1. **Call to order at 2:35 pm**

2. **Approval of Agenda**
   - no changes

3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of December 9, 2008**
   - page 3, Peterson, second sentence near end change “when” to “then”
   - page 6, Change “If we’re adding staff they should be around these priorities.”
   - Page 5, last sentence beginning Carroll, Johnson was “kindly interrupted” by speaker Thompson instead of “cut off”
   - Page 7, next to last paragraph with “S. Marshall, fourth sentence – strike no one came portion”
   - Page 8 D indicated, 4th sentence at end “but asked us how we used the information for program improvement” instead of “asked us to report on it.”
   - Page 8 Covino paragraph, last sentence – strike it.

Minutes approved as amended.

4. **Announcements**
   a. Barbara Manrique announced that the Stanislaus Connection includes a page of poems, quotes, etc. The publication has a focus on peace, justice and the environment. Tina Driscoll from the Connection is looking for people who write poetry that might relate to these issues, and some connect to the disciplines. Manrique distributed a sign-up sheet if people would like to submit something. Manrique has Driscoll’s email address to share to those interested.

   b. Eudey distributed information about Instructional Institute Day to be held on February 6th, and the spring quarter book clubs.

   c. Filling shared information about happenings at Dominguez Hills regarding reorganization of colleges. Two colleges were merged without faculty consultation and they were assigned a new dean. Dominguez Hills’ responses to budget cuts include canceling state travel and all assigned time, canceling classes, and canceling attempts at AACSB accreditation. Filling suggested that we could consider a statement about the conditions at Dominguez Hills. Thompson noted that we have a time certain at 3:00, but if time allows we can come back to this later in the agenda or in the open forum.

   d. Thompson announced that SEC decided to disseminate the SEC agenda to the general faculty and that it will come out electronically. The last agenda was distributed after the meeting, but in the future it will go out electronically at the same time it does to SEC. Thompson also announced that the President approved the faculty governance award and the call for nominations will be out soon. Thompson recognized Eudey as the new Director of the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning. Thompson’s letter to the faculty dated Dec 6th indicated concerns about faculty roles in enrollment management, and this topic was further addressed by SEC. Thompson, Covino and Pugh will continue discussion of faculty involvement in enrollment management. Finally, there was a request from Provost Covino regarding the Strategic Plan Work Group and the Student Success Committee (SSC) which will take on a different role and charge. There has been faculty membership on the SSC, so SEC asked the Provost for an update on the membership and charge, and the opportunities for input on that.
5. Questions about Committee Reports
Nagel asked about CR/NC option for WP courses mentioned in the UEPC report. Petrosky replied that UEPC got a request form the University Writing Committee to discuss this, but UEPC does not yet have full details.

a. Highlights of the January 26, 2009 meeting of the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC) include:

- **UEE Pilot Special Session Policy**
  
  FBAC members continued reviewing numerous sections of this pilot policy. We will continue discussion at our next meeting.
  
  Some of the parts of the Pilot Policy that we came to agreement with were:
  
  Section a(vi.1) – Financial management
  Filling, Covino and Criswell-Bloom will meet and make changes for review by the next FBAC meeting.
  
  Section a(vi.3) – Academic support
  The UEE Program Manager will ensure all programs and classes are supported through the special sessions course proposal process. This includes preparation, routing, and maintenance of the Special Session Course Proposal forms. Additionally, the Program manager will assist in book and instructional material procurement.
  
  Section a(vi.5) – Student services
  UEE serves as a primary focus point for special sessions students with questions about tuition fees, financial aid, OIT support, graduation, and other non-academic issues.
  
  Paragraph after section a(vi.6)
  UEE will not provide administrative support to the College. The administrative support cost borne by the College should be factored into the program budget as a separate line item.
  
  Section b - Shared fiscal responsibility and accountability
  Filling, Covino and Criswell-Bloom will meet and make changes for review by the next FBAC meeting.
  
  Section c – UEE support fee, university and chancellor fees, and surplus share
  
  Change from:
  Should a surplus be realized, the surplus split for programs that realize under $100,000 in net revenue shall be allocated 60% to the College and 40% to the University. Should the surplus exceed $100,000, the surplus will be shared equally.
  
  To:
  1. For a surplus up to $50,000, 70% goes to the College and 30% goes to the University.
  2. For a surplus above $50,000:
     a. for the first $50,000, 70% goes to the College and 30% goes to the University.
     b. for the amount above $50,000, 60% goes to the College and 40% to the University.

- **Suggestions for Self Study Inquiry Circles** (carried over)

- **Budget information**
  
  Garcia and Filling walked FBAC members through the UBAC’s recommendations to the President. These UBAC recommendations have been posted to

  
  There’s a general feeling that FBAC members should be more involved in the decision making process related to the current budget crisis.

b. Highlights of the January 29, 2009 Graduate Council Meeting include:

1. **Graduate Education Assessment**
   The Council continued to review and revise the assessment plan for graduate education and continued to review assessment data. Collectively, ongoing discussion about graduate education assessment is connected to the current discussion about graduate culture at CSU, Stanislaus and will inform near future graduate education strategic planning.

2. **Petition/Appeal of University Requirements**
   The Council will be forwarding this month to SEC/AS Petition/Appeal of University Requirements draft policy for AS approval. This policy contains elements directly related to course substitution for graduate program requirements.
3. MA/MS Interdisciplinary Studies Director Position

Dennis Sayers, current Director of the MA/MS Interdisciplinary Studies Program, completes his 3-year term this spring and will not be seeking reappointment. The position description has been reviewed by the Council and has been forwarded to SEC for review. The Committee on Committees will appoint the search committee. The search process will begin this spring.

4. Administrative Support for the Graduate Council

Raichelle Owens, administrative support for the Graduate Council, will be on leave this spring. Alyssa Mazzina will be serving as administrative support during the spring semester.

Highlights of the January 22, 2009 meeting of the University Educational Policies Committee include:

- **Online Courses.** Chair will meet with the Vice Provost, Chris DeVries, Carl Whitman, and Brian Duggan in February to review the WASC response regarding online courses; the fruits of this discussion will prompt further action at future meeting of UEPC.
- **Program Revision: Bachelor of Arts in Child Development, Minor in Child Development, Liberal Studies Concentration in Child Development.** Second reading: approved contingent on further positive consultation with Biological Sciences.
- **Course Proposal: SW 2010 Introduction to the Social Work Profession.** Sociology Department Chair Dr. Paul O’Brien and a contingent of department faculty met with the committee to discuss the proposed lower-division GE course, as well as the response from the GE subcommittee. Issues raised included the general process of consultation on this campus, whether simple information-sharing constitutes consultation. Discussed redundancies in the content of the new course with topics covered in Sociology courses. Discussed the role of graduate professional programs in offering undergraduate liberal-arts-oriented coursework. Questioned whether Social Work faculty were disproportionate access to argument in front of the GE Subcommittee (further inquiry indicates that this was not the case). Final action expected at the next meeting of UEPC.
- **Student Petitions Committee Membership and Charge Revision.** Due to potential conflicts of interest, the Counseling faculty expressed an interest in removing their required membership on this committee. Change was approved.

6. **Discussion Items**

   a. **WASC Report (continued, 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”:

- “Clarify the centrality of general education to the mission and to the distinctiveness of the University” and “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)
- 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)
- Address “library resources . . . with attention to the issues of sustainable high quality research and scholarship.” (34)
- “[S]upport decision-making, planning, and resource allocations . . . [through greater clarity and specificity in the statement of goals and in the metrics to evaluate attainment.” (34)
- “Renew . . . consideration of advising and related services as they help achieve the goals for General Education and student success . . .” (34)
- “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)
- 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)

Earlier this afternoon Thompson sent to AS the 66 recommendations from the WASC site team report and the governance committees to whom SEC thinks these should be referred. Please let Thompson know if you have other ideas for places within governance to which these should be referred. Thompson then asked senate to raise issues related to the report.

Hejka-Ekins asked for Demetrulias to clarify the meaning of #42 – shared discussions regarding written expectations for teaching, research and service at program, college, and university levels. Demetrulias noted that this is one of the most important items. She said that the site team discerned that we did not have a consensus regarding our processes and the judgments being made. Partially this is because we have elaborations that some could read as a list of competencies, but the team wasn’t sure that these were communicated clearly. The team used the term “criteria” to mean expected levels or standards of performance within categories. They mentioned that at the university or college level we might want to describe different kinds of decisions – assistant to associate, associate to full, dual line, early tenure, etc. and to draw upon existing governance process, but also encourage doing this through open and shared discussion so that all can participate in resolution. It may mean revising the RPT policy to reflect changes that came through FAC and URPTC. For Demetrulias the urgency is that we do this well and soon. Because research had been an issue in last reviews, they reminded us that this had been on the agenda before for WASC review and we should take it seriously. We’ve made good progress, but not made it all the
way yet.

Hejka-Ekins addressed the move from decentralized toward centralizing for consistency. Departments can still determine their own criteria, but there is a lack of procedural consistency that they want to see more centralized. Demetrulias says it wasn’t cast that way, but that we need clarity to show how it is engaged in at all three levels. At the university or college levels others don’t have specificity like we have in our departments, but there may be statements that discuss the import of particular issues. Most talk about the primacy of teaching in college and university policy, but we don’t specify that as clearly as other campuses do. It doesn’t say how this plays out, but does name teaching as the primary criteria and asks departments to say how that would be judged. Demetrulias doesn’t say everything has to be centralized, but that there should be consistency in framework, not criteria.

Thompson clarified the process for addressing the WASC recommendations regarding RPT/RSCA from the report he authored on Dec 6th. SEC is in agreement with his report that the process does need to be lead by faculty, keeping in mind that the authority faculty have is to make a recommendation. We should take that recommendation seriously, and there are two general faculty committees leading the effort – URPTC and FAC, but there does have to be broad consultation. We’ve had many times in the past run a process with broad consultation from students, administration, staff, and faculty. Third, in return for leading this effort is a hope that when recommendations come that faculty take them seriously, that’s at the heart of this. The responsibility is that we take the recommendations seriously. Fourth, to encourage the good faith participation is the standpoint that we don’t start from a position that denigrates the work that we’ve done and the processes that have been mostly successful over a long period of time. We begin as believers in our current process and see how that might be fine-tuned.

Saraille said that from what he has heard about the WASC report, there are very different spins on what the report says coming from different people. He encouraged everyone to make sure to check their sources closely and don’t just rely on another person’s interpretations of what is being said by WASC.

Covino said that FAC and everyone should take a look at the criteria developed conscientiously by faculty at other CSU campuses as examples of how others have deliberated and come up with the sorts of statements the WASC members are more accustomed to seeing. There are good examples that we could learn from, others could learn from what we have done. This could help guide us and make the process easier than if we were to try to reinvent something. Covino also agrees completely with faculty leading the process, but would recommend that there be, as there is, some standing administrative voice or voices in the meetings that take place so that we can demonstrate that we have moved through a consensual process so that Deans and others who are key members of the RPT process and have a great responsibility and accountability for making good decisions are voices making decisions at every moment of the process. He’s not thinking about votes and majority and minorities, but would like to see participation at all points of the conversation by some of the others who are part of the RPT process as a way of contributing usefully in the conversation about a process we participate in regularly.

Thompson had a general question regarding how we will approach General Education and General Education Assessment. What should we expect to be coming to this body, to be moving through governance, that needs to be done this spring, if anything? Marshall said that the General Education Academic Program Review draft will be with GE Subcommittee on Monday. They will meet on the 30th for the first discussion of that item.

Thompson noted that WASC will remain on the agenda for next time.

b. CSU Information Security Policy, Responsible Use Policy, and Information Security Standards (Holmberg, Whitman time certain 3:00)

Thompson introduced Charles Holmberg and Carl Whitman and noted that the policies were sent by email separate from the agenda. This is a system-level initiative and campuses have until March 2nd to respond so the policy will be on the agenda again at the next senate meeting. Whitman distributed a handout outlining and summarizing key points from the materials distributed electronically. He noted that the documents sent via email are from a 2-year process including consultations throughout the CSU. The unions have been involved and there has been broad distribution. In the first review of the policies last year, there was a request for more time for campuses to review. There were also additional revisions made by a newly-hired consulting firm. The documents include the “security policies” that offer a high-level statement regarding policies and intentions. These intentions are implemented in detail in the “Standards.” For the sake of simplicity, there is a “responsible use policy” to provide a summary of the others. The documents are especially about computer security, but the intention is to address information security in the broadest sense. What is requested of us is to provide feedback to the Chancellor’s office. Whitman noted that Charles Holmberg is the Information Security Officer for the campus and is responsible for security issues. Holmberg will compile responses from around the campus and then submit them to the Chancellor’s Office and hope to see our input reflected in subsequent revisions of the policy drafts. The intent is to move this through the processes to culminate in an Executive Order from the Chancellor’s Office and become CSU policy.

Much in the documents is already the practice and policy at the CSU, they’re not new to many campuses, although many are new here. Today we have inconsistent application of our security policies. This is an attempt to improve consistency. There was a recent security audit of the campus, and these were mandated by the Board of Trustees and required a lot of response on our part to clear the audit findings. Front and center is the absence of a comprehensive policy such as the one we’ve been asked to comment on. Whitman asks us to pay serious attention to the polices since they do represent aspects of change to our practice. Hopefully the summary document will be an entry point for considering the documents. The OIT Advisory committee is trying to go through the document word by word.

O’Brien honed in on the responsible use document, and although not an expert, he sees some of this as a bit Draconian, for example that we can’t put software on our computer systems without approval. There are many things that are troublesome. Referencing the second paragraph on the first page… “specifics… fed, state, law, policies, etc.” O’Brien asked if this is saying that our local policies would be
Taniguchi did read through it all, but is not well informed about such issues. There are a number of places in standards 10.0 and 11.0 that reference documenting practices, and she thinks it will be helpful to indicate who stores the information, and helpful to put that information on the organizational view under 5.2 risk assessment. There is nothing there that says where documentation is stored and who has responsibility. Another thing not seen in 5.2 where identified risks are elaborated, she doesn’t see any language that deals with privacy or identity theft. Taniguchi thinks it would be helpful to specifically address that kind of risk and how it’s rated in terms of impact. Whitman said they intended to address identity theft and identity, so it’s not clear that should be added. Whitman appreciates Taniguchi’s point regarding documentation as well. There is an assumption that procedures are maintained locally in the originating department, but overarching that is a belief that whoever is given this risk management goal (finance office here) that that person serves as a central repository for that kind of information, and website. Much of this info is either appropriate for general purpose websites or those that are password protected.

Taniguchi thought more should be explicit. Third, in the glossary, it would be helpful when the document includes acronyms to also have those in the glossary. They are explained in the document, but it would be better to have an easier reference in the glossary.

Sarraille indicated that he has so many problems with this that it would take more than 2 hours to go through them all. He will be on the negotiating team that will discuss this policy between CFA and the CSU Administration. These parties have not yet met for the first time. However, over the weekend he reviewed this policy and wants to address a few things. He finds that this is not a policy that addresses the fact that we are a university, that is the most fundamental thing about it. It starts with the approach that we are a bank or a fort, and addresses our security needs. There have been some issues put on it like post-its about academics, but that’s about the extent of it. In the policy itself, if you look for the word teach, instruction, class, classroom, scholar, or scholarship you likely will not find them. There are other documents where words are used sparsely, but that gives the flavor of it. Why didn’t the authors of the document go to universities or to people and ask for examples of best practices of polices and work from that? Maybe Whitman will say they had input, but it does not have the appearance of having done that.

Sarraille continued that we should be curious about where our security program is destined to lie along the centralized/decentralized access continuum. This is not addressed in what we’ve received so far. Sarraille thinks it is not in our best interest to have an imposed centralized policy that applies to all. There is no assurance that will not be the case. It took Sarraille a long time to realize that certain things in the documents could potentially apply directly to faculty. If we look at level two protected data, that includes grades, courses taken, schedules, test scores, advising records – something every faculty could have in their possession. There are many provisions in the policy that apply to that kind of data and there are possible implications for faculty because they deal with that data. We might have to sign confidentially agreements, have a background check, encrypt grade books on our computers and keep it in that form unless permission is granted, and we might undergo security training. Whitman agrees that Sarraille’s characterization of the policy is accurate so far. Sarraille says we might be restricted to which networks we can connect our computer to. All communication regarding grades will be regulated by campus personnel or in encrypted form. You might have to have your computer rigged to log you out after 20 minutes of inactivity. That’s just a few of the concerns. Sarraille noted there are other things to mention that apply more narrowly to faculty like himself. Sarraille teaches computer science and networking, and the students he teaches need to use the network as a learning tool – it’s about what he is trying to convey to his students. There are things in these documents that tell us that we cannot use the network to do instruction, that we can’t use the network for a learning tool unless they okay each aspect of it in advance. That’s a stifling prospect for teaching.

Whitman thinks Sarraille is correctly characterizing the content of the document although Whitman has a different view of how difficult it will be to deal with certain issues, most specifically on the network point. The response would be to propose to give the faculty member a totally independent network for teaching purposes that doesn’t happen to be the same as the campus network. It’s the sandbox aspect that you might appropriately want to include that is different from the business aspect. Sarraille noted there might be many sand box needs. Whitman said that if we supported the documents fully, we don’t have the resources it takes to implement it – it’s not trivial from a cost and resource standpoint. This is another dialogue to have at a time of fiscal challenge, is this a priority? Is this sort of thing where the CSU priorities lie?

Filling said there is a lack of understanding that in a university setting information is owned by disparate parties, not by the “corporation.” The notion is it’s all the systems and they get to determine what to do with it. If we look at the experience we’ve had to date with data loss and risk of exposure, it’s not losing a grade book that causes risk exposure, it’s the primary systems and the experiments made by those paid to do so. Faculty aren’t where the risk is.

Petratos noted that UC Berkeley has a less restrictive policy. Why do we want to add more responsibilities on already stretched resources?

O’Brien thanked Sarraille for his review of the policy and impacts. When looking at this regarding mobile devices, it says that no protected data can be included unless encrypted including notebooks, flash drives, etc. which means that excel grade books on a laptop would be out of compliance. O’Brien asked if there will be liability insurance for us if we make a good faith effort. This reads like a risk management document, and he’s wondering if maybe there is something in the CFA contract to protect us when we’re not doing bad things.

Taniguchi note that regarding compliance issues, that having information available via computers is important for students with different disabilities. As these policies are firm up we need to keep in mind the power of computers for helping nontraditional students with certain disabilities access the kinds of materials we are trying to teach. We need that to be facilitated not harmed by this document.
Thompson had a question regarding standard 5.2 (page 5) which offered a likelihood and magnitude grid regarding chances for something horrible happening. What has our campus faced or is currently facing regarding likelihood and magnitude? Holmberg replied that one of the on-going jobs is to look at our data and classify it according to this grid. This is the grid they propose we use to classify our status. Whitman said that our auditor would say there are a number areas that are “high” vulnerability. One might take issue with their assessment, especially as to whether there is a motivation to exploit a vulnerability, but we get written up based on traditional audit measures. An example is the way we manage user accounts and passwords, or our lack of management. Is that high vulnerability, maybe not, but we have systems that have had no controls applied to them when the vulnerability is not that data is gained but they would be a point of operations for subsequent activities that could do bad things.

Thompson asked if we’ve had events. Whitman said we have, but the only one since he was here, and involved the systems operated by the food service vendor. We have taken steps to take them out of our environment entirely and moved them to an independent network separate from the university. If something were to happen in the credit card processing we can state that all liability is theirs.

Thompson questioned the language in the responsible use document regarding having “reasonable cause” when looking at others’ information. Reasonable cause exists when “a member of a group within the campus or community has been detrimentally affected by some action.” Is there some other meaning that you have in the information area regarding what detrimentally affected means? This seems like ‘you hurt my feelings’ falls into that. Whitman says that that is an example of something that probably bears greater specificity regarding meaning. In practical means, we rely on public safety to determine if something requires special action – they are the ‘reasonable person.’ No OIT organization has the time to engage in trivial pursuits of these issues. Likely there is no problem if it’s made more formal and strict to focus action on the campus.

Saraille noted O’Brien’s hope that CFA gets us out of this, and Saraille hopes that Statewide Academic Senate will get us out of this. Saraille doesn’t believe CFA having more than a narrow set of things that can be settled between CFA and administration. He claimed that this is really a deeply flawed process. We have this document that has some nice characteristics, but has severe drawbacks in its present form. Whomever is responsible needs to go back to the drawing board and do it over again and come back with something more befitting the institution that it’s aimed at. Some compromise will happen, but we need to go back to our respective fora and get it reviewed before it rolls over too many of us.

Tan returned to discussion of the responsible use policy. She finds the policy very disturbing due to the “must not” lists. Tan ends up confused because it’s not clear what she shouldn’t do. If in a situation when she is not sure what to do, who should she call for clarification? For example, standard 4.2 says users must not edit, delete or destroy data without authorization. Who do I have to ask permission from? Tan finds it confusing and disturbing. Whitman said the example was meant to refer to the specific context of a person employed in an administrative office with complete access to PeopleSoft and who is supposed to add or delete data, and being told they need authorization. Whitman can imagine that it’s these kinds of things that create the must not’s, and it needs to be bracketed to specific contexts, not teaching, research, etc. Tan noted that there are many of these. Whitman says that clarification should come from the Information Security Officer, but more fundamentally done via the required training. Whitman noted the need for training and awareness, and that’s part of the overall program coming from the Chancellor’s Office.

Strahm addressed standard 4.2. Social science could be impacted by the language of this. Sociologists don’t study all the nice things in society, for example Neo Nazis. They are sometimes engaged in research as an anonymous user, and working on websites that would be banned. There’s an important consideration that those of us in communities of scholars are inserting ourselves into areas that could get us branded for our computer use. Whiteman noted that somewhere in these documents it must be stated that we need a process that enables faculty to do what they need to do without running afoul of the policy. Reveal what you’re doing to somebody to avoid misinterpretation. If something here cause the work to be constrained, there needed to be documentation as to what was done to unconstrain it. An auditor will look at the process, and not be so concerned about the final result. The auditor will ask, “did you approve the exception to the rule?” In response we just need to show how exceptions were made. We need systems that don’t create barriers while living up to the letter and spirit of the privacy standards.

S. Davis said it seems like there is a lot of context missing from the document, and there should be more clarity on parameters and local implementation, particularly the implications on our work and our intellectual property. S. Davies queried who the members are of the OIT Advisory Council Whitman mentioned. Whitman will send the names including Chris De Vries, Pengtao Li, Priscilla Peters, Tom Carter, and also Dean McNeil and the director of IR.

Wendt reminded us that we see an encompassing word like “data,” we need to remember that a huge body of the data that we’re responsible for has to do with ourselves as employees. We need to be mindful that a policy like this will cause a lot of work, time and effort for Wendt and staff, but the protection of a lot of the data is directly related to the faculty employees. Identify theft is the tip of the iceberg. All of the information embedded in PeopleSoft regarding health care, social security numbers, etc. needs to be protected. We do need to be very, very protective of our faculty privacy and confidentiality rights. Let’s not lose sight of this in these conversations. The institution needs to be responsible about the information that has been loaned to them.

Thompson noted we’ll keep this on the agenda for next time in case people have more comments.

7. **First Reading Item**
   a. 1/AS/09/UEPC—Statement on Impact of Budget Reductions on Educational Quality (sense of the Senate; from the University Educational Policies Committee Statement Regarding Budgetary Process).
Petrosky indicated that this is a Discussion:

Increasing faculty's teaching workloads
Consolidation of course sections
Eliminating and/or consolidating sections of required toward degree. This affirmation of instructional priority is based on the following assertions:

In consideration of the educational implications of budgetary decisions, the STATEMENT

This Statement was attached to the resolution distributed at the January 20, 2009 Academic Senate Meeting:

STATEMENT

In consideration of the educational implications of budgetary decisions, the University Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) affirms the imperative of offering a course schedule that, to the greatest extent possible, ensures student access and timely progression toward degree. This affirmation of instructional priority is based on the following assertions:

Eliminating and/or consolidating sections of required courses will increase students' time to graduation.
- Shifting the supply of classes does not guarantee the consequent shifting of demand.
- Not all students have the weekday/time-of-day flexibility to significantly alter their schedule, particularly those first-generation students who have work and family issues to balance against their pursuit of an education. Faced with a schedule that does not conform to their needs, students may postpone their educational goals.
- Students receiving financial aid may be doubly impacted, given that reduced access due to the cancellation of course sections may compel them to alter their status from full time to part-time.
- Even a one-time reduction of course sections will likely have a significant impact on future graduation delays. Students postponing their coursework to a subsequent semester will fill classes and force other students competing for the same section in that semester to postpone to a subsequent semester, ad infinitum.

Consolidation of course sections will adversely impact the quality of education.
- Enrollment caps assigned to particular courses at the time of their design and through the ensuing course approval process are not arrived at capriciously, but rather are the product of close consideration of class level and pedagogical concerns. Adherence to those caps should likewise avoid caprice.
- Pedagogical considerations impact the effectiveness of larger class sizes, e.g., lab sections require more hands-on direct instruction by the instructor, and case-based classes necessitate student interaction and participation that cannot be achieved on a larger scale.
- The concomitance of quality, access, and class size is regularly evidenced in the outcomes and highlighted in the narratives of our ongoing graduate surveys.

Increasing faculty's teaching workloads will adversely impact the quality of education.
- Faculty who are actively engaged in scholarly pursuits in their respective disciplines are likely to transfer the requisite currency derived from that engagement, as well as the novel insights which are the probable outcomes of that engagement, to their students in the classroom.
- Faculty who are engaged in improvements to the curriculum -- such as the pursuit or maintenance of accreditation; the development of new programs, courses, or course delivery; or deliberation on policies which govern the curriculum -- enhance the quality of education.
- The assumption of additional instructional responsibilities of any faculty member -- through the assignment of additional teaching loads or increased class size -- will necessarily reduce the time available for service to the university and scholarly pursuits. The quality of instruction will diminish and with it the quality of education.

Discussion:

Petrosky indicated that this is a first reading but Senate saw a version of it in December in a slightly altered version. A few had issues
with the way statements were made in the December document, especially that they were not general, and at its January 8th meeting UEPC considered the Senate comments and created a policy statement. On the second page is the statement that reflects consideration of the comments, addressing the nexus between budgetary actions and their impact on educational quality. The statement attached should be a guiding principle for budgetary decision making. If approved, these principles need to be shared with the entire campus community. The rationale says that those traditions and essential character items developed over 48 years shouldn’t be cast aside for a temporary budgetary situation however long “temporary” may be.

Filling indicated that Petrosky hit the high points of the resolution. While UBAC met its deadline for the 08-09 deadline, this is a relevant statement for UBAC to use for 09-10 and future.

Thompson reminded us that we’ve seen a version of this before and requested UEPC bring it back as a resolution, and it is offered as a sense of the senate. He asked for questions, clarifications and advice to UEPC.

Eudey asked if this needs to move to second now, or if waiting for the next meeting is okay. O’Brien indicated that we can wait. Covino said that the president will respond to the recommendations which will set into motion a scenario building process that will take a number of weeks. The calendar for next year will not happen within days, and there will be several weeks before making recommendations on what to do for next year.

Thompson noted that what we have to deal with next time in terms of action are the two resolved clauses. While we had lots of discussion about the statement itself, that won’t be up for amendment in Senate, so please suggest those to Petrosky for consideration by UEPC before the next meeting.

8. Open Forum

Young asked to return to WASC. Earlier we discussed a procedural issue regarding senate approval and GE assessment, and she’s using this as an example because in GC they are working on an assessment plan for graduate education. She questioned what would be coming through AS, what kinds of things from an assessment perspective would be requiring senate approval. Thompson responded that anything that we would consider an academic policy needs to be approved by the Senate and the President. In another conversation with someone who has done a lot with WASC, there was a question if it’s debatable whether something is policy or not. Something that isn’t a policy can still be addressed as a recommendation by the senate. Our power is to recommend, and if it’s something of broad interest to the campus and something that needs to be discussed, we can do that even if it’s not a policy. Whatever is policy must go through to AS, and whatever needs broad discussion among the faculty should be brought through.

Young said that Graduate Council was working to affirm an assessment plan for Graduate Education, which is much like GE, asking different programs across campus to come together for some kind of unified plan. Young questioned what the process is for GE to arrive at some approved, affirmed, standard, whatever word we’ll use to get there. S. Davis said that this is the first honest APR that GE has tried to do because GE is so diffused in so many areas, it’s difficult to look at as a coherent program. In reviewing what comes from the study, GE subcommittee will make recommendations to UEPC whether there is a change to the process, organizational structure, language, etc. will be recommendations for campus consideration and senate will likely hear about it at some point.

Thompson sees the analogy, and to him if we were looking at how the campus was to assess GE and it came to UEPC, Thompson would expect that to come to senate, not to stop at UEPC. Young clarified that when GC comes to an assessment plan, why should it come to Senate since it’s not a policy. Thompson wondered if the plan would act as a policy – are you telling programs things they have to do? Must the instructions be followed? If not, it’s guidelines and principles, not a policy. Young clarified that GC would still bring it to senate for discussion. Thompson asked why would you not? Young noted that GC membership includes a coordinator from every department that has one or more graduate programs.”

Demetrulias noted that sometimes it’s not clear what’s a policy and what’s a procedure. Some committees have worked autonomously because the membership is representative and chairs are serving on SEC. The sharing of minutes, issues, etc creates an opportunity for SEC/Chairs to determine what could be considered by Senate or others. Sometimes decisions have been made without consultation/approval in the past, but there are structures in place where people beyond a chair have the opportunity to give counsel on what may be policy or procedures. Thompson understands how things like this can happen, but when looking at the charge of a committee, their charges do not say that they are making policy, they’re making recommendations to the senate. And even if things have been approved that one year were not deemed policy, and another as policy, when in doubt we try to follow the correct path the second time. We’ve sent out information that anytime an administrative liaison brings an item to a standing committee or subcommittee they should communicate that item to the executive assistant. If that happens, then it’s communicated to SEC so they should be aware of it. There is a strong mechanism for ensuring communication so at least SEC can have a discussion if it’s policy or would like it brought forward even if it’s not policy.

Marshall wanted to talk briefly about GE assessment and about recommendations about that. Marshall has worked with colleagues on an ad hoc advisory committee to talk about GE issues. For the academic program review she has been trying to describe what they’re doing for GE assessment, not making recommendations for changes. She is gathering pieces and describing what we have for GE assessment on this campus. That has been daunting. If it hasn’t yet come to the campus as a whole, she wasn’t thinking there was clamor for it. But it will be coming out via the APR and Marshall would be happy to talk about it in the senate.

Thompson reiterated that discussions should be had about whether or not something looks like policy.

9. Adjournment. 4:16pm