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

2. **Approval of Agenda**—Move 9 a) under Announcements. If discussion is needed, add under Open Forum. Agenda approved as amended.

3. **Approval of Minutes of November 4, 2008**—Page 3, 5th paragraph, third line, delete ‘no.’ To then read ‘Young replied GC didn’t discuss this ...’ Page 5, first paragraph, third line, delete ‘responsible’ and add ‘reasonable.’ Delete ‘create’ and add ‘facilitate.’ The sentence would then read ‘Further, Young asked if it would be reasonable for URPTC and FAC to facilitate a dialogue...’ Page 5, 10th paragraph, insert ‘only’ to read ‘Young said that she thought that is not that we only need numbers, ...’ The minutes were approved as amended.

4. **Announcements**

   a. **President Shirvani** said he was delighted to be here to introduce Suzanne Green who has been with us 2 months, but due to schedules he was not able to officially introduce her earlier. She is serving as an Interim VPBF. Green has been with the CSU for 35 years, working at three other CSUs, CSU San Diego, CSU San Marcos and CSU Sacramento. Shirvani said Green is a leader in financial analysis and information, and even when Long Beach people have questions, she is one of the 2-3 in the system that they call upon to find out how they should do a specific function. We are honored to have her, she brings a wealth of experience with financial systems, data analysis, and the whole finance/budget concept systems and she has been working diligently for us. As we know, our financial system was not much in order, and then we went through a transition with an interim VP and he made some contribution, but the system is more complex and required more expertise. Green wanted to retire and Shirvani convinced her to come and fix our system. She kindly accepted it. She’ll be here until October 1 next year. A search for a permanent VPBF is ongoing and President Shirvani hopes to bring the candidates in January and to complete the search in March or April so we know who will replace Green. The person will not join us until the fall semester. Green will leave a complete, organized shop for the new VPBF. The President said that Green is also working diligently with UBAC and we’re hoping that we can use her expertise to deal with a challenging set of circumstances that we’re facing now and for the next several years.

   Green said it was good to meet us and get to know us better. She wanted to tell us that she found this campus to be beautiful, and she loves the fact that we have such wonderful grounds and facilities, and resident geese and ducks which is very unique. As all CSU campuses have their unique features, she’s just getting to learn and understand CSU Stanislaus. As much as some like to think that we’re pretty much all the same, we’re not. She’s looking forward to knowing CSU Stanislaus better and is very glad to be here.

   President Shirvani has called a special gathering on Monday to present a bigger picture of what is happening with the budget. In the
meantime UBAC is doing a great job and will be working on the budget and the processes that will lead us to some solid decisions early next year. The meeting is 9-11am in Snyder Hall on Monday. President Shirvani will be making a presentation and answering all of our questions. If he can’t answer a question, Green and Covino will be there with answers. He hoped that we have a wonderful Thanksgiving holiday. Shirvani said we’ll do our best, do everything possible to get through these hard times and be prosperous and move this campus forward. He is sure we will do this given the faculty and staff here. Shirvani is also sure that Green will see that this is the best CSU campus.

b. **Steve Stryker is here to talk about WASC.** In spite of difficulties, WASC goes on. The WASC visiting team was here a month or so ago and drafted a report. That report will come back in final form in a week or so. The draft report was sent to ASNET. There are no expected drastic changes. Stryker’s reaction is that the report is extremely positive in many senses. The hardest part about dealing with the recommendations they made is that we only have a year to deal with these things. Last time we didn’t see them for 10 years, but this time they’ll be back in 15 months. There are some things that we need to get started on in order to try to address some of the issues that were brought up. In the draft document, there were 11 commendations and some very positive things that were said. There were 8 recommendations on specific topics, but nothing rises to something that endangers our accreditation. We’re concerned about the timeline because the 8 recommendations were things that are long term problems, universal issues, things that will take a while to deal with. With the Inquiry Circle leaders, we’ve turned some of the stickier questions to faculty governance. As faculty governance gets started on some topics, Senate and Senate Committees will be getting involved. We’re hoping that some will get started soon.

Stryker said that in order to emphasize the positive, he wanted to share some very important sentences. On the bottom of p 28 of the site team report, “the extent of preparation for the CPR is noteworthy in the seriousness with which the entire institution has approached the review, leading to an exemplary report document and to a thoughtfully scheduled and ultimately productive visit. The University has been creative, resourceful, and intentional in using the necessity of accreditation visits to help the institution improve. The team observes that the faculty, staff, students, and community advisors with whom we met all share a deep appreciation for CSU Stanislaus.” On page 31 “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.” Stryker believes we should be proud of that. Stryker would especially like to thank members of the Inquiry Circles and hopes to keep us motivated to finish up for the EER, which will be drafted to go out to the campus by the beginning of fall semester. We’ll work through spring and summer to complete the EER. Stryker drew our attention to the one page handout entitled the “Timeline for Next Steps in WASC Reaccreditation Process.” The WASC process is shown to end in June/July 2010. Item number eleven says the draft will be circulated in September or October. Stryker closed by reiterating that there were no surprises in the site team report, that 95% was in our report already from our own self-study. Stryker was not surprised by anything they had written.

O’Brien asked with the recent election an appointment of a new person as Secretary of Education, does WASC think about this change as we’re giving our final report in July 2010? Does WASC anticipate changes with a new administration? Stryker says he hopes so, but thinks Diana Demetrulias may know more. O’Brien wonders if there will be changes happening. Stryker hears that others who are later in this three-tiered process (proposal, CPR, EER) agree with him that the process is overkill, too much, too expensive, too long, and Stryker thinks that when members of the region meet with WASC in April, we’ll hear from folks in a range of positions at a lot of universities that this process is too much and Stryker hopes that the process will change. Demetrulias does think Spelling had some influence on depth and length for accreditation, but, whether it changes in the future will not change us mid-stream. The accountability movement is still strong. While campuses are feeling the pressure, WASC is also feeling it since the federal government is seeing regional accrediting bodies as weak. For WASC to improve their accreditation and credibility, they need to be strong. They’ve added site visits to new programs within 6 months, which has added enormous pressure. Demetrulias is hopeful that as more campuses have experienced this process that WASC will keep the best of what it offers, cut other parts and continue the quality of the process. Demetrulias expects to carry that message as well.

Stryker says that one irksome part of the process is that WASC site team members are here for three days and prepare a report almost as long as ours, and then come back in 16 months and they expect to see progress on many issues/topics. Stryker questioned what we are going to do in a year on GE, RSCA, and RPT/elaborations issues. Stryker’s plea to faculty governance, even within the personnel/budget context, is to please listen to the pleas and see if we can at least on certain key areas set up the appropriate governance process to show that we’re dealing with issues even if they’re not resolved by the time the site team returns. Stryker hopes that we can show we’re moving on the topics and this requires help from the various committees. Stryker, Scott Davis and Vice Provost Demetrulias will visit groups who are key players related to the major recommendations to talk about them and determine a realistic plan of attack. Thompson asked Stryker how long he had been WASCing, a groups who are key players related to the major recommendations to talk about them and determine a realistic plan of attack. Thompson thinks Diana Demetrulias may know more. O’Brien wonders if there will be changes happening. Stryker says he hopes so, but thinks Diana Demetrulias may know more. O’Brien wonders if there will be changes happening. Stryker hears that others who are later in this three-tiered process (proposal, CPR, EER) agree with him that the process is overkill, too much, too expensive, too long, and Stryker thinks that when members of the region meet with WASC in April, we’ll hear from folks in a range of positions at a lot of universities that this process is too much and Stryker hopes that the process will change. Demetrulias does think Spelling had some influence on depth and length for accreditation, but, whether it changes in the future will not change us mid-stream. The accountability movement is still strong. While campuses are feeling the pressure, WASC is also feeling it since the federal government is seeing regional accrediting bodies as weak. For WASC to improve their accreditation and credibility, they need to be strong. They’ve added site visits to new programs within 6 months, which has added enormous pressure. Demetrulias is hopeful that as more campuses have experienced this process that WASC will keep the best of what it offers, cut other parts and continue the quality of the process. Demetrulias expects to carry that message as well.

O’Brien asked with the recent election an appointment of a new person as Secretary of Education, does WASC think about this change as we’re giving our final report in July 2010? Does WASC anticipate changes with a new administration? Stryker says he hopes so, but thinks Diana Demetrulias may know more. O’Brien wonders if there will be changes happening. Stryker hears that others who are later in this three-tiered process (proposal, CPR, EER) agree with him that the process is overkill, too much, too expensive, too long, and Stryker thinks that when members of the region meet with WASC in April, we’ll hear from folks in a range of positions at a lot of universities that this process is too much and Stryker hopes that the process will change. Demetrulias does think Spelling had some influence on depth and length for accreditation, but, whether it changes in the future will not change us mid-stream. The accountability movement is still strong. While campuses are feeling the pressure, WASC is also feeling it since the federal government is seeing regional accrediting bodies as weak. For WASC to improve their accreditation and credibility, they need to be strong. They’ve added site visits to new programs within 6 months, which has added enormous pressure. Demetrulias is hopeful that as more campuses have experienced this process that WASC will keep the best of what it offers, cut other parts and continue the quality of the process. Demetrulias expects to carry that message as well.

Stryker says that one irksome part of the process is that WASC site team members are here for three days and prepare a report almost as long as ours, and then come back in 16 months and they expect to see progress on many issues/topics. Stryker questioned what we are going to do in a year on GE, RSCA, and RPT/elaborations issues. Stryker’s plea to faculty governance, even within the personnel/budget context, is to please listen to the pleas and see if we can at least on certain key areas set up the appropriate governance process to show that we’re dealing with issues even if they’re not resolved by the time the site team returns. Stryker hopes that we can show we’re moving on the topics and this requires help from the various committees. Stryker, Scott Davis and Vice Provost Demetrulias will visit groups who are key players related to the major recommendations to talk about them and determine a realistic plan of attack. Thompson asked Stryker how long he had been WASCing, and Stryker replied he had started in 1996. Thompson thinks it’s valuable to have someone who has been involved for so long to give us the perspective that Stryker has given us.

Covino is not optimistic that there will be a reduction in accountability under a new administration. At a WASC training last week he learned that the 10 year reaccreditation period that we received last time is becoming more rare, with more campuses getting 7-9 years. In addition, it was pretty well agreed upon by the WASC administration that those institutions that receive a 10 year reaccreditation will need to file a mid-year report within 5 years. The comment was “even the best institutions can change quickly in 5 years.” Those are tendencies that were striking to Covino from the training, and we do need to raise questions about process and costs in the spring. We hope to be giving a presentation at that conference on our collaborative structure here, and will be speaking of those issues.

Scott Davis has nothing new to add other than to remind us that among all the other topics that are necessarily going to come up during this year, Davis doesn’t want to lose sight of GE, and it’s one thing that threatens to slide under the table. We can’t afford to do it anymore. Thompson noted that the site team report is on the SEC agenda. SEC is scrutinizing the report, adding our notes, working on
an outline of process. Demetrulias and Thompson have talked about the 71 items noted in the report, and she will communicate with SEC through the normal governance process about where she thinks the 71 items would be best placed on different agendas for faculty committees. Senate has this as an informational item today, and all senators got the url address for the report, and we’ll have it on for a discussion item at our December meeting. Thompson is hoping we can have a good discussion when it’s back as a discussion item.

Garcia doesn’t want to make any negative statement, but wonders if we’re paying attention to how much we’ve spent in the WASC process. Covino replied that we are paying attention, and that we have it budgeted with a combination of university-wide funding and Academic Affairs funding. It is significant, although he doesn’t have the figures in his head. Stryker says that the time and effort put in by faculty members in the Inquiry Circles is not reflected in the budget. This is taken out of the hides of faculty, staff and students who have been involved. This is not reflected anywhere. It’s difficult to put a monetary value on this. Demetrulias noted that one of the principles of WASC is that if we have embedded in our structures the characteristics of quality education with emphasis on educational quality, then accreditation will follow. That is something to keep in mind. When we agree to be accredited, we make students eligible for aid, and their courses can transfer to other universities, etc. The three tier process is long but can be improved but the underlying philosophy is we would be doing it anyway. It gets away from the point. We agree to the standards if we wish to be accredited. The member institutions come together to agree to the standards for quality education. Demetrulias is not sure where to start to put a cost number on accreditation. There are obvious fixed costs, but if we can figure out that what we’re doing is good for us and our students, then it’s a part of what we do. Thompson said that part of what Green is doing is putting together better information on budget transparency.

Covino says much of the cost is in the dedication of people here. It’s very constructive and positive dedication. Much of it is in our assessment of student learning. For every accrediting body in the country, direct assessment is the foremost concern; we are institutionalizes the direct assessment of student learning and GE so that it’s something we believe in, pursue, and prioritize. We may have sequestered dollars to institutionalize assessment of student learning, this should be something that is a permanent priority as it becomes a permanent commitment to be accountable to how our students are doing. We have allocated money to the particular ceremonies that inform this cycle of accreditation, and money to a set of activities that show commitment of faculty to assessment of student learning. We need to keep this distinction in front of us. Thompson reminded all that faculty governance is around year-round, so faculty will be available in summer for consultation.

Thompson counted about 200 people for the Provost’s forum that became a budget forum, and noted there was lots of good conversation. He again reminded us of the President’s Budget forum on Monday.

5. Questions about Committee Reports

Dunham-Filson stated in the November 13 UEPC minutes, the third bullet should read ‘biological’.

   a. Committee Reports

   --Faculty Budget Advisory Committee-November 5, 2008 Meeting

   Tan gave FBAC members a copy of the President’s email dated November 3, 2008, addressing the “university budget gap.”

   Suzanne Green, Interim Vice President for Business and Finance, explained the university budget gap. We have a $4.4M “base budget gap” which includes $704,000 cut from the Chancellor. The base budget gap is made up of the following:

   Carryforward Budget Gap (from 2007/2008) $ 1,534,500

   1.1% Cut (2008/2009) $ 704,600


   Teacher Performance Assessment $ 150,000

   Base Budget Gap $ 4,405,400

   In the above numbers, administration is included under staff.

   She further explained that this base budget gap of $4.4M is before any additional cuts from the CSU this or next year. Since we are anticipating additional cuts from the state to our General Fund appropriation, perhaps as early as January 2009 but certainly for the 2009/10 budget, we must begin looking at ways to reduce this existing base budget gap.

   The unfunded salary benefit increases are the faculty and staff bargaining unit increases where funding was not provided by the
Chancellor. Each of the campuses has felt unfunded costs from the Chancellor’s Office. The base budget gap varies by campus and how closely they manage their funds. If you have enough cash, it masks the problem. It shows up more clearly when onetime revenue dries up and you sort out ongoing from one time revenue. The process of reducing the base budget gap works once we pull out the financial information and make it available so people can come up with recommendations to solve the problem. It is difficult and not an easy fix, but it can be done. She stated at Sac State it took 4 years to fix the problem. It got worse before it got better.

The President’s email also included an EXCEL spreadsheet of proposed budget cuts to deal with the base budget gap. The President asked the provost and vice presidents to begin putting together proposals to reduce the gap this year so that we enter the next fiscal year with less than a $1.5 million base budget gap.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Revised Final 08/09 GF Base Budget (Oct 08)</th>
<th>Projected Baseline Cut</th>
<th>Allocation of Clearwire Funds</th>
<th>Net 08/9 Budget Reduction for Planning Purposes *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>$41,200,030</td>
<td>($1,998,800)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>($1,498,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Finance</td>
<td>$9,358,899</td>
<td>($454,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>($454,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>$4,597,446</td>
<td>($223,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>($223,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Advancement</td>
<td>$1,586,128</td>
<td>($77,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>($77,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>$749,876</td>
<td>($36,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td>($36,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>$4,343,117</td>
<td>($210,700)</td>
<td></td>
<td>($210,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Wide Financial Aid</td>
<td>$8,065,382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Study</td>
<td>$511,388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Wide Allocation</td>
<td>$25,791,770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Fund Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$96,204,036</strong></td>
<td><strong>($3,000,000)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>($2,500,000)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note - When completing budget reduction form, Divisions will get credit for benefit reductions made by reducing personnel costs that cause benefit costs.

**A total of $1.2 million in Clearwire funds will be used to help mitigate the overall budget gap in 08/09.

We have the challenge of reducing the budget while maintaining enrollment and fee revenue. Green stated that she is very concerned about our cash position. This is too big of a gap and we have no carry forward money from last year.

Thompson advised that in the past FBAC and AS have approved budget priorities so it seems people on UBAC would have to be guided by them. When we have budget cuts, we always say lets protect the core. Budget priorities will keep in mind what the core is. Green stated that we are asking for proposals and recommendations. That is what gets presented to UBAC and hopefully they will have conversations with vice presidents with each of the proposals and UBAC will make a recommendation to the president. And the executive administration would also recommend to the President. At some point, the President has to make a recommendation. FBAC members will prepare a list of budget priorities at our next meeting.

--Faculty Budget Advisory Committee- November 19, 2008 Meeting

* 2008/2009 Budget Priorities Resolution

FBAC members started work on preparing a set of 2008-2009 Budget Priorities by reviewing our 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 Budget Priorities. We hope to finalize this at our next meeting.

* Clearwire Agreement

Carl Whitman, associate VP for IT, presented information about the Clearwire Agreement. Whitman explained that the university has been licensed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) since 1981 to use microwave transmission technology to broadcast televised classes from Turlock to remote sites in Stockton, Merced, Sonora and other locations. Radio spectrum in the 2.5 GHz frequency band now known as the Educational Broadband Service (EBS), but better known under its older designation of ITFS – Instructional Television Fixed Service – is used for this purpose.

Clearwire Corporation of Kirkland, Washington is leasing the spectrum to provide high-speed wireless Internet access and
telephone service to its Central Valley customers. Clearwire directly leased most of the spectrum capacity. A small portion was acquired by HITN Spectrum, LLC through Clearwire for the purpose of leasing it back to Clearwire. Another portion was leased by Sprint Nextel which is currently merging its wireless Internet business with Clearwire.

The university will receive compensation in the form of initial one-time payments, ongoing monthly payments, service credits, and user discounts. The initial one-time payments totaled $3,980,000. This included $3,500,000 from Clearwire, $230,000 from HITN acting on behalf of Clearwire, and $250,000 from Sprint Nextel. The ongoing monthly payments will total $48,697,482 after 30 years. During the first five years of the agreement, monthly payments of $92,500 (with annual increases) will be received, for a total of $1,110,000 during the first year. The approximate value of the service credits is $2,850 per month. All current CSU Stanislaus students, faculty and staff will be eligible to receive a 15% discount on Clearwire modems and related broadband wireless service offerings, and a 10% discount on PC cards and related broadband wireless service offerings.

Whitman showed FBAC members an OIT plan (please see attached). It was asked who approved the use of this money and Whitman replied as part of his job, he decided the use of this money after discussions with the president, vice presidents and deans. $1.7M of the $3.98M is used to address the current budget gap. $0.25M is used in FY’09, and that leaves about $2M that is still available to the president. The Clearwire money would be spent on the under-funded library such as renovating the library and increasing its collection. Money is also used to buy faculty and staff computers, and to meet some of the Naraghi building requests. Some will be spent on a data warehouse software that will allow the production of financial reports as the current Brio system is not report user-friendly; if all goes as planned, he hopes to complete this data warehouse project by March or April, and we will get better reports to help our decision making.

--Graduate Council-November 20, 2008 Meeting

1. Graduate School Associate Director Update
Roger Pugh announced that the Graduate School Associate Director search is currently on hold until the budget picture becomes more clear. In the interim, Lisa Bernardo continues to assume these responsibilities and is on-site in the Graduate School to provide support to students and faculty.

2. Additional Meetings Scheduled
To accommodate a full agenda, the following additional Council meetings have been scheduled:
December 11, 3:00-5:00 p.m., MSR 130C
January 29, 2:30-4:30 p.m., MSR 130C

3. Policy/Procedures for Awarding GFW/GA/TA
The Council considered recommendations made at the first Senate reading regarding criteria for hiring Teaching Associates. Revisions have been drafted for review at the second Senate reading.

4. Course Proposals Reviewed
• ANTH/GEOG 5852 Advanced Geographic Information Systems – Approved

5. Program Revisions Reviewed
• MS of Psychology: Counseling and Behavior Analysis Concentrations – Approved
• MA in Education: Physical Education – Approved
• Master of Business Administration – Approved

6. Master’s Degree Course Substitution Policy
The Council continues deliberations on draft policy relating to substitution of courses in approved master’s degree programs. Once approved by Grad Council, the draft policy will be forwarded to SEC for review.

--University Educational Policies Committee- October 23, 2008 meeting
• Repeated Courses Policy. L. Bernardo joined the UEPC to discuss the data set provided to the UEPC members regarding repeated courses at CSU Stanislaus. L. Bernardo will try to break the course information out further to show which courses are repeated most often. Open University can be used as an alternative method for those students not allowed to repeat a course for higher than a grade of C. Enrollment Services is working toward implementation of an articulation database which would be used for degree audit. Discussion will continue once the additional repeated course data information is provided to the UEPC
from L. Bernardo.

- **Control of Adds and Drops.** Discussion continued regarding assigning instructor control over adds and drops on the first day of scheduled classes each term. L. Bernardo reported that registration can be turned off at the college level in PeopleSoft. It was reported that the College of Natural Sciences is enthusiastic about this feature and may be interested in piloting this option for fall 2009. L. Bernardo will send a memorandum to each of the college deans regarding this available option and will work with any college interested in piloting this option.

- **Academic Program Review Procedures.** Discussion continued regarding the Academic Program Review Procedures. Each of the discussion items were presented to the UEPC members. The results follow: 1. Timeline – The UEPC members desire the timeline to include a Winter Term for the purpose of completing the self study document. D. Demetrulias will revise the timeline and present it to the UEPC members at the next scheduled meeting. 2. Initiating the APR Process – The UEPC members suggested the APR process be initiated at the college level so that the dean may tailor the APR procedures document with an addendum to that particular college. 3. Evaluating APR’s – Most APR processes have guidelines to help committee members review the self study documents. 4. External Reviews – The UEPC members agreed that funding an external reviewer would be beneficial to the APR process. 5. Students’ Participation – The APR process speaks to the quality of the academic program and having students involved in the process may be beneficial and colleges are encouraged to include students in the review process. 6. Student Engagement – Programs under review for 2008/09 were asked to consider participation in piloting an APR criterion related to fostering student engagement. The UEPC members were in agreement to this recommendation. 7. Graduate (Master’s) Programs – Currently APR procedures allow either separate or integrated APR documents for graduate programs. The UEPC recommended the choice be left up to each program. The Graduate Council will consider this issue as well. 8. Institutional Research – The recommendations for Institutional Research came from many areas. The UEPC members strongly recommend that IR move toward providing summary data and analysis for each program undergoing APR. 9. Assessment – UEPC agreed that the annual reports generated by the Program Assessment Coordinators be included as part of the APR self study document. 10. Meeting with Provost – It was suggested that this process be structured more formally through a memorandum of agreement, signed by provost, dean, and department chair. Discussion will continue at the next scheduled UEPC meeting.

- **Proposed Ad Hoc Advisory Committee for First Year Experience.** S. Marshall is requesting that the UEPC appoint an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee for the First Year Experience (FYE) program. Following discussion UEPC voted unanimously to appoint an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee for First Year Experience in consultation with the Committee on Committees (COC).

- **Program Revision: Bachelor of Science in Applied Leadership (formerly Applied Studies).** The UEPC members discussed the program revision for the Bachelor of Science in Applied Leadership as a first reading.

- **General Education Program Charter.** S. Marshall joined the UEPC to discuss the draft General Education Program Charter provided to the members.

--University Educational Policies Committee—November 13, 2008 Meeting

- **Academic Program Review Procedures.** Discussion continued regarding the Academic Program Review Procedures. The UEPC members expressed their desire at the last meeting for a timeline to include a Winter Term for the purpose of completing the self study document. D. Demetrulias revised the timeline and presented it to the UEPC members at this meeting. UEPC approved the changes unanimously.

- **Program Revision: Bachelor of Science in Applied Leadership (formerly Applied Studies).** The UEPC members discussed the program revision for the Bachelor of Science in Applied Leadership as a second reading, and approved the changes unanimously.

- **Program Revision: Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Science in Biological Sciences.** The UEPC members discussed the program revision for the Bachelor of Science in Biological Sciences as a first reading.

- **Program Revision: Bachelor of Science in Physics.** The UEPC members discussed the program revision for the Bachelor of Science in Physics as a first reading.

- **UEPC Statement on Impact on Educational Quality.** In response to calls for reduction of courses and/or consolidation of courses for winter and spring 2009 sessions, the UEPC issued a statement of expected impact of those practices on educational quality (sent via e-mail to ASnet and SEC on 11/14).

6. **Action Items**

   a. **19/AS/08/GC—Policy and Procedures for Awarding Graduate Fee Waivers and Employment of Graduate Assistants and Teaching Associates**

   Thompson reviewed the process for discussion, and noted a new handout was being distributed with updated format/text from the Graduate Committee. Young indicated that the handout contains three revisions to the original resolution proposed by Graduate Council. Because the Graduate Council met last Thursday, these changes were not available to distribute with the agenda. Revisions one and two are technical revisions that the committee found. This language appears in the timeline for fee waivers in pages two and three. Now that fee waivers are strictly scholarships, there should be no reference to resumes or position descriptions. Revision #3 is in response to recommendations and concerns raised at the first reading in senate. “Academic Progress” is changed to “Qualifications.” The line should read, “In order to encourage high quality of instruction and to encourage…” Graduate Council added the fourth bullet, which draws from the prior document to offer some more details regarding prior experiences. The final phrase was added because Graduate
Council still feels that it is important to allow flexibility for program coordinators and departments to hire people without prior teaching experience if their advisor feels the student is able to take on the position with oversight by the coordinator/advisor, so this is a compromise phrase that would satisfy the concerns on both sides.

S. Davis clarified that the change to item #3 is just tied to Teaching Assistants, not Graduate Assistants. Young said that since the TA is an instructor of record, and the GA may only be assisting in a class or a research assistant, this new qualification need not be added to the GA section. Thompson clarified that the pages we’re looking at are not part of the actual resolution, so while we can take action today we won’t be taking changes to this document. Moved to a vote, and passed with unanimous approval.

b. 20/AS/08/SEC—CSU Stanislaus Academic Senate Statement on Observing Elaborations on the Retention, Promotion and Tenure Criteria

Thompson advised the new revised is on page 7. There were some minor changes based on the discussion at the last Senate meeting. At that meeting John Garcia was looking for language showing what our intentions were. O’Brien contacted Garcia via email and Garcia shared language with O’Brien and SEC, and you’ll see these reflected in two new resolved clauses that are trying to ensure that departments have their clear footprint on RPT in the whole process. These are changes open for discussion although they add clarity. Filling accepts joint culpability with Garcia for the second resolved. Thompson reminded us that this is not a policy statement that would go to the president for approval, it’s just a sense of the senate.

Hejka-Ekins says that in light of what Steve Stryker said about WASC, this is a timely entry point to begin reviewing issues of teaching, service and scholarship at the department level. This is an affirmation that we’re stating here, and this can move into the WASC process. Thompson wanted to note that there was a change in the rationale in addition to the new resolutions. Ballots were distributed, with 39 yes, one no vote.

Thompson thanked the Graduate Committee and SEC for these resolutions. Thompson stated that as Hejka-Ekins noted, this resolution is an important first step in responding to WASC.

7. First Reading Item

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

Hejka-Ekins introduced the resolution on page 8 of the packet. Hejka-Ekins moved the resolution, second by R. Floyd.

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus recommend the amendments to the Principles, Criteria and Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure indicated in the attached document, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate recommend the amendments become effective upon approval by the General Faculty and the President, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the approved document be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook.

Rationale:

These amendments simply attempt to bring the text up to date (e.g. it references past versions of the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining agreement). Some passages use ‘school’ rather than ‘college’ and that no longer reflect our present organizational structure. In Section V. A, the composition of the URPTC does not reflect the current definition of that body’s membership per General Faculty Constitution. Section 13.3 and 14.3 was amended per Unit 3 Collective Bargaining agreement. And VI. D. and L. timeline was amended per Unit 3 Collective Bargaining agreement. Under VI. J. the issue of ranking was deleted because the committee no longer ranks.

It is likely that this procedure will again be considered by Senate this year after SEC, FAC and other appropriate groups and individuals have the opportunity to fully consider issues related to RPT that continue to be raised by faculty, members of the administration, and by the members of the WASC visiting team. Because the current resolution addresses only the changes necessary to match the procedure with the CBA, the constitution, and university structures, approving these changes will not negatively impact any future consideration of substantive changes.

Discussion:

Hejka-Ekins stated that this is an attempt to change the RPT procedures so that they are accurate to the CFA contract. This is not substantive or related to RPT criteria. Pages 9-13 show the specific changes, with additions underlined and deletions marked with strikethroughs. This deletes anything that is not in the contract and adds language that correctly expresses what is included in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Sarraille would like the Senate to look at VI.J., the piece about the conference committee. If you read this narrowly/literally it basically says that the CC would essentially order all the candidates linearly according to their merit for some obscure purpose, perhaps to rank them so if there were insufficient funding to promote them that they could be triaged and you could take those at the top of the list. Or you could read this more liberally and think that the conference committee would achieve consensus regarding the proposals for promotion or tenure, whatever they’re up for. If they’re no longer ranking the candidates, he finds that troubling because the policy requires them to do that. It’s a worry that we would consider changing the policy to align it to what the URPTC in fact does. That’s a concern that Sarraille will just leave out there. Another thing, in lining out these items it leaves a void. It well may be that this language
should be changed, that there is something that needs to be better stated, but if we leave out the ranking language it restates the charge of the CC and leaves it without any charge. Now the committee exists but it’s unclear what they do. Sarraille thinks it’s a good committee, the idea of what it does is good, and he would like to see a charge of that committee incorporated into this document and would like to see it all done at once as a single transaction rather than taking this out and adding it in later.

Sarraille also realized that although nothing was proposed to be done about item K, there is a change in the contract that addresses this. There is no longer any provision for denying promotion for insufficient funds, and therefore K should be changed as well. We shouldn’t be denying anyone promotion for reason of insufficient funding. K addresses the case when tenure is denied for lack of funds, and this is not the case anymore.

Wendt agrees with Sarraille, and believes with the change of language the Conference Committee does seem like a committee without much of a charge. There doesn’t seem to be a rationale. But based on past procedure for the last 6 years, and in most people’s recollection, the ranking of candidates is not part of anyone’s memory. We can’t find people who served when that was done. In one sense he agrees with the principle, but it’s not something that has been done in recent memory. The common practice has for all intents and purposes been acknowledged as a practice by all involved. Wendt feels we’re in an awkward position here. We could debate if there should be a ranking, or if we want to restore the language to send a clear message to the committee that this is a mandate, past practice be damned.

Thompson thought that K was linked to J because in looking at people’s files he has seen that people have been denied tenure or promotion on the basis of funds, and the funding limitation was the reason there was ranking. Novak said that many years ago there was a certain amount of money set aside for promotions and the rankings were critical at that point. K refers to situations when there were times when there was not enough money. There was a given amount of money set aside, and the committee had to decide how many associate and assistant professors were allowed to be promoted. Novak is not sure if they still need to rank candidates since the purpose is no longer there.

Carroll questioned whether if after deleting section K and the ranking system, is there some other reason to retain the conference committee, a committee he hadn’t heard of until now.

Johnson had never heard about ranking either. If we don’t have to do ranking, Johnson would hate to see it reinstated and it violates the principles with the policy we just passed relying on faculty expertise in departments. It forces the conference committee to compare the research of faculty from different disciplines about which they are not familiar to compare their teaching and working with IDEA forms which cause problems when we try to interpret them. To have the VPAA and URPTC have to compare candidates on different dimensions when they’re not experts in the field is a problem. The only reason for the CC is because the President meets with the committee if his decision differs from the URPTC or VPAA. It provides a venue for further discussion and consideration of the candidate and a sharing of ideas.

De Vries suggested that based on the contract language, article K should be retained but updated to say they may NOT be denied because of lack of funds.

Covino thinks the CC should be retained related to the structure of the levels of review. At other institutions, what would be our URPTC would make recommendations prior to the Provost’s recommendation. Here they are working at the same time, and it is often difficult for us to have a dialogue about cases that we may need to have a dialogue about. Covino doesn’t know if this is against the rules, but we do it informally and he asks questions of that committee. In Covino’s first year the CC met without the Provost, last year they were all together. The CC could provide the Provost with some supplemental or additional views of the candidate that may be less accessible to him because the recommendations are made at the same time. The Provost and URPTC seem to disagree rarely, but when we do hearing the arguments of that committee is useful to Covino. The charge could be that the committee makes arguments for their decisions in the presence of, or to, the president. Covino thinks it’s valuable.

This will return to FAC tomorrow and should come back as an action item next time.

8. Discussion Item

a. UEPC Statement on Impact on Educational Quality

Petrosky stated that in the current climate of discussion of consolidation and elimination of courses to meet budget shortfalls, the UEPC decided to put their two cents into the discussion. Mindful of their charge, they discussed what educational impacts such cuts could have, and this led to the item on page 15. UEPC intended this as a document for UBAC to assist their considerations, and sent it to senators via ASNet and it was discussed in SEC. The final sentiment was to send it here for more discussion and perhaps consider it as a sense of the senate. Statement follows:

In consideration of the educational implications of the Provost’s mandate on course reduction and consolidation, the University Educational Policies Committee asserts the following:

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 we intend to serve who have work and family issues to balance against their pursuit of an education. It is likely that
many of them, faced with a schedule that does not conform to their needs, will 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.**

- It is our belief that enrollment caps given to particular courses at the time of their design and through the ensuing course approval process were not arrived at capriciously. Non-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.
- Evidence of the concomitance of quality, access, and class size abound, but is neatly summarized in the responses to a recent graduate survey:

  The responses cluster around the perceptions and opinions that CSU Stanislaus would be attractive to prospective students because of the availability of class, class size, access to courses; campus size and appearance; faculty diversity, friendliness, knowledgeable, available to students—these factors accounted for about 48 percent of the responses (see [http://www.csustan.edu/IR/documents/CR1/Cl1_OveralGradExit.pdf](http://www.csustan.edu/IR/documents/CR1/Cl1_OveralGradExit.pdf)).

**Increasing instructor workloads will adversely impact the quality of education.**

- As the Provost has noted on several occasions in multiple venues, 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.
- Likewise, 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.
- Therefore, since the balance of any instructor’s time is a zero-sum game, 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.

The document aimed at highlighting that there is an adverse impact on education because if we change the supply it does not suggest a change in demand. Every time we change the supply we are changing access to our product and that access is differentially felt. Some of the more hardship cases may be even more adversely affected, especially those who receive financial aid, and it may change to the point where they may not qualify for aid. Should we go for the route of consolidating sections to make larger sections of frequently offered courses, that flies in the face of the course enrollment caps that UEPC didn’t think were designed capriciously. If we do consolidate or eliminate courses or add to the workload of faculty or add seats to current sections that a faculty member’s time is not something that can be so freely manipulated. It is a zero sum game, time spent teaching more students is time not spent doing service or research.

O’Brien wanted to thank UEPC for putting it out there and letting everyone know. O’Brien would like this to be a sense of the senate for documentation and historical reasons. We do face potentially dark times, there are members of UBAC here, and if we clearly articulate our desires and our goals, that’s an important step.

Mayer is nervous to say what he wants to say. The playing field has changed since this was written. Mayer’s response at the Provost’s forum and today acknowledges that clearly we are headed into some unprecedented times. Mayer isn’t comfortable with the adversarial tone, and adversarial may be too strong of a word, but he doesn’t like that we’re not embracing this as one whole as administration faculty and staff together. Mayer appreciates that the President gave us one-time money to get us through the winter and spring. He’s not sure if this was the best decision. Mayer does appreciate that the President made this gesture, but ultimately we need to face these issues together. He would like us as a faculty to avoid any tone that is remotely adversarial to the administration. We need to work together on these issues. The band aid helps, but we have tough issues to address.

Sarraille pointed out that all we have ever asked was to be in the room. If you bring up this word adversarial, is it adversarial to be asked to be included in the discussion? We found ourselves in a situation as faculty where people trotted over to the departments and said you’re being cut this much, sign here. I embrace this idea of working harmoniously with the administration, as one as we can look at the facts together, let’s work together and not bring up negative thoughts.

O’Brien is surprised at how Mayer reads this. O’Brien will look at this word by word, but he doesn’t read this as adversarial. From O’Brien’s perspective this is not denigrating any other players in the process, but Senate is our body and for O’Brien it seems appropriate to make a statement regarding it. Thompson says it’s a statement of principles that is good to have handy, and when things get put into the form of a statement of principles or priorities, that they usually have a fairly neutral tone to them even though they may be directive. A good example of that is the budget priorities from FBAC. Those have been developed over time, we get an iteration most years, and they are presented in a fairly neutral tone.
Filling doesn’t see this as argumentative, it states a point. Filling wants to make a point that the reason the President put up the funds wasn’t because he had an epiphany. It’s because of statements like this and people putting up a fuss. We need to remind people that this is important.

Peterson thinks we have a fundamental problem. Peterson says her chair that has been here 35 years said we have never had good, clear budgeting information available to everyone. Over a year ago the President promised to try to have that available and it’s still not available. Lack of information leads to a serious level of mistrust. When told to cut things it’s hard to accept. Peterson’s an economist, and if she sees and can understand the numbers she can act. But now we’re reading news releases that we have certain Clearwire money, but it’s unclear how we have this deficit. Until that budget information is clear, we’re feeling uncomfortable. She doesn’t want to fight, just to understand the numbers so it’s clear how to use the scarce resources. Maybe this comes across as adversarial, but these seem like factual statements in the UEPC document. Until she can see the numbers better, it’s hard to accept it. There’s a lot of wondering where money is coming from. The President has promised it as a priority to get us the numbers. It’s the people’s money so it should be out there in the sunshine, we should all be able to see it. Thompson said that at the college meeting Ed Erickson, Chair of Economics did say that the information presented by Suzanne Green is the best information he’s gotten in his 35 years here. This may be good incremental progress.

Mayer greatly appreciates faculty leadership. He thinks it’s in our interest as a faculty, and understands some of the mistrust, but we are clearly now in the room and to harbor feelings from the past is problematic. Mayer isn’t sure this document is adversarial, but some comments lead him to think we’re “kinda adversarial.” Under consolidation... “ensuing not arrived at capriciously” the implication is that the provost doesn’t understand that. Mayer thinks that is understood. The response from the department chairs from the dean was that cuts needed to be made. When Mayer didn’t make all of the cuts, he used many of these arguments. Mayer is glad faculty stood up at that moment because it helped get us in the room. But Mayer doesn’t think we need to point fingers. Another example is “it will be a detriment to us who are engaged in research and scholarship”.

Johnson sort of agrees with Mayer. She thinks these are important, but the tone can be made non-adversarial by changing the language a bit. She recommended in the first line of the heading to remove “the provosts’ mandate on”

S. Davis noted that the words “quality of education” strike him because of WASC’s role. He is thankful to see this and increasingly interested to see this. He’s having difficulty understanding the status of this document. S. Davis asked if Petrosky could walk us through the circumstances of its development in UEPC, does it represent the entire committee? Petrosky noted it wasn’t intended for AS, it was intended to add to the conversation at UBAC. It was crafted partially at the November 13 UEPC meeting, and agreed to by email the following day after revisions by Petrosky.

Stefanco noted that at the UBAC meeting Green said lots of budget information would be put on the web, so in the next few days a lot of the information deans and chairs and UBAC have been given will be available and Stefanco hopes we will avail ourselves of it.

Dunham-Filson thinks it’s good to put out these statements because ultimately everyone wants to be heard and have their issues taken into consideration. It’s nice that the statement is out there, but what is each group doing to make suggestions for changes? Dunham-Filson noted there are going to be cuts, we can’t get past that.

Garcia is hopeful that we can be humane in this process, but he is less concerned about the adversarial nature. Garcia appreciates our willingness to engage, to disagree and critically reflect on the issues, and thinks that’s helpful. We’ve had good discussion in UBAC and Garcia is optimistic that we’re going in the right direction. As a UBAC member, he appreciates getting information like this as he considers what to cut. He would like to see this go even further. We get stuck into our groups of faculty, staff, students, and say that this is what’s important to faculty, but what are the unintended consequences to staff and students?

Covino noted that as the implied object of adversarial energy, one of his first responses when reading this was to write back to UEPC to thank them for the statement. Then things shifted and the situation changed. These are the sorts of statements that faculty should be making. Covino would agree with Johnson that he doesn’t think there was a mandate, and there doesn’t need to be reference to a mandate as part of the document. Mayer echoes the sense of Johnson’s comments, and would like it to be more generalized. Mayer believes that what we do need to discuss is the quality of education because the choices we’re going to be making are things we are going to want on the record and the types of decisions we make are going to diminish the educational quality of what it is we offer, or we’re going to feel it in human terms.

Johnson speaks in favor of change. She noted that O’Brien was talking about bringing this forward for the record as a sense of the senate statement. By leaving the comments in that related to the Provost, it makes this related to a particular issue at a particular time, and this is a strong statement about the effect on the quality of education of reducing scheduling, flexibility of schedules, and class size and those issues should last over many years, and are not just tied to a particular issue. This statement is not saying we will never increase class size, it’s asking that we acknowledge that there will be an impact of doing so, that it’s not cost-free. It’s a strong statement, but it should be set up so that it’s not referring to a particular instance.

S. Davis seconded Johnson’s comments and underscore that we wouldn’t want to bind this to a particular moment in history or season of the year.

Tan said that a statement like this is very important because if we don’t articulate our values to the President clearly, that we value education which this statement is in line with, that we might not have gotten the Clearwire money that was allocated in two phases. It’s
important to have a statement that shows what we value – education, class size, offering classes, time to graduation. If we don’t have a statement like this, when someone tries to allocate money, they might think that this is not a priority. Money could go to the technology area and maybe we think that investing in machines or software is less important than it going to people. The document voices our values and our focus on education.

Sarraille wants to throw out a word of caution. Some people have said that we will be cut eventually, that we must be realists, or that the quality of the institution will have to be sacrificed eventually. Maybe this is likely, maybe certain things are inevitable, but not long ago people thought that real estate would never go down. Keep an open mind. There’s a $66 million proposal, but don’t assume there are constraints that aren’t really there. You can hem yourself in. We need to figure out what the constraints are, know them well, and work with the constraints that actually exist. Someone from Statewide used to joke, “quality, access, affordability, pick any two.”

Brown spoke to the other side of the coin that Sarraille referred to. He supports this document, but also sees it as a defensive document. If cuts come in the future we don’t’ want to be cut, and by making this statement we are trying to avoid that. Committees should take a proactive approach as to how to cut the budget if it does come down. We shouldn’t be reacting. There should be some ways to plan to trim the budget, and Brown doesn’t know what prevents us from doing that now.

Colnic feels that what is right on is the idea that this is not a personalization because that creates rigidity. On the other hand, to keep it devoid of all context is a problem, we are in a crisis the extent of which we don’t know. If we remove it from the context entirely, it becomes somewhat meaningless. What do we want to do in this time of crisis? We want to maintain classes at a manageable size in order to offer high quality education.

Moore stated in his mind we are talking about issues that are connected to the fiscal situation and the changes or reductions we are trying to make in the most appropriate way to accommodate the situation. We should not lump them together. We had changes in Business and Finance and how the budget is arrived at, how we are funded and we are still in the middle of this process. He hopes by going forward we should keep in mind that while one affects the other, there are two distinct problems or challenges. So as we get numbers that are reliable or as accurate as possible, we can then provide the best programs for students.

Thompson would like to go back on the issue of tone adjustment. He thinks the tone has been adjusted so he would like to speak up for the UEPC and to go back to the second section about consolidation, second bullet that starts with pedagogical. One of the things that happened is that the original draft the Al-isms were removed. It read “…on the scale of an Obama-style rally.”

Eudey stated she is unclear where we are on this document. Does it go back to UEPC for revision? Is it a sense of the senate document? It will have no standing when we adjourn.

O’Brien moved to refer this back to UEPC to see if they want to rework this and bring it forth to the senate. Seconded by John Mayer. Covino would like to add back in the reference to rallies. Approved for referral to UEPC.

9. Information Item
   a. WASC Report-sent to ASNET – moved to an announcement

10. Open Forum

11. Adjourned 4:29pm.