

<p>Academic Senate March 3, 2009</p> <p>Present: Bell, Bender, Bice, Black, Brown, Cogan Bailey, Colnic, Cotton, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, DeVries, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Hall, Hejka-Ekins, Heredia, Hight, Jones, Keswick, Manrique, M. Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Nainby, O'Brien, Peterson, Petrosky, Russell, Silverman, Senior, Silverman, Snizek, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Tuedio, Werling, Young</p> <p>Proxies: Tan (Campbell), Robbins (Dunham-Filson)</p> <p>Guests: Dean Aly, Vice Provost Demetrulias, Duggan, Dean McNeil, Dean Novak, Saraille, Dean Stefanco, AVP Wendt</p> <p>Diana Bowman, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>2/AS/09/GC—Petition/Appeal of University Requirements & Course Substitution (Graduate), UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED</p> <p>21/AS/08/FAC—Amendment to the University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Procedures, APPROVED</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, March 17, 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

2:37pm call to order

2. Approval of Agenda

no changes requested

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 17, 2009

Shawna Young, page 7, replace “or” with “and”

Eudey announced that April Dunham-Filson sent grammatical changes that will be incorporated into the document.

4. Announcements

Scott Russell noted a serious problem with transcripts going out from admissions and records. A top student in the department was applying for research programs, put in a rush order two weeks ago and was not notified that the transcripts were not sent to all schools and deadlines were missed. Russell called admissions and records, and learned there was a Peoplesoft error that has caused this. There are supposedly signs up in MSR about this, but they're easily missed. Taniguchi noted that this is not an isolated matter. Taniguchi isn't sure that checking on the status helps. Russell stated he keeps getting told it's a PeopleSoft issue. O'Brien wondered if we can transmit the transcripts electronically. Robbins noted that every grade is having to be checked into the new system, it's not transferring smoothly. Everything that is transferred from Banner to Peoplesoft is being checked. She said that stamp and seal are needed on transcripts so likely they can't be sent electronically. Covino acknowledged that many issues of concern were arising, and if there are problems with transcripts of any sort, you can address those to Covino or a dean and they'll get them to enrollment services and see what's happening.

Manrique has a request from CSU Stanislaus branch of ERFA to take brochures to the departments and share with faculty who are considering FERPing or retiring. This group was founded in 1985 to protect the rights and benefits of retirees. In this economic climate Manrique noted that it's especially important to watch out for their rights. Many campuses have been able to ensure that the emeriti faculty have email and library access, ours do. We're still working to get parking privileges, as most of the campuses have. Some campuses have lifetime parking for spouses of deceased retirees. Please share the brochure with your faculty.

Stacey Morgan Foster announced that on March 19 and 20 the campus will be visited by a researcher from the Southern Regional Education Board, a group conducting a study on schools who are successfully supporting students traditionally seen as at-risk. They are studying 16 colleges and universities that have graduation rates higher than would be predicted from the students' academic profile. We're the only western school that qualified, Long Beach is also included, for they have shown great improvement even though they do not meet the study's criteria. Eudey and Morgan Foster are coordinating the visit. There will be opportunity for faculty to talk with him to discuss what we do right.

Colnic announced that on March 30th from noon to three, California Campus Compact will be here for a working entitled “Thriving in Uncertain Times” focusing on service learning and engagement. The focus is on how we can continue to develop community based service projects in these economic times when they are especially needed. Fliers were distributed. Registration is required, and there is a website with info on how to register. Colnic noted that a good turnout would be good for our community and show Compact how we do things around here – another opportunity to show off.

FAC Chair Hejka-Ekins shared information on the RPT process and what is underway. Originally after the WASC report there were a number of items identified that need to be followed up on. Item 42. She noted that there are numerous steps that need to be taken, but FAC is initiating the process. Thompson, Flora Watson as URPTC chair, and Hejka-Ekins met together and then with FAC and URPTC to discuss how this would be implemented. From that discussion, they agreed that the RSRA guidelines are in place and the top priority is to focus on teaching and service criteria. There is a process for faculty dialogue to address the question, "What are the guidelines for teaching and service that faculty are expected to meet?" They will use this question as an open dialogue to gather data and opinions about how we should proceed. Watson, Hejka-Ekins and Thompson will meet with 6 colleges during a chair meeting and discuss the importance of this process, and ask chairs to discuss this in their departments. They are therefore using a bi-level approach with dialogues at department and university-wide levels. Upon request of any committee chair, they will attend a department meeting if it will help to facilitate the dialogue. Two public forums will be held March 18 1:00-2:30 in FDC 118, and March 19 from 1:00-2:30 in FDC 118. Hope that members of FAC and URPTC will be there, and anyone interested will come and give opinions. The hope is that this will initiate a broad conversation throughout March. Then they will collect the data, compile it into a report, and discuss at FAC and URPTC for policy recommendations. Based on that, they'll continue through the normal processes for review and approval by faculty and administration. The purpose is to create a dialogue about teaching and service. The expectation is that departments will clarify their guidelines, the actual outcomes will be the result of the process. So, Watson and Hejka-Ekins hope that by the end of the spring to have compiled the data and have a picture of how the faculty view this to have something to report to WASC to show that we are progressing as an institution, which is an important issue for our accreditation. She hopes all will participate since this is a really important issue for us all.

S. Davis wants to thank FAC and URPTC for their attention and work on this. Thompson added that at the next SEC meeting we will be looking to focus on the GE portion of the WASC recommendations and have invited Susan Marshall, S. Davis and D. Demetrulias to give us a clear idea of the questions, the response so far, and what else we might be looking at so that SEC will try to get a grip on what the requests are, what's going on, and what we might see in the future that will be good information for faculty leadership this year and next.

Garcia is skeptical of the process, not that the idea of bringing faculty to dialogue is not good –we do that well when exploring issues. He is hopeful that through this process we will raise issues about accreditation, about what and why we're being asked to do things for WASC, about the cost of doing this. We're taking time away from what we do well. The more they ask us to pull away from teaching, the more we move away from what we are good at doing. Hejka-Ekins said that maybe we need to define what good teaching means and the price we're paying doing this committee work. It would be a good dialogue for us to have.

Young noted that the current director of the MA/MS in IDS has sent out a call for applications for a new program director. March 24th is the application deadline, which may have been deleted from the email. Questions should go to Dennis Sayers.

Heredia announced that Nu Alpha Kappa and ASI are sponsoring a bone marrow and blood drive with Blood Source from 9-2:30 on Wednesday. You can get appointments by calling 667-3156.

Thompson saw that ASI approved goals for spring. Heredia replied she doesn't have them with her, but will get them delivered electronically.

Eudey announced the upcoming book clubs and invited faculty participation. She also distributed a flier about MERLOT – Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching, and opportunities for faculty to obtain and/or contribute resources to the site. The Chancellor's Office is sponsoring a contest, with the campus with the highest percentage increase in faculty and staff usage of MERLOT by August 1, 2009 receiving a \$10,000 award and funds for a MERLOT Scholar-in Residence. Workshops will be held on campus and via "webinars." Peer reviewer training next occurs in April. See Eudey for more information.

Thompson indicated that one of the things he said at the end of last spring, at the general faculty meeting, and that was said in the mid-year report in December was that he thought that the recommendations around RPT concerns needs to be seen as coming from the faculty to the faculty. That's been his intent. Hejka-Ekins has developed a base structure to start the discussion on this and it will branch out from there and be more inclusive. What he has promised is coming along. The other part of that is that he is trying to let go of it now. It's been referred to FAC and URPTC, two major General Faculty committees that are spearheading this. He will attend almost any meeting where he's requested to, but is trying to let go because he respects the leadership and composition of those two committees.

5. Questions about Committee Reports

Covino offered a little more detail related to the FBAC report. At the Feb 25 meeting they discussed a template Tan distributed that reflects expenditures and fiscal items over several years. Green visited and was asked about one item that showed that the operations budget for Student Affairs had increased at about twice the rate of Academic Affairs. Green explained that the perceived increase was due to athletic fees that had previously been outside of the formal Student Affairs budget but part of the General Funds budget. It was not new money, but money that was not recorded clearly before. This shows that displays of our fiscal situation may reflect variations in reporting that may not allow consistent pictures across the years. Also the note that Academic Affairs has something like 42-43% of the share of budget monies for the university. But as we discussed, the share we have been allocated is more like 66% percent. The 66% AA budget reductions/allocations is figured on corresponds to 66% of the budgets allocated to the divisions. So if you take all the divisions and add them up, they total 100% and AA is 66% with respect to the budgets of the other divisions.

Tan wanted to address the 66 and 43 percentages. Sometimes when we pick a number we have to be careful how that number was calculated. These numbers are what are called financial ratios, and needs to be consistently used over years to get a sense of how that ratio has increased or decreased – what the pattern is over multiple years. The pattern is important. One year of numbers doesn't help us

know what is going on. With regard to the share of the Student Affairs operating expenses that appear to have doubled when compared to prior year, again in FBAC they were looking at 5 years and the trend was surprising that operating expenses had changed over prior years and FBAC is still digesting the information they have, i.e. athletic fee revenues that may not have previously shown as a source of funds but is now an expense. The same holds with the Clearwire money, that will be consistent for years but is listed as a revenue for the university but also appears as an operating expense for OIT. So in terms of usage, we thought it was appearing as an OIT expense, which suggests that they have control over the funds. We wondered where is the faculty share of the decision making regarding the Clearwire money, which raised questions in FBAC regarding faculty involvement. This is a healthy discussion to have. That's the purpose of the pamphlet Covino is addressing.

Thompson concurred that it was a good discussion in FBAC, and it seems that better information is being received. FBAC is working on laying out a template for information that they would like to consistently receive. Garcia has pushed this a lot and FBAC is doing some good work to get consistently good information. Morgan Foster thanked Tan for her work. Her concern is that while now money is coming into Student Affairs for Athletics, that wasn't in the past, and she would like to remind all that recommendations could go in the wrong direction if we don't track history. If we track that this money came from athletics and is being counted in a new way, some may think that Student Affairs should be cut more. It doesn't necessarily track logically. The recommendations should mirror and reflect what happens with the budget.

Tan noted that athletic fees now show up as revenue, but asked what happened in previous years. Morgan Foster said they showed in university revenue line, and that Athletics was only added to Student Affairs in 2006. Athletics is now 30% of the Student Affairs budget. She doesn't want to be critical, appreciates what Tan did, and welcomes continued dialogue, but wanted to note that the budget is confusing to all and couldn't explain it all. Tan said they did know about Athletics being incorporated in Student Affairs in 06 and did incorporate that into their calculations. They also noted the changed location of OIT.

Colnic noted that Academic Affairs receives a portion of money that is 42% or so of the total university budget, but 66% of the division budgets. What sorts of things are not counted? Covino replied they include benefits, financial aid, and utilities, that cannot be addressed in the same way as other kinds of cuts and allocations.

1. Highlights of the February 25, 2009 meeting of the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC) include:

- **UBAC-Related Budget Issues**

Filling and Garcia gave FBAC members an update of UBAC developments. FBAC members heard about the UBAC chair configuration and discussed who should serve on UBAC. FBAC members agreed that instead of just the FBAC Chair-Elect, both the FBAC Chair and the FBAC Chair-Elect should be members of the UBAC so as to help fill the need for institutional memory and consistency.

- **FBAC Template**

FBAC members reviewed a draft FBAC EXCEL template. The template will capture information of FTE/salaries for part-time and full-time faculty/staff/MPP as well as expenses (by divisions and university wide). FBAC members will continue our discussion of the template at our next meeting to refine it further. We want to ensure that Business and Finance and OIT are aware of our data needs as the contents of the template reflects the types of data that FBAC members have needed in the past, and we have had problems getting this information, or it arrived in a form that was not useful for our decision making. Interim VP Suzanne Green stated that it will take time to populate the template as she is working with OIT to create a process to develop a data warehouse so information can be extracted.

FBAC members also looked at the budgeted operating expenses for the various divisions (please see attached table 1) and noted that some divisions have some extraordinary increases in operating expenses in 2008/09. Members were concerned that since the current budget cut is based on the 2008/09 figures, the divisions with the biggest increase in 2008/09 (e.g., University Advancement, OIT, Student Affairs) will actually suffer a lesser cut than other divisions.

Tan advised that the budget (please see attached table 2) for Academic Affairs (excluding benefits) was decreased from 44.9% of General Fund Expenses (GFE) in 2004/05 to 42.8% (before cuts) in 2008/09.

2. Highlights of the March 5, 2009 meeting of the Graduate Council:

1. Petition/Appeal of University Policy

While the petition/appeal policy itself was approved in Senate, there were some suggestions provided from Senate members for improvement of the related *Course Substitution for Graduate Degree Program Requirement* form. These suggestions were considered and incorporated by Council. Once the policy is approved by the President, the Graduate School will inform all graduate programs about the new course substitution form.

2. Academic Program Review

Graduate Council feedback generated from the February 19th meeting was passed on to UEPC for consideration while drafting recommended revisions of the APR process. Reflecting on their feedback, the Council agreed that they still need to consider ways to respond to WASC recommendations with respect to the APR process to ensure that appropriate attention is directed to graduate programs during reviews. The Council will deliberate further at its next meeting.

3. WASC CPR Report

The Council examined WASC recommendations articulated in the CPR Report. Plans will need to be established for how the Council addresses these recommendations.

4. Commencement

The Council continued discussion of commencement as it relates to recognition of graduate students. The Council will bring student feedback for discussion at the next meeting where it will be determined whether ceremony recommendations will be forwarded to the Commencement Committee for consideration.

5. Graduate Education Strategic Plan

The Council continued discussion about the identity of graduate education, and how graduate education fits within the University Strategic Plan. Discussion of the benefits and challenges of both a centralized and decentralized model of graduate education occurred. Deliberation will continue at the next meeting.

6. Action Items

a. 2/AS/09/GC—Petition/Appeal of University Requirements & Course Substitution (Graduate)

The resolution has been amended. There were two concerns raised in the first reading – the changes are noted in double-strike throughs. Page 9, lines 3-4 of course substitution. They created two sentences, deleted “Semester units” and replaced with “total program units.” The second concern related to 9000 level courses. As written, it was not clear that there would not be additional work required for substituting 9000-level courses. The language on the form was changed (page 10 of the packet). In the verification section they replaced the language to read “undergraduate level” so that the differential grading and expectations would be needed only with undergrad courses, not graduate level courses.

Thompson noted the resolution is on page 6 in the minutes under item eight. Tuedio asked to whom changes would be sent regarding the form. Tuedio doesn’t know what it’s supposed to say – that they meet appropriate standards for graduate level work, and wonders why it doesn’t just say that. Thompson thinks that Graduate Council would review that again, and that Academic Senate could review the form even if not policy.

Stefanco is curious as to why it is different from the undergraduate substitution form so that now only the instructor and graduate program director sign, and not chair or dean. Young characterized the conversation related to that decision on the form is that program coordinators are charged with advising and they’re the folks who know the program best. When talking about substituting a course to meet program requirements, these are the ones most familiar with content of course and what would be reasonable. They are also the ones having the ongoing dialogue with students in programs and know the reasons why they are requesting the substitution. In light of that, the Graduate Council is recognizing the unique role of the program coordinator in trying to give more authority to them. Also some deans were present and thought they didn’t need to have another form to sign.

Brown wasn’t there during the discussion, but heard the concerns and thinks that Young characterized these well. Stefanco thinks that that would be the argument for just about everything. Doesn’t know about everyone else, but the overwhelming majority of the time people know what they’re doing, but sometimes it’s helpful to have another eye to catch things. She’s not clear why this is different, although it doesn’t matter much to her.

Heredia had to get a ton of signatures when graduating. Why is this form different?

Young noted that a Master’s program is 30 units, and the course sequence is quite prescribed with not a lot of electives and leeway, so there are fewer units and it doesn’t seem as necessary, which is probably not a compelling argument, but coordinators are intimately involved in this small (unit-wise) program. Demetrulias noted that the undergrad substitution doesn’t include Dean’s signature, but it does have instructor and department chair. This form requires instructor and graduate coordinator, and part of the discussion in GC included the dean and it seemed excessive and burdensome. Many coordinators indicated that chairs wouldn’t have intimate knowledge of the students’ program and would need to go to coordinators anyway, so this was a compromise.

Nainby wanted to characterize the difference is that in the graduate program coordinator is functioning as a curricular advisor and administrator which is different than in an undergrad substitution since that is typically two different people. Young thinks that’s an accurate distinction.

Novak thinks the compelling argument is Demetrulias’ one not requiring a dean’s signature for a program change, keeping exceptions within the department. The deans don’t generally need to get involved in the curricular substitutions, and this would be consistent.

Vote on 2/AS/09/GC – approved unanimously

b. 21/AS/08/FAC—Amendment to the University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Procedures

The first reading was a while back, it went back to FAC and has returned. It was attached to a resolution that we can approve, disapprove or amend today, but we wouldn’t be looking at amending the language that the FAC has brought back to us. The amended version is on pages 11-16 of the agenda packet. Hejka-Ekins reminded all that in the fall AVPFA Wendt sent a memo to FAC and suggested looking at the RPT procedures to conform the language to the contract. This was a technical discussion, not a substantive change initially. The changes noted on pages 11-14 are to comply with the contract language, not substantive changes. But last fall when we got to “e” on page 14, when we talked about the RPT procedure in regard to the Conference Committee, substantive process changes arose and FAC

needed to discuss RPT steps. FAC discussed these steps, asked John Saraille to join the discussion to ensure that they would be in compliance with the contract, then discussed it with SEC and brought it back to AS.

Hejka-Ekins noted that in page 14, item e, there's an asterisk attached to the Conference Committee – there is a definition offered for the Conference Committee in the asterisked footnote. If in the RPT review there is a difference of opinion regarding tenure and promotion, that's where the CC comes in.

Hejka-Ekins indicated that on page 15 under I and J the process is made more clear. In "I" it is indicated that the files are reviewed simultaneously by URPTC and the Provost. During the process the two will share any new information they obtain, and will share their tentative recommendations after completing the review. Under "J" the Conference Committee is defined again, and then it is noted that URPTC and the Provost shall "seek to achieve consensus regarding their intended recommendations..." and then decisions are forwarded to the candidate and President. If the President's recommendation differs from the Provost or URPTC, s/he will consult with the Conference Committee. There is an attempt for a good faith effort to discuss different points of view with the hopes of coming to consensus, but if not at least a discussion has occurred. The idea of the Conference Committee is that when there is a disagreement between URPTC, the Provost and/or President they will come together to listen to each other, with the President still making the final decision. This gives an opportunity for cooperation when there is a disagreement in the decision.

Finally, Hejka-Ekins noted that in K, the language was clarified to indicate that availability of funding shall not be a consideration. This was left in for punctuation. There are substantive and technical changes here. FAC is open to questions and feedback.

S. Davis asked if the Conference Committee meets before tentative letters are in hand. Hejka-Ekins said that they would meet before. Covino was surprised by the answer, since there is a tentative letter and final letter. He thought that the tentative letter is received by the candidate and the Conference Committee would meet before the final letter. Hejka-Ekins noted that this should be clarified.

Tan says this has nothing to do with the steps, but in regard to consistency with terminology, in J the paragraph uses the term "provost" but other times it's the AVP. There isn't consistency with URPTC, URPT Committee, and the same language should apply throughout the paragraph. Then on paragraph J, the fourth line also lists the group name differently.

Thompson noted that we're in a second reading that was attached to a resolution, so the only thing we can talk about amending is the resolution. Sometimes we do what might be cosmetic, grammatical, or editorial corrections, but would be hesitant to even do that about statements that are personnel policies. Our options would be to either vote on this as it is as amended and brought back from FAC, or we could refer it back to committee since we can't refer it back to the floor.

DeVries understands that the resolution is not in front of him from the old meeting. Thinks that "members" of URPTC should be included there.

Eudey stated if changes are clarifications but does not substantively change the policy, we should approve it now so that we're in compliance with the contract. Since we expect this same policy to be returning to AS within a few months as we further consider more substantive changes to RPT, we can make the editorial changes then.

Covino noted concern about paragraph J – seeking "consensus" – he doesn't think it's the Provost's role to seek to try to change the mind of the URPTC. He thinks that it also indicates that if consensus isn't reached that there is a breakdown occurring, but there isn't a breakdown when different levels of review disagree. He would have preferred to see "clarification" rather than "consensus" since that frames a different process and dialogue than currently exists. Clarification, which is a common process, is embedded in the policy later. This is consistent with everything we do and preserves the collegial relationship we want to have and the principle of independent levels of review.

Filling wants to be precise that URPTC review is not a prior level of review to the Provost but occurs simultaneously. Consensus is a good word because we have people from outside that person's discipline reviewing the files and it's not out of bounds to try to reach a common ground.

Wendt is trying to figure this out logically since at every level of review the candidate may have 10 days to write a response and/or rebuttal, and working back from the top of page 16, so if the president has issued a tentative to the candidate but say his pending decision differs from the recommendation from the Provost or URPTC, but also the candidate is writing some sort of response in that same time frame. How logically does this mesh if say the candidate takes the full 10 days and on day 9 gets the rebuttal in and meanwhile the president has met with the Conference Committee and hasn't had a chance to see the rebuttal. Wendt is not sure if there is a solution.

Wendts' philosophical concern is that there is talk about consensus among parties but there are two important players not being allowed into the conversation, and that's two prior levels of review. It feels strange that there is consensus at the highest possible level that is not taking into consideration the dean and department. Consensus is only asked for higher up, and it troubles him, flying in the face of separate, independent, autonomous levels of review.

Thompson wanted to clarify that the document says that shall "seek" consensus, not necessary "reach" it. There is nothing to direct them to achieve consensus. The Conference Committee is not new to this policy, the basic set up is already in the policy. Thompson pointed out in item N, "Nothing in these procedures shall be construed to exclude later levels of review from consulting previous levels of review." So there is freedom to consult. For Thompson, consulting can include clarification and trying to reach some consensus. We're not restricted from consulting, and it would be useful for later levels of review to consult earlier levels.

Sarraille said if you look at page 11, the first thing in the document is a statement of the guiding principles, and that paragraph indicates that the idea of consensus is preeminent. The idea of independent and autonomous is not really prominent. When independent is used it is to clarify that it is not a completely joint process, that there are separate reports. The contract calls for the appropriate administrator and peer reviewers to have separate reports, but independent and autonomous are not stressed in the guiding principles. Consensus is a legitimate thing to synthesize the principles with. As far as the logistics in terms of the tentative letter, probably at least some of that can be worked out by adjusting the calendar itself. The calendar is a separate issue that we can address.

Brown was reading J and it seems the last two sentences could indicate separate or common comments, so it seems that it allows for consultation or collaboration rather than consensus.

Stefanco comes from a different tradition that stressed independent levels of review, but it may be different here. She would not want to be pressured to make a decision. In terms of the ten days, she thinks it'd be helpful to have more time to write the letter, but with the creation of the calendar she is wondering if the folks in the various levels of review could be consulted regarding the calendar. If changes are made, where is the time subtracted from? Last year she made an effort to have the spring timeline for dean reviews extended. She wanted clarification on page 12 under 3.a.1 where it says level of review, and under 14.6.e it mentions the department committee but the chair isn't mentioned. Under "e" should we have chair optional for consistency or is she missing something?

C. Davis responded to Stefanco's earlier question, noting that the time in the RPT calendar comes from the candidate. The file this year was due Jan 2nd. It was nice the deans had more time, but she would have liked more time to do her own part of it. Files were either done over the holidays or during finals week. As the only one who is currently in the process who has spoken on this point, she would be comfortable knowing that if the URPTC and Provost disagreed that they talked, whether seeking consensus or discussing. She likes that they tried to understand the two sides, and is okay with the term consensus.

Nainby offered another untenured comment. He also agreed with the emphasis on consensus as something to seek, but not required.

21/AS/08/FAC – C. Davis read the resolution. Paper ballot was distributed. Passed 36 yes, 2 no.

Thompson indicated that this will go to a vote of the General Faculty and hope they are in a mood to approve it and then it will go to the President. During the voting he was looking through to a point on page 11, there is the last sentence of the principles that says the "The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail." I think we have to factor that word 'concur' into our calculation when we consider what consensus and consultation means. If we are looking at this policy as a means to reach consensus, this can be seen as another step in our ongoing response to WASC.

7. Open Forum

Young asked to go back to Hejka-Ekins' process for RPT discussion. She asked if only the teaching and service components would be topics, and wondered why scholarship is not included in the conversation since WASC asked us to reach consensus in all three areas, especially since this is the one we seem to have the most concern with campus wide. She thinks we'd miss an opportunity if we didn't address scholarship in the deliberations. Hejka-Ekins said that there was a previous decision regarding research guidelines, and already a resolution saying we had such guidelines. Thompson said it is not excluding that discussion, but we can't do all at once. When the WASC team met with SEC, they were on teaching, asking why we don't have elaborations for teaching. This is a first step in our response, and to demonstrate that we can make movement as a faculty in response to WASC. What they were talking to us about directly is that we have elaborations about RSCA, and say you're a teaching institution but don't address teaching in your RPT requirements.

Young said that WASC also asked us to reach consensus in all three areas, and part of the language related specifically to RSCA in trying to reach consensus about how we define it and what our expectations are. She feels like with this great opportunity to have inclusive dialogue and it seems we'd be missing out if we didn't include all aspects in the conversation. DeVries said that included dept, college and university levels that are not elaborated on, they're criteria, not expectations. He thinks that we have part of the scholarship but not as much on teaching and service, but need to develop in all three in terms of expectations specifically.

Hejka-Ekins thinks it's good to want to deal with all of the criteria, but the question is how do we do it, and if we take a big hunk it may prohibit us from coming to terms with one area at a time. We may need to continue next year with different segments, or may not be able to respond in a timely way.

Novak supports DeVries and Young's concerns about addressing what WASC is asking – they want us to come to some grips with the real expectations that we have for RPT, that's the word used. If it's going to take a long time, WASC will do more than express concerns but may take severe action. Young noted that when the dialogue is staged that we're going to focus on specific issues – teaching and service – it's not directly excluding conversation and dialogue on RSCA, but it's not inviting or encouraging it. By default it's excluding it.

Thompson noted that we have a resolution from the College of Business Administration that was distributed in paper at the start of the meeting. The letter is from Randy Harris, the College of Business faculty speaker. A related letter came out on Facnet which Thompson read aloud. Thompson noted that SEC will be talking about this, and wondered if any in Senate had points of view to share.

Garcia thinks the two issues are related – budget and WASC. It seems we'll be jumping into this time and labor intensive RPT process when we're in the midst of the budget crisis and we're being taken away from figuring out how we got here. We should put all of our time on the budget.

DeVries asked if we can run in deficit for more than one year. Thompson noted that we have been doing so.

Morgan Foster says we need to have cash to balance the books. The deficit has gotten so large that there is not enough cash to catch up. In the end we caught up with cash that was budgeted but wasn't spent. The size of the deficit is so large that it will be difficult to run it for several years. Thompson indicated that we have to look at what we are doing to the university versus what it means to try to carry a deficit or to borrow money if there is money to borrow.

Saraille may not like the note that this strikes, but wants to express his personal disappointment that we were lied to about the structural deficit. We were told there is one, took people at their word and tried to address it. Then we were told there wasn't a structural deficit. The prop wash from the backpedaling was knocking people from the room. Now the deficit is back. He's personally disappointed in the way he has been disrespected and the way this was handled. Thompson has had several faculty refer him back to Chancellor Reed's review letter of the President that said Shirvani had resolved the \$5 million structural deficit, and they are asking if we have created a new one.

Covino indicated that Green is a person of integrity and honesty and is supplying UBAC with information as accurately and quickly as feasible. We're getting more information about the history and the strategic or other decisions made that put us in one position or another. In terms of this resolution, we should invite Green to address some of the questions that have started to come about regarding running a deficit, what one can borrow, etc. Covino cannot respond to these authoritatively.

Tan said that Green was at FBAC and mentioned her experience at Sac State, that in the past they had a structural deficit and it took a few years to fix the problem, it's not something to fix in one year. Currently the perception is to try to make it disappear in one year, and to do so the colleges are running around trying to figure out who and what to eliminate. It's too hard to fix the problem in one year. This applies to the proposal before us in the sense that we need to fix the problem that developed over many years over the next few years.

8. Adjournment

4:32pm