Academic Senate  
September 23, 2008


Guests:  Dean Nael Aly, Dean Carl Bengston, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, Zbigniew Gackowski, Dean Roger McNeil, Dean Daryl Moore, ASVP Carlos Morales, Dean Gary Novak, John Sarraille, Armin Schulz, Dean Carolyn Stefanco, Steve Stryker, AVP Ted Wendt

Recording Secretary:  Diana Bowman

| WASC Report |
|-----------------|------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation of Senators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Tenure Review, DISCUSSED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UEE/RSCA Support Criteria, DISCUSSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process for running searches, DISCUSSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, October 7, 2008
2:30-4:30 pm., JRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:  Betsy Eudey, Clerk

1. Speaker Thompson called the meeting to order at 2:34 pm

2. Approval of Agenda-Thompson asked to move 7d) WASC to Announcements. Agenda was approved as amended.

3. Approval of Minutes of May 13, 2008-Minutes were approved as submitted.

4. Announcements
   a. Steve Filling noted that at 1pm today, the governor signed the state budget. The CSU was funded at $97.6M above the January 2008 budget. Filling credited the work of the Alliance and others involved in advocating for restoring funds to the CSU.

   b. WASC--Steve Stryker distributed a handout about WASC. No discussion is needed at this time because WASC will be here in one week. Six people are coming on the site visit. The WASC Chair will be in Stockton next Tuesday, then the group will be here on Wednesday afternoon. The only thing scheduled on Wednesday is a reception in the afternoon. Next Thursday is the day they’ll be on campus during all business hours. There will be twenty-some meetings on Thursday. The complete schedule is 20 pages long and posted on the web. The handout was a reminder regarding the structure of the CPR and reiterates the difference between the Capacity and Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Report. He has been around to major groups to discuss these differences. It’s important that campus leadership be informed of the structure, the four inquiry essays, etc. as noted on the handout. On the back is information on ten things to think about to make this a successful visit. The self study webpage address is listed on the handout. All are invited to view the report, especially those relevant to committees or projects you’re involved in. Most of the document is appendices, the actual report is 35 pages long. For those at the Stockton center, WASC chair will be there on Tuesday – open forums for faculty, staff and students to draw attention to it. Trying to do all they can to get students to attend the forums. Please provide whatever support you can to get folks at the forums. Otherwise items are self-explanatory.

   c. Thompson reminded senators that they will receive the agenda packets on the Thursday before the Tuesday of the Senate meetings. Thompson also asked senators to please remind folks in your departments to fill in the IDEA form requests.
d. Thompson identified guests at the meeting – all Deans, Wendt, Demetrulias, Sarraile, Morales, Schulz.

5. Questions about Committee Reports
Thompson indicated that reports from some committees were sent electronically to Senators. Some groups haven’t met yet so no reports were sent. In the past, the reports have not been placed into the minutes for the Senate meeting so we have no record of actions by committees. We will from now on electronically incorporate the reports into the minutes. See below:

a. Speaker of the Faculty
The 0809 SEC began meeting on May 21 and maintained an electronic discussion of several issues through the summer. We had a retreat on August 25 where we discussed what we saw as important topics for the year and how to address those topics through our governance structure, viz: Strategic Plan and Priorities, RPT, PTR, open budgeting, UEE, Stockton development, enrollment/admission, OIT policies, and engagement with administration.

On August 19th we met with President Shirvani to discuss his goals for the year, the goals that he presented at General Faculty and later disseminated to the campus electronically. We were able to engage well with the President at this meeting and believe that he took seriously our comments as evidenced by several changes he made to the presentation of goals.

On September 9th the SEC met with the Provost, the main topics of discussion being leadership positions at the Stockton campus and RPT. It was a useful meeting so far as reminding ourselves of the issues that surround RPT. We also discussed possibilities for achieving greater consistency across all levels of review.

At our September 16th meeting, besides the items on the current AS agenda, we discussed a proposed Faculty Governance award that was referred to the FAC last year and has now returned to the SEC as well as a draft UEE Pilot Special Sessions Policy which we referred to the FBAC.

At our September 30th meeting we will be discussing the Systemwide Security Policy & Network Port Upgrades and Allocation Policy with AVP Whitman, Administrative Review (which is with the FAC, but we want to discuss in light of the President’s September 3rd memorandum and including the review of deans), and Referrals of Inquiry Circle “Suggestions for Consideration to Governance and Administrative Units.” We will also meet with Dean Novak (we have invited each college dean to meet with us this fall) and then with UEE Interim Director Bechill on that day.

So far I have attended meetings of the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Graduate Committee, and the University Educational Policies Committee and intend to show up for as many meetings of standing committees as I can.

Finally, I want to reiterate my invitation to all faculty to attend AS meetings. Thanks,

b. Faculty Affairs Committee: No report

c. Faculty Budget Advisory Committee: First meeting 9/24/08.

d. Graduate Council: The following are the highlights of the September 18 Graduate Council meeting:

1. Replacement for Steve Graham, Former Associate Director of the Graduate School
Steve Graham left the University this summer for a faculty position at Delta College. Lisa Bernardo, Dean of Admissions, has been assigned on an interim basis to carry out the duties of this position. The Council is requesting an opportunity to speak with Bill Covino to discuss plans for permanent replacement for the associate director’s position.

2. Graduate Council Bylaws
The Graduate Council bylaws are being revised to align with the recently amended University constitution. Final approval will occur at the October 16th meeting.


4. Unit 11 Bargaining Agreement Affects Employment of Graduate Students
As a result of the bargaining agreement with the union representing student (Unit 11) employees, fee waivers can no longer be used as payment for work (e.g. research support activities, teaching assistance, etc.). Fee waivers can only be offered as a form of scholarship. A graduate student receiving a fee waiver can volunteer to perform duties. The current limited sources of funding for hiring graduate students as a Graduate Assistant or Teaching Associate include external donor fellowship funds and Department or College funds. Draft procedures related to graduate student employment was presented to the Council by Ted Wendt. The Council has not yet provided feedback on the draft.
5. Preparation for the WASC Visit
Diana Demetrulias shared an overview of the site visit process as well as suggestions for how to prepare for the visit.

6. Course Substitution Policy (Non 5000-Level Courses)
Draft policy relating to the substitution of approved program 5000-level master’s degree courses was reviewed and discussed. The Graduate School currently holds a list (last updated 5/17/04) of undergraduate substitution courses that programs have submitted. The purpose of the list is to enable graduation evaluators to verify that any undergraduate courses appearing on an MA/MS student’s graduation form has been approved as a substitution course by the department program. When graduate students take an undergraduate course to be applied toward the master’s degree requirements, additional assignments reflecting advanced disciplinary content and intellectual rigor are contracted between the instructor and individual student. Currently there are both 3000 and 4000-level courses included on the list. Debate exists among Council members as to whether 3000-level courses should be allowed to serve as substitution courses. An argument against the inclusion of 3000-level courses is that the original intention was to include only senior level courses that are more representative of capstone experiences that require a breadth of disciplinary content, thus is more aligned with graduate level coursework. An argument for the inclusion of 3000-level courses is that in many undergraduate programs, the assignment of 3000-level versus 4000-level appears to be arbitrary and that only a specific program can make the determination of the appropriateness of the content of a course as it relates to the master’s program. The policy is being further revised for discussion, amendment, and approval at the October meeting.

7. IRB Clearance Procedure
Carl Bengston brought attention to the Council IRB policy that requires IRB approval to appear in the bound copy of any final research project or thesis. The Council reviewed the policy and is currently exploring practical implementation procedure to be approved at the October meeting.

e. University Educational Policies Committee: From 9/11 UEPC meeting
1. Online Courses. Given the ongoing concerns regarding online courses, as well as the emphasis placed by the President in his address to the General Faculty on the importance of creating online programs, UEPC members were told to anticipate many such issues for their action in the coming year. Policies from other CSU campuses were forwarded to Teaching and Learning Subcommittee, which has yet to have the opportunity to meet this year. The chair also suggested the UEPC take a proactive stance, beginning with members reaching out to their own colleges to collect any college- or department-level policies which deal with online courses, or standing policies which had been amended or altered to accommodate online learning; he offered such a policy from his own college -- adopted last year -- which dealt with online course delivery and review.

2. Instructor Control of Adds and Drops. Concerns were expressed about the current status of adds and drops: with such actions possible within the first ten days of the semester, a student could potentially miss up to ten classes and multiple lab sessions. UEPC will schedule Dean Bernardo to discuss our options.

3. WASC Visit. Vice Provost Demetrulias outlined what to expect for the upcoming WASC visit in October. She disseminated a list of the “Top 10 Ways to Prepare for the WASC Visit,” provided a list of instruments which collectively make up the evidentiary trail of capacity, and illustrated UEPC’s participation in the distribution of assessment methods/findings.

4. Athletes and Priority Registration. Continuing the discussion of course attendance policies and their differential impact on student athletes, John Mayer (Faculty Athletic Representative) visited the committee and raised the possibility of awarding student athletes a registration priority to allow them access to classes that don’t conflict with their competition and training schedule. Anticipate further, more formal actions in the near future.

f. Statewide Academic Senate: September 11-12 SWAS Meeting:

Reports
Gary Reichard, Executive Vice Chancellor
*EdD moving forward and is accepting many students
*PhD in Nursing will not go forward at the moment due to budget issues
*Professional science masters is moving forward on 14 campuses with numerous outside funding sources to help fund program
*Voluntary System of Accountability is moving forward
*Council for Undergraduate Research is looking to CSU for best practices

Chancellor Reed
*Much on budget – additional cuts could happen but common wisdom is that both parties have not attacked CSU budget but times are difficult
*PR campaign “Get on the Bus”-bus is traveling across CA to excite students
*Veterans bill with education benefits passed with CSU help
*Asked all faculty/staff/admin to be sensitive in professional international travel= which is hard to justify with
budget crisis and doesn’t look good in current budget situation
*CSU/UC and community colleges are all working together on budget positions for higher Ed

**John Travis-CFA**
*Alliance of CA is going well
*Budget-CFA is concerned that if compact does not hold-re-bargaining of contract may be necessary
*PPI program is going forward with potential of 2.5 to 3.5 percent increase based on the rating of the faculty member i.e. meets or exceeds expectations
*System will use lists of that faculty having been longest without a salary increase divided over this and next year

**Passed Resolutions**
*Resolution passed requesting Board of Trustee to submit a budget that will meet all needs of the CSU

6. **Consent Item**
   Thompson announced that these Standing rules offer an overview of the general way we conduct business in the Academic Senate. Last year we incorporated into the rules how we deal with common actions (i.e. friendly amendments), so these are reflected in this document. The new addition this year is item “i.” Sometimes when we’re in the middle of a debate, we get asked whether something was a sense of the senate or going to the president for action, so we would like for this to be incorporated into the Standing Rules to avoid confusion. No objections were raised. Consent approval was obtained.

7. **Discussion Items**
   a. **Orientation of Senators**
   Thompson sent via email the Importance of Faculty Governance and the Role of the Senator, and a copy of the powerpoint that we have used before. He wanted to review portions of that, and to have committee chairs talk a bit about their roles. But since this is an orientation, he asked if there is anything anyone wants to ask about? There was no response. He emphasized the terms we associate with governance are shared responsibility, joint decision-making and collegiality. He wanted to discuss why we have our share of the responsibility in university governance. Who says we have a share? - from Statewide AS in 1985 – tries to define collegiality. The legislature’s statement. “is essential to the performance of the educational mission” Next slide indicates that it includes the senates. A Statement from Board of Trustees “collegial governance” focus on educational functions of the institution. Coming from different directions, it is said we should have authority, the trustees agree to a certain degree, and the legislature supports this. We should have authority because it’s grounded in our disciplinary expertise. We are the appropriate body to address the curriculum. This extends to personnel decisions and the Academic Senate and the people in the room are the ones who by our constitution are the representatives for the general faculty in making those policies. Those are the main things to me. The rest you can read at your leisure. Thompson then invited committee chairs to introduce the work of their committees.

Petrosky - UEPC is the bright shining light in the sea of academic intrigue. Its main purpose is to consult with and recommend to the provost any issues related to Undergrad curriculum and projects. General Education, University Writing, Assessment of Student Learning and Technology and Learning Subcommittees report to UEPC. UEPC touches the lives of all in this room whether you want it or not.

Tan - FBAC – There are 15 members, 12 are faculty, one student rep, one from the library/counseling, and the provost. Duties were read from the General Faculty Constitution.

Hejka-Ekins - FAC – There are 7 faculty on the committee. Ken Schoenly, Chau-Pu Chiang, Mark Grobner, Chuck Floyd, Annie Hor, Daniel Afonso, and April Hejka-Ekins. Their focus is your concerns, your issues. She then read the four duties of FAC from the General Faculty Constitution. This is a very important committee that has a wide scope. If you have concerns, questions in any of these areas, call Hejka-Ekins, email her, or stop by and see her. She will be happy to represent you. This year’s FAC is a good committee and will consider the issues and take them to SEC and back here to you. They hope to represent you well.

Young - Graduate Council – Is comprised of the 16 current graduate program coordinators from programs that offer a Master’s degree. Vice Provost Demetrulias is also a member. The charge from the General Faculty Constitution was shared.

O’Brien – Statewide – 23 campuses have an academic senate much like this one. Each campus has 2 senators that serve at the Statewide Academic Senate. Paul O’Brien and Steve Filling serve as our statewide academic senators. A few of the larger campuses have 3 representatives. There are 4 regular meetings a year at the Chancellors Office, 2 in fall, 2 in spring, and 4 additional interim meetings where committees work to do things in preparation for the regular meetings. The first meeting this year was a week and a half ago, the initial report was sent on ASNET. Filling and O’Brien will coordinate reporting so Senators won’t receive duplicate
messages. The report was mostly focused on the budget, but hopefully that is resolved and we’ll move to other roles.

Thompson announced that Filling is also Speaker-elect and Eudey is Clerk. There are other standing committees like RSCA that aren’t represented on SEC. Thompson solicited questions and comments, but received none.

O’Brien noted by just looking at the list of senators on page six of the agenda, many if not most are returning senators, but there are a few new ones and it’s good to see them here. Having gone through the experience of being on the Senate the first year, as you hear discussions, take it back to your department to discuss it. Do that before it is voted on and it’ll make your life easier. Thompson indicated agreement and that he tried to emphasize representation and reporting in his comments on the role of the senator.

Eudey commented as someone on the Senate and a member of a self study team, she emphasized the important contributions of the Senate to the operations of the campus. If you look at the improvements over the past 10 years, how much we have grown. The Senate has had a key role in improving this campus. The Faculty Development Center is an example. We didn’t have it 10 years ago. It is important to look back. We’ve had reorganization of the colleges, creation of an assessment plan, general education, the Academic Senate helped to create. We are a great university because of faculty volunteering, having good consultation and faculty serving on committees. We should take it seriously. We have come a long way and there is a lot to be proud of when WASC comes next week. You have an opportunity to continue to improve this institution.

Thompson noted that it is implicit that senators should read all materials distributed before coming to the meetings.

b. Post Tenure Review

Thompson sent out some documents related to PTR via Asnet. These included the actual policy and the message that came out from FAC to the general faculty indicating what PTR is and what it isn’t and some points of consensus that were reached among committees and via interaction between faculty and administration.

Hejka-Ekins offered a refresher on PTR. Under Renae Floyd’s leadership, FAC worked with the President in November 2007 to sign the policy, and in January administration and faculty met to flesh out how this would work. In spring last year FAC held a few information sessions and basically PTR is now in the hands of each department. The goal for the fall is for departments to create some criteria used for review. Criteria is completely up to the department, this is totally decentralized. It is up to each department to come up with criteria and submit it. In spring PTR reviews will begin. As she understands it, a full professor needs to be reviewed every 5 years for PTR. Since this is the first time we’ve done this at the institution, the most senior faculty would be on the top of the schedule and then departments would work their way down through the rest. Since we’re just starting it, we have up to five years from the spring in which to catch up to review all senior faculty. There’s lots of wiggle room to get it done. The main emphasis in the fall is for each department to decide on whatever criteria they wish to use for review. While we need to be systematic, it is in the hands of the faculty. Faculty don’t need to get over anxious about it. She encouraged being task orientated getting the criteria decided upon so it can be enacted. Hejka-Ekins solicited questions or concerns.

Thompson indicated that he has had email discussions with a few faculty asking about this policy. He noted that this is a policy that was developed quite a while back. It went through the Senate and no action was taken by the President [Hughes]. What President Shirvani approved is basically the same policy as the one approved by AS in 2001. Because there had been some questions about the policy, it was decided to put it on the Senate agenda. Thompson solicited questions or comments but received none.

c. UEE/RSCA Support Criteria/2009 Faculty RSCA Support Program

Provost Covino was asked to offer an overview of the 2009 Faculty RSCA Support Program. Covino noted that as shared with Senate last spring, he was able to sequester some dollars that were surplus from University Extended Education. His own priority was to devote surplus dollars to support academic research programs. He decided given the strong interest in additional support for faculty scholarship that he would devote the one-time dollars available – not recurring at this point although desirable – in support of faculty scholarship. He worked with the Council of Deans to develop a set of provisions for the 2009 FRSCA Support program. The deans have brought this back to the colleges for further discussion and each college will develop a process and determine exceptions as warranted, and recommendations will be made to the provost for assigned time for scholarship for spring and fall 2009 by Nov 1 so that adjustments in the teaching schedule can be made. He anticipated to have about $150,000, so it works out to roughly 90 WTUs, apportioned proportional to the number of FT TT/T faculty in each college.

Thompson indicated that the SEC had discussed with Covino. The issue went to our CHSS chairs council who had a discussion and proposed some alterations. He’s interested in hearing from senators and deans ideas about making exceptions, what’s changing and how are the decisions being made. Gary Novak, Dean of CHSS noted
that issues were raised because in a college like theirs with lots of graduate coursework and theses and also the field experience, there was concern that 18 units limited to actual scheduled classes was too restricted. They discussed this in executive committee and with department chairs and coordinators and recommended Novak going to the Council of Deans to discuss their concerns. He did, and Margaret Tynan wrote a memo supporting the college’s viewpoint. At COD they agreed colleges do have the opportunity to make exceptions to the policy. John Garcia noted that as a Senator he wants to voice the opinion that he is VERY concerned about this program, especially when it comes on the heels of great discussion on RPT and concerns raised about the definition of RSCA, and he is concerned that this as a whole continues to push the definition for how we conduct RSCA and how we disseminate those releases.

Elaine Peterson commented that it does seem like this runs a little contrary to the workload agreement in which it was put forward that people should have time for RSCA without having to jump through these extra hoops to complete it. It sounds like this is because there isn’t enough money to fund the time and they should have all along. We still have a problem here because if we’re saying that folks have to jump through hoops, then we’re not funding what we bargained for.

Thompson stated that part of our discussion we’ve gone back and forth, and had some disagreement about if this constitutes an academic policy that requires consultation. Thompson asked if it was in support of the Workload Agreement, and was told no. In the workload agreement there is not a provision for funding but there is also no provision against funding. This is not a point of some ambiguity. If it’s not funding the workload agreement, then the clause requiring consultation is not operative. One of the things we did talk about was from the allocation of money to formation of procedure, to development of allowance (some came out of discussion from SEC) this has not been a consultative process.

Covino stated he didn’t anticipate it to be so difficult to give money away, but there are some difficulties attached to it. He wanted to stress for Professor Garcia that the process and the nature of the scholarly works that are eligible for allocation is to be determined by colleges, implicit or intended in this document. Relative to hoops, he would point out that the workload agreement does ask for proposals for scholarly projects that are reviewed and approved based on resources. The review is not unlike this. The process for doing this, and the degree or number of hoops that one must jump through, is in the hands of the colleges and not prescribed which allows people to decide what process they decide and recommend names to him.

Dave Colnic felt the 18 units creates a disincentive for administrative work including PAC, program coordination and people who do this are mostly ineligible for this. That seems problematic. He understands that this is a resource issue, but since so many junior faculty are PACs, they may be the ones who would benefit from this. Program Coordinators also.

Garcia noted in #4 the college will recommend a process, but in #5 it seems to be giving more than guidelines as to what is and is not allowable. Covino replied #5 was carefully crafted to allow for deliberation and flexibility. The deans were all intent upon that as we discussed it together. We did land on assigned time for these with the “for-instance” phrase, but these instances are not intended to be exclusive.

Johnson had questions regarding how criteria are established. In item 3 it indicates a timeline for completing the project without further assigned time, and item 5 does specifically say it will not fund assigned time for presentations or proceedings. There are many projects that take more than a year or semester, and many times you need feedback from conferences. If you have a timeline and are requesting release time that didn’t end up in a completed project at the end of the year and wanted to continue it on to publication, but perhaps there was a presentation in this year, would this be excluded because it goes beyond that time and because there is a conference presentation that comes out of it? Covino replied one of the reasons for that provision was the recognition that conference travel has not been funded centrally, but by the colleges. It may not be adequate but we were leaving the issue of conference travel to college allocations and trying to fund assigned time that would not necessarily exclude a conference as a stepping stone, but travel itself would be funded by the college rather than by this program. If someone is stepping toward publication via a conference, that’s fine. Johnson asked what if you had a multi-year project but you thought a conference presentation was part of the “along the way” step? Covino replied that wouldn’t be uncommon. That’s a decision in terms of setting priorities and a process in the colleges and is a discussion that can be had at that level. It’s not precluded in his mind.

Thompson stated he was going to ask Mark Bender who just left to report on this, but will try to report it as best he can. Two things CHSS did was to say they wouldn’t have the 18 unit requirement, and said it would be available to Assistant and Associate but not Full Professors. These are two points chairs council is kicking around. If you can change that on one, then you could change that to support conference presentations or whatever the college decides. Another reason to ask about this today to get clarification is because the process has been kind of a strange one. Allocation skipped university governance, and is now consultative at the college level because we were given permission from Deans Council. In our college, it is consultative and will go to the faculty, and the decision on the college level will be consultative, but he’s wondering if it’s happening across the
colleges. Tan stated colleges can have different criteria. How do you know how much money to give to each college? Covino replied the allocation is tied to the percentage of TT/T faculty in each college.

Tan questioned why not just give the money to the colleges to do what they want instead of having so much criteria? Covino replied he did exclude College of Business from the start because COB is currently sufficiently supported in terms of research support for faculty, and he wanted to point it at other colleges. Handing money to the deans would have been possible, but thought that it would create a more participatory role for the faculty if we developed some criteria and invited a process for allocation. In the past, Provosts have just asked deans or others what projects were around to support and given out some money. This is a more fully deliberative process and Covino tended to prefer that.

Carroll asked if suppose we did what Tan said, how is that less participatory? Covino replied it wouldn’t necessarily be less participatory, but there’s no assurance of full engagement of the faculty by handing money out and saying I trust the deans would put out a process but on a smaller scale. He has had folks who were most visible working on a project come to the deans’ attention and wanted to ensure that everyone discussed a process for doing this.

Sarraille questioned how has this played out in College of Natural Sciences? As far as he knows, they haven’t had meetings to discuss how this program of RSCA will be conducted in CNS, but it seems there has been an announcement. Dean O’Neil replied perhaps the 8 WTU could be waived in instances when it was compelling when an individual didn’t meet this eligibility requirement but additional RSCA support would be helpful. Most in the college are close to 24 WTU. The intent was to move in that direction instead of moving others to 0. Another thing to follow up with the Provost, initiating an article that would culminate in a conference proceeding would be viewed. The end product need not be an accepted for publication work for a journal, but we need to get people started as well as finished.

Nagel stated the discussion is related to surplus generated by UEE. He has questions about how is the surplus generated by UEE, whose labor generates this, and how the people whose labor generates this are treated and how they are paid by the University. Is the shifting of funds in some way unintentionally exploiting those people? Covino replied we’re talking about a surplus generated in small ways by a range of programs that UEE does. Overseas certificate programs, credential programs, special sessions programs like EMBA or the new Child Development certificate, Genetic counseling, degree completion in CJ. A budget is generated that starts with the cost of the program for the students. For example, the cost of the EMBA is $26,500 for the current cohort, then deductions start – required deductions for the Chancellor’s office, sub-university processing that can’t be paid by general fund, salaries for UEE folks are paid by UEE revenue, faculty that teach are paid via collective bargaining, and educational material costs (lunch for participants, etc). You get to bottom line, whatever is left, is currently split between the college and the university. This money is what is left of the university money. Covino stated he is devoting a portion of that to support faculty scholarship. We have to follow system-set regulations re deductions, salaries, etc. It’s a pretty bureaucratized program.

Filling stated to the best of his understanding given the nature of financial information we get, EMBA accounts for about 50% of UEE, and 50% of UEE profits, but does feel compelled on behalf of College of Business colleagues to echo Nagel’s point. How do we match some ethereal description of you guys in COB have sufficient funding when it’s the fruits of their labors that are creating the surplus in the first place?

Thompson gave a mini-summary of what he understands for correction. This has become a consultative process on the entirety of page 17 except the last line of it. And that there are processes in the colleges where faculty or elected faculty representative groups can make changes to any of these 5 items listed on page 17. No corrections offered.

Eudey commented that the provost indicated wanting to have continuing money to support programs like this. She is pleased that consultation is occurring so that faculty has input into this process, but this consultation is occurring outside of Academic Senate processes, and we need to ensure that appropriate processes are used if/when this one-time practice becomes more permanent. We need to watch after the 2009 allocation, and not consider this resolved. It is important for the Senate to work with the Administration to find ways to support the workload agreement. She is thrilled the money is available now, and pleased that faculty are able to provide
input even if only at the college level, but this can’t be the end of our conversation on this. One-time funding with variable criteria is not sufficient to meet the needs of faculty.

Dean Moore stated we’re just getting started with this program and in his college in particular, they haven’t had a chance to meet. But the model Dean McNeil described is what he’ll use. There will be consultation between chairs and faculty.

Carroll questioned if there are limits to the extent that colleges can make exceptions, alterations, etc. In the extreme, maybe there is no need for a policy. Covino replied he thinks colleges will decide as they deliberate. We have simply decided as a COD that colleges may implement exceptions. Carroll stated in theory, a college could decide to rewrite this policy. Covino replied that’s true.

Nagel stated he is confused by Eudey’s calling this is a means to fund the workload agreement. Eudey clarified that was not what she meant. But we need to find ways to fund the workload agreement. We can’t just rely on this. Thompson added it’s in the strategic plan that we need to fund the workload agreement.

Sarraille stated we have a workload agreement, even if some aren’t aware of it. There are forms that one can fill out to request RSCA funding. There are questions about what the rules are and how far we can go. Filling out the form and that process would eliminate the ambiguity. The rules are there. He is mystified why Provost Covino chose to create his bizarro workload program when we have one already. Why do we need his clone of the workload plan. Further, he put in a lot of effort hammering out that agreement.

DeVries asked if a college could substitute the Workload Agreement forms for that purpose? Covino replied at this point, it’s out of his hands. He just wants recommendations on November 1. It’s in the hands of the deans and the colleges. Let the colleges decide.

Wendt stated a lot of effort was spent on the Workload Agreement. In his way of thinking, the forms Sarraille alluded to, they are not requests for funding. They are a mechanism where a faculty begins a consultation process with their chair and dean by which assigned time for RSCA would be given. But the Workload Agreement never speaks to funding, probably on purpose. The assumption was maybe the assigned time would come out of money coming from someplace –maybe even the provost – but could come because of department chair and colleagues being very entrepreneurial about scheduling coursework, size of classes, or some other manner of making at least some assigned time available within the department while meeting department demands, enrollment demands, etc. The solution wasn’t only to throw money at it, maybe some other manner including possibly deans having the wherewithal perhaps through some means to help enable this process. Please remember, go look at the Workload Agreement. It’s a document that is largely aspiration. We’d surely like to get to these goals, and on average we are hoping this is the kind of ration of activities that all faculty will have on campus.

Filling commented that AVP Wendt misspeaks a bit. The form does allow requests for assigned time. We’re not dealing with how we get money. We have it. The question of how to allocate that across projects is very different from “is there money?” I think those forms work. Sarraille agreed to what Filling said. There are the forms and an approval process. Read the Workload Agreement and you will find a process for going through and getting approval for requests for assigned time. If someone had merely made funding available for that process, it would have been sufficient to get the job done.

Covino pointed out that he had to fight for these dollars, to hold on to them. They almost disappeared in the wake of the budget cuts. All of the responses except for the deans, have been not thankful, but how dare you. I resent it.

Thompson replied if the provost is referring to the responses he has given, it’s a misrepresentation. What he resents is that the money was originally posed as not funding the workload agreement in order to avoid consultation at the university level and now the faculty are in the position of having the Dean’s Council tell us we’re allowed to consult at the college level.

Dean Moore stated as far as he understands this program, it’s one way to make funding available so that faculty on this campus can further advance themselves in their particular areas of expertise. There wasn’t any time in those meeting to make decisions about who should get the money or setting up a criteria that isn’t driven by the faculty in the programs that would need the money. That really is it. He’s not trying to oversimplify the situation, but specifically for this program. His college will get smallest amount, but will take it so faculty will have what they need to advance their work.

8. Open Forum

Carroll reported he is speaking for the non-administrative members of his department regarding the process for running searches this year. They talked about this a good bit and about the precedent this is setting. As a practical matter, they don’t have part-time money in the department to fund a position. They recognize their
position has been at the top of the recruitment list in the past. It’s not the first time we’ve been in tough budget
times, but this is a new approach. This seems to be part of a larger trend of decentralizing financial
responsibility, TAships and searches without corresponding decentralization for budgetary responsibility. The
impact of taking PT money to TT position would mean more faculty teaching lower division and less teaching
upper division to support graduate offerings. Lots of departments want to run searches. Running one under
these conditions is difficult. He urged Senators to look at the long term consequences of what is going on here,
and if possible refuse to run a search under these terms. If we all do this together, we may make a point.

Thompson, whose department does have a lot of part-time staffing, stated he not sure what his department could
do as far as cashing in part time and offering our classes besides bringing in a new literature professor to teach
mostly composition. Eudey indicated that many may not know what the hiring policy is, and asked if someone
could briefly describe it.

Covino indicated that he said to the deans that we don’t have any new dollars this year. There are no new
dollars for anything including faculty searches. There are significant needs in the colleges. We could go ahead
with high priority searches, but since there are no dollars external, they need to look to their own college budgets
to pay this. We need to deal with salary lines from people who left departments, consolidating part time, but can
go ahead with searches if noting these are based on available funding and the money is available in the college
budget. We can’t make appointments until we see the January budget from the Governor. He doesn’t want to
risk putting us in an over-committed position and then have to take drastic measures. Colleges can decide or not
decide to do searches. He regrets deeply that funding to hire new faculty disappeared in the budget. He hopes it
provides some opportunities for departments and colleges, but regrets it is so constrained.

Dean Stefanco stated in the CHSS it was discussed among leaders. She had individual meetings with
department chairs, looked at the budget and planning committee recommendations, and is trying to be as
creative as possible to find dollars to make this happen for those who decide they want to work with the process.
The process is problematic. We need more faculty. The percentage we get in the RSCA program is smaller
than our percentage of FTES production. Where we can go forward and where departments will be creative, it’s
a great thing that we can even have these conversations in these dire times.

Young wished to go back to the RSCA support program. She stated she thinks it is also important to share some
perception of the program that is positive. We had a dialogue in the College of Education at the executive
committee yesterday and we seem to at this point to be able to have constructed a mechanism to make it work
for us. We’re going to take whatever opportunities for research release time we can get. With a EdD program
we need to embrace more opportunities to engage in research so we may be looking at it self-servingly and
realize there are many kinds of implications. She hopes she is expressing positive perceptions of the program
and not speaking for others when she shouldn’t, but the conversation was very positive in COE exec yesterday.

9. Adjournment – 4:05pm