicated that there had been a suggestion to increase class size as a way to deal with the budget problem. She is worried about class size being increased by getting rid of PT faculty, and if we get rid of PT faculty then classes they teach will be given to TT faculty, and they will have large class sizes. Bullet point #3 is there to reduce that possibility, because we don't want the PT faculty to be disappearing and class sizes to go up because of it.

Filling supports the resolution as written. As a member of UBAC figuring out what to do and how, he desperately needs input from faculty regarding what is important and what is last to cut. He likes the statement from 2007 and would like to do that stuff, but we don't live in that world. He noted that as members of UBAC, he, Garcia, and O'Brien need to know what to save.

Johnson said she came here prepared to vote for the resolution, but what DeVries said is compelling. She understands the intent, and vision to support students first. We are a university. By focusing on the teaching aspect, she is afraid that if resources are taken away from the research area it will be hard to get them back, and we'll be a community college in focus and not have a university focus. All activities are critical for a university, although teaching is a central focus.

Colnic noted that we have implicitly being prioritized, and perhaps we can collapse RSCA into another line regarding professional development. Are we a university if we let the library languish? You can look at our library now and know when California has had hard times – the books have not been replaced or made up. Hate to see this happen again for the sake of future students and faculty.

Covino addressed what budget cutting means to us and what restoring it means to us. The only product that we get funded for by the legislature is enrollment growth. If we take something off the list and say we'll put it back when we can afford it, there are a number of things on this list that we cannot afford as a result of enrollment growth dollars. When we come to a point when enrollment growth dollars comes, it will be attached to an expectation for enrollment growth. There will be no monies earmarked for research, library, etc. When we get money we will be asked to grow commensurate with enrollment. It doesn't come back as a funded item from the system, all that comes is an injunction to enroll more students.

Thompson asked for an example of what would be cut. Morgan Foster suggested that in 2004 a counselor was cut and they have never been able to restore it.

Hauslet said that she is from a small department, it would be great to have money for RSCA, but for her it's time that's most important, and if we don't maintain SFR and don't retain tenure track faculty it's less time she has for RSCA. C. Davis began to propose an amendment, but stopped.

Sarraille made a joke last meeting about quality, access, affordability. To be serious about that, it looks like this resolution will be reworded, and maybe the rewording should be based on those things. Our job is to offer a quality education to as many as affordably possible. What is the most we can deliver to maintain these characteristics? That should be our priority. That is what we should maximize. There is lots of discussion about things cut and how we get funded and so forth, the money is all green. Part of the reason they go away and don't come back isn't about a line item or not, it's a matter of what folks want to spend the money on, what people with control over the money want to spend the money on. The way we are funded is not immutable. I hope that when people say "that's how they do it in Long Beach" doesn't stop us from saying "we ought to do it this way." The Long Beach way can change too.

DeVries sees that part of this is to guide UBAC in terms of their high-level decisions. We've looked at the plans and all included these flat cuts across major units and those haven't seemed to move given the wide variations over the year. Departments and colleges know how to allocate their money. We should suggest cuts that might be more realistic but not evenly across units, and let colleges and departments determine their budgets as they best see fit. He doesn't see the RSCA mission as being opposed to education. In his GE

courses he can teach what is in the book, but the value he adds is his connection to the community, and that's an important part of his courses. The RSCA is not opposed or in conflict with the mission, or the library. DeVries puts his own books on reserve since the library doesn't have them. It's not either/or, but it's tradeoffs, and these should be done at lower levels.

Mayer says that maybe we need to make a statement that highlights our current situation but references the older documents. The present situation may force us to look at them from a different perspective at this place and time.

Bender wondered if our funding is based on FTES, so the thought process that set priorities for RSCA is not necessarily being given up, but in these times the emphasis may change. We aren't getting special funding for RSCA, it's all based on enrollment.

Tan asked what the funding is for RSCA? Covino said that generally the funding comes in some respect from the RSCA grant funding from the Chancellor's Office annually, a little less this year than last, and even less because he pulled some back. It also comes from grants and contracts we generate. It also comes from the budgeting decisions made by departments and programs with respect to delivery of the curriculum that allows or doesn't allow part of the department budget to be set aside for travel to conferences or assigned time for research.

Dunham-Filson would like to support the resolution. She understands what is being said regarding other bullets, but if we're working together as a university, we need to make these cuts to have less of an impact on the whole university. By adding all the bullets in, from a staff position, it's taking the funds from somewhere else. Also, coming from financial services area for over 12 years, she doesn't think the departments can handle allocating their budgets based on their prior spending.

O'Brien made a motion to move this to a second reading. Filling seconded. O'Brien supports doing this because although there have been diverse views, as a member of UBAC he thinks they are guarded in what they say because they are still getting reports from VPs and don't have clear priorities. It would be nice to have this before January decisions are made. Tuedio spoke against it because we don't have time to make the changes that may be necessary.

S. Davis asked when the next Senate meeting would be and was told Jan 20th.

Nagel suggested that in light of the urgency, one way to think about this is that if it goes to a second reading it is amendable, and could be addressed fairly rapidly. Peterson supports a second reading and asks the speaker to extend the discussion deadline for this topic.

DeVries thinks this is equivalent to redirecting the mission of the university and shouldn't be entered into lightly. Young doesn't support this because it relates to the mission, particularly in relation to RSCA, so she doesn't support moving forward.

Hejka-Ekins is concerned about UBAC because they don't have direction. We can debate it and discuss the resolution in spring, but it'll be too late. Mayer asked if UBAC needs an official document to work from, and if there not other documents to work from.

Covino noted that the 2006/07 resolution notes that the resolution covers subsequent years until further notice. Absent a new one, the 06/07 applies. Peterson indicated that 06/07 doesn't help in this environment, but the new one does point out that 06/07 will be in force in the future. We can play around with this later, but if we want to be a part of the decision making about how UBAC advises the president, we need to act now.

In a hand vote regarding moving to a second reading, 29 voted yes and 14 opposed. We moved to a second reading.

C. Davis indicated she had two amendments, and first offered a motion to amend to add a new resolved clause to read "while in past years resolutions on budget priorities have identified 10 or more priorities in these difficult economic times, it is prudent to further focus our priorities on what we consider to be the most important of those priorities." It was second by Bender. C. Davis indicated that some said it would be helpful to indicate why we are limiting the list and this amendment refers to prior lists that were longer. Bender agrees that it allows for further discussion as to why we are focusing on these in the tough economic times and may appease concerns.

S. Davis questioned whether as a tactic this gives FBAC and UBAC a sense of priority as to how to act. Does the amendment give members of UBAC discretion to privilege these four and then as room allows to add things to the longer list of 11 from 06/07?

DeVries thinks the language is most important, and doesn't like this because it suggests the entire list is in fact ranked, and the previous lists weren't ranked and for good reason. Young asked how you go about prioritizing which items reemerge. S. Davis stated that the amendment references previous resolutions. It doesn't say what to do about the priorities. If the intent is to give FBAC and UBAC direction as to the lingering ghosts of priorities, then we should say what that direction is.

Tan responded that S. Davis calls them "ghost" priorities, but they're not. The idea in the FBAC discussion is that the FBAC chair-elect (Garcia) didn't want priorities in isolation, they're not ghost priorities since they were priorities set by senate. When we pass this budget crisis we will always be looking at our priorities, they don't disappear, but at the moment they are not listed. They are still there, but for this year, if we put too many when it comes to UBAC, they may not have a sense of the relative importance of items. But they are not unimportant, they're still there but not most important.

Carroll has a sense that those no longer on the list are expendable in some way. Johnson has a concern that the top priority is .. (Johnson was kindly interrupted by Speaker Thompson to return discussion back to the amendment)

Voted on amendment. 11 for; 22 against. fails.

Johnson has a concern about having maximum enrollment as the first point, not because it's not what we should do as a university system, but if we make that a top point we're saying that we're ignoring the fact that our funding is cut. We make the effect of that funding invisible to the public, they're not going to notice the effect that has on our staff, on other services available, on professional development, or RSCA. They'll just notice that people aren't getting in or getting the classes. If you get less money, they'll operate more efficiently. If we make this a top priority, they'll think we're being more efficient and hurt our ability to argue for increased funding.

Mayer feels like we're rushing this through. He might have been inclined to support the amendment, without knowing the other amendments he'd be unable to support it. He wanted a more aggressive look at the document.

Peterson offered a friendly amendment to bullet item one to take out "maximum possible" access because that is not reasonable given other priorities. All agreed to make this change as a friendly amendment.

Filling said that our enrollment is decreed to be 7090 and we'll have problems above and below, in light of that, not sure if that's the institutional imperative, what our ponderings on access means.

Sarraille responded to Filling. If more severe cuts were proposed, he doesn't think it's unthinkable that we'd be given lower targets. It's a question of whether we want to give a statement about what we think our target should be.

S. Davis was curious about C. Davis' other amendment to propose. C. Davis suggested a bullet new point about RSCA. S. Davis asked if anyone had any potential language to improve it to give UBAC additional direction to go into the meeting tomorrow.

Carroll suggested an amendment to add a new bullet point reading "as far as compatible with the above, maintain resources for fostering RSCA and professional development." This was meant to imply library, infrastructure, etc. S. Davis seconded. Johnson suggested removing "as far as compatible with the above" to not make it a lesser priority, and adding in "community engagement. The revised amendment would read "maintain resources for fostering research, scholarship and creative activity, professional development and community engagement." Peterson feels it weakens the amendment because it makes it a laundry list, but not for or against it. The amendment was approved.

Mayer suggested revising the second bullet to move from "retain and appoint" to "maintain." Seconded as an amendment by Tuedio. Mayer sees the operative word as "maintain" and in the financial situation we are in we should be happy to maintain our current levels.

C. Davis said FBAC chose "retain and appoint" because they felt it was below the level we desired. "Retain" is to say those we have we should keep, but we also want to raise levels. Tuedio doesn't support this because in the budget cycle we are in that will have some growth in structural deficit, we need to be careful about where we expand resources within our current expenditures. If we are maintaining our academic investment and increasing our staff, where will the cuts come from? There aren't that many other places to go. Support motion to maintain, but we should not increase levels.

The amendment to replace failed.

Colnic questioned the meaning of the final resolved regarding timeline, asking if it means we'll be visiting this next December, or can we put a time in here that's earlier in the fall semester to begin this process of discussing budget priorities? Tan said it's the calendar year – thru 2009. Colnic said we might want to consider this issue earlier than the end of December 2009. Thompson noted that FBAC Chair-elect Garcia will need to keep that in mind.

Tuedio addressed amending the second bullet point "...staff with emphasis on providing effective support for the core instructional mission." Tuedio said there may be areas that are not at this point adequately staffed and we should be conscious that those are the ones we're most interested in being addressed. If we're adding staff they should be around these priorities. DeVries seconded. Tuedio thinks there are areas that are not supported enough by non-teaching staff and these are areas we need to think carefully about and if we're adding staff they should be in these areas, not just general support. There will be other areas where we may want to add staff, and the amendment allows that to occur, but adds emphasis on the instructional mission.

DeVries says as it reads now it suggests that laying off staff could be prevented, but that's not the intention?

Sarraille doesn't think that bullet #2 would be interpreted as being able to fire staff in some chosen unit, but notwithstanding he thinks that the amendment that add emphasis if anything weakens it a bit and makes it easier to consider other things besides support of the core mission. He doesn't really think we're worrying about anything too huge here.

Amendment fails.

DeVries moved the question. Seconded by Mayer. Unanimous. Debate is closed. Vote on 22/AS/08/FBAC as amended passed.

## 7. Discussion Item

a. **WASC Report (sent to ASnet 12/3/08);** The WASC report makes observations in several areas and notes that "these observations are made less as criticisms than as intended helpful indicators of useful steps that can and should be taken before completing

the EER report and arranging for the next team visit. They are intended to add strength and credibility to the impressive work already completed”:

- i. “Clarify the centrality of general education to the mission and to the distinctiveness of the University” (32)
- ii. “Document that there is substantial progress in direct assessment of authentic student work which ensures that each graduate has met the objectives of both the departmental program and the General Education program (32)
- iii. Reach a “convincing consensus about expectations for research . . . [through] an open, shared discussion of research, teaching, and service with the mission . . . drawing on the existing mechanisms for shared governance.” (33)
- iv. Address “library resources . . . with attention to the issues of sustainable high quality research and scholarship.” (34)
- v. “Greater clarity and specificity in the statement of goals and in the metrics to evaluate attainment.” (34)
- vi. “Renew . . . consideration of advising and related services as they help achieve the goals for General Education and student success.” (34)
- vii. “Consider thoughtfully centralizing some . . . decision-making to support the continued development of common, or shared, programs (e.g., General Education or First Year Experiences), values (e.g., engagement or diversity), and goals (e.g. supporting the development of [the] service region.” (35)
- viii. Give “equal consideration . . . to faculty and staff development and to planning so as to ensure that these [technological] capabilities are deployed effectively and purposefully to enhance the quality of learning and of support services. (35)

Thompson apologized to guests who had come to speak to this topic and had to wait as we extended time on the budget resolution. He noted that this was important work, and thanked all for their patience and comments. Thompson turned the floor over to Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias to get us started.

Demetrulias indicated appreciation for this topic being on the agenda. She took the 66 recommendations from the WASC site team report and put them on a grid and made recommendations for units/committees/students who may wish to address those issues because not everyone is going to read the whole report and comment on it. This will help to structure the actions on the recommendations. The 8 recommendations at the end of the site team report are considered the most important and are raised to a higher level although all need to be addressed as best they can. She also provided a timeline for the steps left in the review process so people know what’s coming next and what we need to do. In the ideal world, we should address each of these actions by the end of the academic year especially if they involve policy, for implementation beginning in the fall. Anything occurring in the fall will need to be showcased in March when the team comes. It is less effective to have a report that says everything is under development. We can do that selectively, but not all of it. Among the eight, three are most important from a team perspective, and although we can’t guarantee these won’t shift, but for now it’s the GE program, RSCA/RPT issues, and direct assessment of student learning. These are the three that require much campus conversation, action, consensus building and demonstration that we have achieved in these three areas.

Thompson noted this will remain on the agenda for the next meeting. After reading the report he noted that they seemed really interested in GE and assessment. Roseanne Roy is here, as is Susan Marshall, and S. Davis who chairs GE Sub. Thompson asked them to share anything they wish.

R. Roy spoke to direct assessment. WASC looked at the Academic Program Reviews for evidence of direct assessment. Because we have staggered reviews, there is direct assessment occurring, but it’s not reflected in the APRs completed recently. We should see more of this as programs come under review. Thompson was concerned how this interfaces with principles of assessment, and noted that it’s good news that it does.

S. Davis indicated that part of the seriousness of the campus approach to the process is senate involvement. The three areas highlighted are not unique to CSUS, but are areas of national concern, of longstanding concern. On one hand they’re not picking on us and they had to dig deep to challenge or criticize us. S. Davis noted that this is already a pretty positive review.

S. Marshall commented that she and others involved with General Education have been working on the issues related to the centrality of GE via forums and the advisory group, and work on the Academic Program Review for GE. She appreciates those who have participated in the discussions, which have been well attended. As far as direct assessment, it’s an ongoing challenge to get people together to discuss these issues and get the plans going. Marshall understands it’s late in the semester, but if we’re going to get direct measure we need to get busy on that in January and Spring. This needs to be a university wide discussion – who will do that and how.

Novak read the entire document and noted that most of the document is comparing their evaluation of how we’re doing against the standards. There are several places, GE, assessment, RPT, where there are specific issues the team is looking at. Page 16, by EER expected to have direct measures of student learning; on 17 team should see concrete results of direct assessment efforts and criteria for success, benchmarks; 23 more direct measures of addressing student learning. On RPT, for EER, university is to set expectations and criteria for achievement. . . .” and a number of other places in the report where the team is going to be looking for things. They mentioned that at their exit presentation, and it’s clear there are some things here. Be aware that our discussion should be a serious one about how we are addressing these specific things so when they return we have justifications for addressing or not addressing them.

Thompson says it’s important for everyone to read the WASC report. The oral report led to different interpretations, and people have different readings of what the recommendations mean from the written report. Thompson asked Provost Covino to answer what “direct assessment in program reviews” means. What does that mean to you to have direct assessment in the program review.

Covino said from his experience WASC wants to see that we are in effect taking a sample of student work and applying measures/rubrics/expectations established by the department and are looking closely not at how well a student is doing or how well a professor is doing, but how well a program is achieving its goal of encouraging and achieving student learning. WASC wants to see the specifics of that rubric, program, or process, and wants to know that there are substantial samples of student work being looked at and had iterations of doing that as an institutionalized process, and they want to know most especially that the department is taking those results and acting on them, having good discussion, figuring out ways to improve the program in light of the results with the presupposition that programs can always be improved.

Sarraille said that one of the thing that should be listed as an unfunded mandate is the expense of doing all of this program assessment, this assessment of how well students are learning. Thompson noted it did come up in discussions is what counts as “unfunded mandates” that cause our structural deficit

Eudey stated her sense is a lot of us are already doing direct assessment but we don’t articulate it well. In the last two or three years there have been lots of changes in majors and minors and we may be saying we have decided to make changes, but we didn’t indicate that the choices to do so were based on reviewing student work or because we recognized that the discipline is moving in different directions. The main issue is we aren’t saying enough about our use of direct assessment for the WASC site team. We may just need to make things more explicit rather than change our processes.

Roy noted that there is a difference between direct assessment in the classroom and in a program level. We all do direct assessment in our classes. Program assessment is looking at program goals and measuring those goals, not necessarily from a particular class but we’re struggling to do that at a program level.

Demetrius indicated that when WASC came for the CPR, they’re preparing us for the end of the process, the EER. We’re not too much in a deficit model, they did see evidence for direct assessment. Each academic program showed information regarding what methods, direct and indirect that each program uses to assess learning outcomes, and then asking for examples of how that was used. They didn’t ask to see the data, but asked us to report how we used information for program improvement. Every department has some direct measure underway or planned, but since it’s a WASC standard to have direct assessment, they want to make sure that we have evidence that it’s operational and ongoing. PACs have done a great job to try to convey this information, and they have annual reports. PACs need help in academic departments, and to be given time in dept meetings for the review of these efforts and what they mean as a faculty and how we use that information. WASC wants to know how do the faculty come together, what is the mechanism to review the quality of the program? This may be the part we want to refine.

Roy noted that direct assessment is time consuming, requiring time, resources, and people skills. We need to get faculty colleagues to agree on measures, collect data, and talk about the data. The more that faculty engage in that, the easier it is. This process can be very valuable. Are we going through the process, what data are we using to inform the conversations. For GE assessment it’s particularly challenging because GE doesn’t have the cohesiveness of department priorities. GE needs to figure out how to assess the GE goals, but we agree it’s important to have GE and we need to step up and make it a priority.

The discussion ended due to time constraints. WASC will be on our agenda again.

**8. Open Forum suggestions:**

1. Budget -deferred
2. Summer term - deferred

**9. Adjournment:** the meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.