



established the Lynn Boone Memorial Scholarship Program in 1994 with the objective of advancing the field of Human Resources. Scholarships are available to graduate and undergraduate students enrolled in Human Resource degree programs as well as Human Resource professionals enrolled in MBA programs. Applause.

Filling acknowledged our guests CFA President Sarraile, Lauren Byerly, Renee Giannini, Neil Jacklin, Nancy Lewis, Mark Grobner, Vice Provost Demetrulias, and Deans Nowak, McNeil and Moore. Filling also welcomed the new Dean of the College of Human and Health Sciences, Dr. Linda Goodwin.

## **5. Committee Reports**

Littlewood noted that UEPC has indicated that they would make a recommendation on the position of the spring term dates on future calendars. UEPC is now rescinding that. They tried to use the policy to draft future calendars and an issue came up, so they're going back to the drawing board. He's asking faculty, staff, students and MPPs to complete an online survey regarding the best placement of spring break. He noted that it's important to complete the entire survey at one sitting as you will only get one chance to complete it. The link to the survey will be sent out again this week.

Schoenly noted that FAC is addressing the issue of course evaluations. There is a CFA contract requirement that mandates that two courses are evaluated, and many voluntary requests are also requested. There have been cost overruns from voluntary evaluations dues to processing fees with IDEA. FAC consensus view was that if we need to rethink the number of voluntary evaluations that this should be a discussion at the provost level and brought forward to the Senate.

Nagel asked how much the IDEA evaluations cost. Pierce said it's costing us approximately \$12,000 per year for all IDEA evaluations. The voluntary portion is \$4,000. Strahm said that this is for people who request more than the two required courses. Pierce said that some faculty evaluate more than two courses. Filling said that for some lecturers their departments mandate that more than two courses are evaluated. Nagel said that by the contract there should not be special requirements for lecturers, and that if all lecturers are required to evaluate all courses then all faculty must be.

## **6. Action Items**

### **a. 06/AS/10/SEC Doctoral Academic Program Review Policy and Resolution from Graduate Council**

Second reading of the following resolution:

#### ***06/AS/10/SEC – Resolution Doctoral Academic Program Review***

*Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached Doctoral Academic Program Review Policy, and be it further*

*Resolved: That the Doctoral Academic Program Review Policy take effect upon approval by the President.*

*Rationale: The doctoral academic program review process at CSU Stanislaus is the most important method by which California State University Stanislaus will evaluate the effectiveness of its doctoral programs in promoting high levels of student achievement. As such, current (and future) doctoral programs will be subject to periodic academic program review on a cycle not to exceed five years after program*

*initiation and seven years thereafter. The proposed Doctoral Academic Review Policy is intended to describe and guide the process.*

*Governance responsibility for the development, implementation, and periodic review of the effectiveness of the doctoral program review procedures is vested with the Graduate Council.*

Filling asked if the body is ready to proceed to vote. There were no comments. S. Davis called the question. The resolution passed by voice vote unanimously. To be sent to the president as policy.

## **7. First Reading Items**

### **a. 07/AS/10/SEC/RSCAPC Responsible Conduct Research Policy**

#### **(3 PM Time Certain for Patrick Kelly, Nancy Lewis and Diana Demetrulias)**

Moved by Jasek-Rysdahl, seconded by McGhee. Nancy Lewis spoke representing RSCAPC. Lewis indicated that NSF and NIH effective on January 1, 2010 mandated if any university applies for a grant and receives one that they must have a plan in place for respectful conduct of research and training of any undergraduate, graduate or post doctorate student working on the grant. The CSU and the office of Research and Sponsored Programs must adhere to this mandate. This is a tool that all CSUs will use and it is the CITI as indicated in the materials in the agenda. It's an online tutorial that allows students to take different elements of the responsible conduct of research and get a certificate. The ORSP will pay the fee and it is still being negotiated. Anyone can take these courses. It doesn't affect many students because there are so few NSF grants being funded at this time, and the grants that were received prior to the mandate are not affected by this mandate. Anyone can take the tutorials, and ORSP plans to have them available in fall 2010.

Nagel asked if faculty are also required to do the training. Lewis said no. Nagel said that is not clear on the second page of the policy under researchers, training, maintenance it says "all are required to do so," and does not seem to exclude faculty. Is there language that specifically says faculty don't need to do the training?

Lewis said it's referred to within the NSF policy. So when saying researchers, it's what the agency requires. This language could be added and she will look into this. She noted that on page 3 under NSF is where the wording is noted directly from their mandate.

O'Brien asked how many faculty would need to go through this process for this NSF grant. Lewis said she hopes a lot in the future. Currently it would only include 2-3 faculty that are working on these grants. She encourages students in their research classes to take this training.

Peterson asked what the marginal cost was for students to take this online course. Is there a charge per student? Lewis indicated there is no charge to the students and that the overall cost for the program would be paid by ORSP. Peterson said that we could have students use this tutorial to learn more.

Lewis said they're trying to negotiate a price for the volume of the CSU. The Research and Sponsored Programs office will pay approximately \$1500 a year regardless of the amount of use on campus. This item will return as an action item at the next meeting on April 27<sup>th</sup>.

**b. 08/AS/10/FAC Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes**

Schoenly moved the resolution, seconded by Floyd. Schoenly read the rationale as follows:

**08/AS/10/FAC—Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes**

BE IT RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate approves the attached Faculty Policy on Student Recording of Classes; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy be effective upon approval by the President; and be it further

RESOLVED: That this policy be placed in the Faculty Handbook and Student Handbook.

RATIONALE: A policy to protect the copyrights and the intellectual property rights of an instructor's classroom pedagogy is needed. Further, students with disabilities have special needs that require them to utilize learning tools that instructors need to accommodate. This policy allows the instructor to maintain control of the property rights, while meeting the needs of students with disabilities prescribed by law. The policy also provides faculty a means to permit any form of recording they deem useful to support the academic success of those who do not require special accommodation.

Revised 4/06/10

Schoenly said this is a carryover item from the last two years. Last year FAC had created two separate documents, one item is the policy on recording of classes and another is the University DRS policy for providing accommodations for students with disabilities. There were various versions of syllabi and recording agreements put together last year. Students would have to sign the DRS agreement form and DRS would have to notify the instructor if the students are covered under the DRS. The University Recording Policy is something that April Hejka-Ekins suggested last year as there is no existing policy. We do have the Disability Resource Services Audio/Video Recording Agreement dated 4/15/09 which relates to university policy. This item was being discussed along with the faculty intellectual items and Hejka-Ekins' recommendation was to track these as 2 separate policies.

FAC proposed a 2-in-1 document that reconciles the inconsistency from last year while providing a DRS policy for accommodations. SEC offered language indicating additional flexibility for faculty. A third document is the recording agreement. If approved, this form can be downloaded from the DRS website as documentation of an agreement with students. All three documents were sent to Lee Bettencourt in DRS in case he had additional suggestions. Collectively the document includes FAC, SEC and DRS contributions to the content.

Colnic questioned the copyright issues and interface with prohibiting the same students that record with their cell phones. He's not sure of the implications of this. Is this a protection for us for copyright issues? Schoenly said we need to provide a DRS accommodation for those who need it, and we want to provide a means to protect faculty copyrights. He also has vendor agreements indicating he won't release the information to the students. We need to respect that agreement.

Gomula asked what the consequences would be if someone put something out on YouTube. What would happen if they break this agreement? Schoenly said that it would be referred to Student Affairs.

Eudey noted that if students violate the policy they will be referred to Student Affairs for a judicial review.

Steven J. Pierce 4/6/10 9:03 AM  
Deleted: X  
Ken 4/6/10 7:30 AM  
Deleted: s  
Ken 4/6/10 7:30 AM  
Deleted: 09

ipierce 3/25/10 4:28 PM  
Deleted: ensuring  
ipierce 3/25/10 4:28 PM  
Deleted: needs to be protected  
Ken 4/6/10 7:28 AM  
Deleted: disabled  
ipierce 3/25/10 4:30 PM  
Deleted: ensures  
ipierce 3/25/10 4:30 PM  
Deleted: 's  
Ken 4/6/10 7:29 AM  
Deleted: disabled

Unless faculty choose not to refer, in which case it will be handled internally. Part of the issue is privacy issue for both students and faculty. Many students don't allow public records of them and posting on video could be a violation. This is a way to try to protect privacy rights and allows faculty to document when they are sharing information.

Strahm asked about the wording "Audio recording or any other recording." She's wondering if we should include the term "video." Taking notes is another form of recording. Schoenly said one other version of the resolution indicated audio, visual and digital, but it was something that FAC discussed.

Nagel said with regard to the second paragraph about "others approved," he'd like to change it to "only be distributed to others who have been approved by the DRS program" edited by S. Davis.

Tumolo asked who retains the right to have the tapes at the end of the semester. These are recordings to accommodate a student for a particular class. What happens after the semester is completed? That is a copyright issue as well. Schoenly said they didn't discuss that but he will check on it.

McGhee said any recording for a disabled person should be treated as a textbook. Textbooks are copyrighted and they don't have to dispose of it after a course. They should be able to review information in the future. You never know when something will be used in the future. Just because they are disabled they shouldn't be disadvantaged. Filling noted that folks using electronic textbooks often have short periods for using the books.

Nagel is not clear if this is trying to accommodate students with special needs, intellectual property and copyright issues, or privacy issues. He doesn't think doing all three will work. Strahm's indication of recording information by hand makes him wonder if he has rights to the words he says in class. If a student copies things down and posts them to a webpage, is that a violation of my copyright? If this policy tries to do this, it may not be doing it well. Perhaps it shouldn't try to take on copyrights.

Manrique wonders if some different language would include taking of notes.

Regalado is curious whether we should ask for some legal counsel on this topic. Maybe we should consult with someone on this to better understand the parameters of copyright infringement before making a decision. It could answer some questions with more authority.

McGhee doesn't see note taking as recording, while audio or video is a reflection of what happened. Notes may or may not be what was said. He doesn't look at note taking the same way.

Strahm was obsessive about note taking while in college and suggested addressing which forms of recording are not allowed. C. Davis says the last line indicates "unless expressly allowed in the syllabus." In her syllabus she expressly indicates students should take notes.

Schoenly indicates this will go back to FAC. He will consult with Gina Leguria, our new Compliance Officer on this.

O'Brien said that they were looking at a related issue at statewide senate, and there was a lot of the discussion about a website called Course Hero where faculty-generated documents are posted by students. It's all student based. If a student posts a course outline from a course then that gives them the privilege to

download other documents. In his department there was an old course outline posted which became an issue. Faculty are requesting Course Hero to take things off this website but there are delays in this. They had an expert talk to SWAS about it. It's highly recommended that course outlines and anything distributed should have a copyright on it. By doing that you're protected if you find that Course Hero or a student is posting your materials online, you will have some recourse to withdraw it. Without the word "copyright" you're perhaps saying they're public documents. O'Brien noted that SWAS will probably do a couple of resolutions on this.

## **8. Discussion Items**

### **a. Course Time Modules**

Filling noted that the course time modules were distributed online to senators and attached to the agenda packet. This is a venue to raise questions and identify any problems to convey to the appropriate people.

Colnic indicated particular attention to the graduate level courses. He knows the current modules don't accommodate this as there is no 6-9pm slot and admissions has been supportive of keeping that slot open. If things become more codified we will lose that flexibility. He noted that 4pm is too early and ending at 10pm is too late if students are driving from long distances. That last hour of class often leads to student exhaustion. He would like to ensure that the 6-9pm slots are still available.

Eudey asked if anyone was having trouble getting classes scheduled into the 6-9pm time slots.

Grobner said they've had a class offered from 6-9pm since 1997, and he has been told he cannot run a class at this time in the future.

Filling asked Brown if he knew when MBA classes are offered. Brown said some are at 6pm and some are at 4:30pm.

Leyva would like to reiterate what Colnic said. Students in Social Work are required to be in internships from 9am-5pm and to ask them to leave early would be a problem for community partners. Those traveling long distances have difficulty getting here for the 4pm courses.

C. Davis said the reason we went to two night classes was to accommodate rooms. With fewer classes on the schedule do we still have an impact problem for night classes? She's not sure what the numbers of classes are that meet in the two time slots.

Filling said we can inquire about that. With government giving us more money for classes, we may not be too far down.

S. Davis said that's only one part of the issue. There's also the question if there is an abundance of classes offered at 7pm then collapsing courses currently offered would run us out of space.

Eudey indicated that the movement of the winter term courses to fall and spring may also lead to more evening courses. Winter courses meeting several hours per day may create a high demand for afternoon and evening classes.

O'Brien noted that we passed a resolution about postponing implementation of winter term and wondered if we'd obtained a response. Filling said we were not directly notified with a response to the resolution.

Strahm asked about Saturday classes, for example offering those that used to be offered in winter term on Saturday.

Eudey indicated that this is possible as there is nothing to prevent faculty from offering Saturday courses. There have been Saturday classes offered on this campus and the Stockton campus. There is nothing to prohibit this. Courses that are mandatory for a program could likely not be offered on Saturday unless there was also a weekday option, but the weekend time slots would allow a lot of latitude for these classes.

Demetrulias reiterated what she believes Lisa Bernardo said before. When looking at a standard time block from 6-9pm, there was never a 6-9pm module. It was 4-7pm, 7-10pm, but we try to accommodate courses when possible. There isn't a "like we used to do."

Filling has taught only at night using the 6-9pm time slot the whole time. Demetrulias notes that the planning parameters don't have the 6-9pm period and they try to accommodate other courses on a case by case basis. Filling noted that he's indicating standard as past practice. Demetrulias noted that students were to be accommodated by the students' desire to take two back to back classes on one day. To do a 6-9pm slot alone they would have to do a 3-6pm class if students want to take two classes in one day.

Littlewood asked about the use of Saturday classes, if we add Saturday do we need to add Saturday as an academic work day? Demetrulias said that this is in the calendar preparation policy document, and that there is an indication that Saturdays may be counted as an academic work day. If we designated the whole campus to offer Saturday classes we would have to count that, but that's different than allowing an individual faculty member to choose to teach on a Saturday or Sunday.

Littlewood said that the original idea was to move the entire campuses to teaching on Saturday, and if we do that we have 6 academic days in the week; which moves us to a 30 week year rather than our current 36 week calendar.

C. Davis was here for the discussion of the block schedule in 2005. It might be helpful to revisit the minutes because she remembers that in order to accommodate the 4-7pm and 7-10pm that there was push back by faculty to keep the 6-9pm time slot. It might help to look at the prior discussion.

Regalado says we're moving perilously close to when this must be decided. This is still a discussion item, so when does this need to be etched in stone.

Eudey indicated it's a discussion to see if things are working. Bernardo is acting as if this is real for the fall 2010 term. It's considered a done deal but we wanted to bring it forth as we heard concerns from some faculty. We want to find out if this can work and are we okay with these new modules.

Renner said that priority registration will be about to start for fall. The window is about three weeks. Filling said that there are many things that are still not done.

Petratos indicated that many faculty are upset with this, and he's concerned about adding Saturday in as an academic work day.

Bender asked how many students really take 2 courses back to back. If it's very few, this discussion is

ridiculous. Relegating students who can't get here till after 5pm and are forced to take a class from 7-10pm. Many can get here by 6pm. If the reason was that we are impacted in terms of rooms for night classes, and this allows two courses in a night that's another part of the discussion.

Filling noted that students in COE get off work at around 3pm and can get here, so earlier modules may work well for some students.

McGhee has a problem with 6-9pm by accommodation if it can be proved. It's too unpredictable and difficult for departments and faculty to plan if it's up in the air every term. It's hard to plan for the year what will be offered. Maybe we need to look at the number of students and have a parallel system. Mondays and Wednesdays can be set up for 4-7pm, 7-10pm, and Tuesdays and Thursday as 6-9pm. We can look at offering of classes that will accommodate both strategies if there's demand. If it's a low number one way or the other, it's silly to dominate the schedule to the low end. If it's an even split, we might want to look at a dual track, or designate certain classrooms for the alternative schedule. There should be ways to make it more formalized and predict needs so that all can plan for the year.

Bender said if it's a specific major that has courses designed back to back and the students are able to get away early we should try to accommodate them. But to have a policy that says these are the only times throws out the option if a department says that a class is from 6-8:40pm would be appreciated. He strongly suggests that another option is the 6-8:40pm or 6:20-9pm.

Filling asked the senators to talk to chairs or whoever does scheduling and let someone in SEC know if they are having issues with this. SEC will contact Lisa Bernardo and see if we can put this to bed fairly quickly.

Nagel looked at old minutes because of faculty concerns with 6-9pm classes. He found that Dauwalder offered a compromise where he and Bernardo set aside 2/3 of the time slots to 6-9pm to allow flexibility. That's another possibility. We've done it. He referenced the November 8, 2005 minutes.

#### **b. Academic Senate and Committee meeting times**

Filling indicated that Shane Phillips noted the obvious that with a changed course schedule that meetings may have to be moved as well, and asked us to consider changing the time slots for the Academic Senate and governance committee meetings to not overlap two time slots. He asked us to hold these meetings from 2-4pm. We're soliciting your thoughts on this unforeseen concern.

Strahm thinks it's great since she usually leaves early for her 4pm class.

McGhee is indicating that the general policy is that we can hold meetings to fit a course time block. Filling indicated that we need to look for the best mix depending on when courses are meeting. Schoenly indicated that this would also impact standing committee meetings.

Filling asked folks to share thoughts with SEC if any arise.

### **9. Open Forum**

Regalado said that given that there was considerable sentiment regarding the Provost search for one of the candidates getting a fair hearing; there was a question as to whether Jim Tuedio has addressed this with SEC.

Filling said that we can request that Tuedio talk to us but he has not done so to date. Regalado indicated that it is floating out there at this point. He wondered if it would be appropriate to ask Tuedio to discuss this at a future meeting. Filling said that this is a personnel matter that may not be able to be discussed but we can invite him.

Regalado mentioned the upcoming Sarah Palin 50th Anniversary event. In an email today there was a line on the CA Watch website noting, "matters are quickly becoming deadly serious. resisting pressure from Yee." What concerns Regalado is the impression that the word educator includes everyone on this campus. He's wondering if the Academic Senate would like to make a statement that more than suggests that the faculty is separate from this particular issue that may have some corrupt activity. He's concerned that the university may be involved in this dicey matter and it may include the integrity of the faculty itself. The Senate may want to make a statement that protects our academic integrity as it was not the faculty resisting the sharing of documents.

Regalado proposes the Senate writes a statement that qualifies our position on the matter of the activities of the Foundation Board with respect to the Palin invitation that protects our academic integrity from matters that may be corrupt. Seconded by McGhee.

Sarraille is mindful of Senator Leland Yee's press conference. He doesn't think Yee intended to construe or impugn the faculty here as well as others for what he felt was concealing information from the public. Sarraille thinks that part of the solution is to make statements for faculty members when speaking to the press to point out that in our opinion where the attribution for certain acts should go and who is responsible for certain behaviors.

Jasek-Rysdahl said we might also want to say that the faculty representative on the Foundation Board is an interim Associate Vice President and there has not been a faculty representative from the Committees on Committees.

Regalado is concerned with our academic reputation and what will it say about us as a faculty if we don't say anything. Eudey would prefer a statement being made now rather than waiting two weeks.

Peterson thought that sometime in the fall we made a statement in the Academic Senate in support of SB 218 which would require openness of university and university foundation financial information. If true, we could make a statement indicating that. If not we could prepare a resolution now saying we support open financial information by the university and the foundation. Peterson thinks that this is something UBAC, FBAC and the Senate have been requesting for years. We need to say that we support financial transparency.

Filling said it seems you're looking for a statement about activities on behalf of the foundation in excess of the financial issues.

Regalado noted that the financial issues do bleed in and it would be a good place to start.

McGhee said that we had a statement saying we're in favor of open reporting, but we don't want it to be associated with dragging our feet which we haven't done. We need a statement indicating that this is an administrative decision and not an academic decision. It needs to be noted that faculty has not played any part in this decision and are not to blame. There needs to be a clear delineation between us and the

administration in this situation. We're not holding back or shredding documents. We're on the outside looking in as well. It's important to make a specific statement to say we are not a party to this and we have no control over it as we have no power to release information.

Peterson says this information should be more under our control, but it isn't and instead we should say we sympathize with the problem that Senator Leland Yee identified. We have tried to get information about our own institution's finances for quite some time and we support financial transparency. We wish UBAC and FBAC could have the information so they would be able to make statements, as well as the faculty representative on the foundation about how funds are used.

Tumolo said we can do both. Part of this is about control of information and transparency, but it's also an issue of managing impressions of the university. We're talking about a move from an information request to the potential pursuit of criminal charges and the potential articulation of these to the faculty. There are negative impressions on the community at large for many reasons, but now the university administration is perceived potentially as criminals. Both can work together— one as a standing commitment to financial transparency and another on the impression of faculty to the public at large.

Floyd agreed with Tumolo about the specificity and simplicity of a statement about educators. We should clarify how this event came to be and that it did not necessarily include all of the educators at CSU Stanislaus. We need something in the form of an appeal for a correction in the newspaper article, as it is not getting to the host of issues intertwined in this. We need to clarify the use of the word educator as it is being used in the media.

Jasek-Rysdahl offered a statement. "The AS of CSU Stanislaus is concerned about the recent activities related to the CSU Stanislaus Foundation and CSU Stanislaus Administration regarding reactions to information requests about the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary gala with Sarah Palin. At present the faculty of the CSU Stanislaus does not have a representative on the Foundation Board and has not been involved in any of these activities. We reiterate our support for open access to all financial documents and transparency by the Foundation Board of CSU Stanislaus."

McGhee has not seen anything that makes the line blurry as to whom is involved about withholding information. He cannot imagine that people would think that the faculty are the people withholding information just from a broad word like educators. He's unsure if it's necessary to make such a statement when it seems like it's clear who the parties to blame are in this situation. It casts more light on an already bad situation.

Sarraille agreed with McGhee that he may be right. Yee's press conference did include mention of teachers; quoting Yee's comments "who are these administrators and teachers and what are they doing in class."

Tumolo said the problem has to do with failure to disclose financial information and potential perjury and potentially trying to destroy evidence. The problem is not from an educational or teaching standpoint but one of managing finances. We need to draw a distinction between the role of educating and role of administrating.

Filling asked if we can have a straw poll on who is in favor of making a statement. Unanimous interest in preparing a statement.

Colnic said this is a good opportunity to reiterate our past and tie the two together. We don't know what is going on and it would be nice if we did. We don't know if we want to be perceived as carrying torches but we do need to say that part of the reason is that we don't have access to information to make decisions.

Eudey suggested that Bruner is officially listed on the Foundation Board as a faculty representative, and if we say there is no representative we may end up having attention given to this one issue which could discount the focus on the rest of the statement.

Tumolo suggested saying "Faculty were not represented on the Foundation Board in this decision."

Regalado retracted his original motion which was approved by the body. Kelvin moved the new statement.

Eudey read the statement as follows:

***09/AS/10/AS Statement on Foundation Activities***

*Resolved: That the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus issue the following statement:*

*"The Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus is concerned about the recent activities related to the CSU Stanislaus Foundation and CSU Stanislaus Administration regarding reactions to information requests about the 50th anniversary gala with Sarah Palin. Faculty were not represented on this board in this decision and have not been involved in any of these activities. We reiterate our support for open access to all financial documents and transparency by the Foundation Board and the Administration of CSU Stanislaus; and be it further*

*Resolved: That this resolution be transmitted to President Hamid Shirvani; the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees of the CSU system; the CSU Stanislaus Foundation Board, the CSU Stanislaus Administration, the CSU Stanislaus faculty, Senator Leland Yee, the CSU Statewide Senate, the Associated Students, Inc. of CSU Stanislaus; the media to include The Signal; Turlock Journal; Modesto Bee; Stockton Record, Chronicle of Higher Education; and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).*

Seconded by O'Brien.

Eudey recommended that this go forward as a Sense of the Senate. S. Davis asked if the office of the Academic Senate would be able to handle follow up questions.

Colnic asked if this is about all information by the Foundation Board or also include the University, suggesting we want to see all information. Floyd agrees that this is the Foundation Board. There are things that belong to the administration and the faculty and this would indicate no obligation to share.

Schoenly moved the waiver of a first reading and movement to a second reading. McGhee seconded. No discussion. The vote was unanimous to move to a second reading. No further discussion. Voted on the second reading. Passed with one abstention. This resolution will be forwarded to the president as a sense of the senate.

Nagel just returned from a CFA assembly in Los Angeles. They discussed budget, bargaining and Barbarism.

If you have concerns about bargaining, contact Sarraille and Nagel as they are the people to talk to about the successor to our contract which ends soon. They're working on holding a road show on bargaining sometime later this month. Be on the lookout for that. If you have questions about deliverology, CFA is strategizing ways to respond to this proposal and initiatives coming from the Chancellor's Office. Please share your ideas.

S. Davis asked what happens when the contract ends, does it go to interim status. Nagel said the current contract rules apply until negotiations are exhausted and that can take up to 2 years.

Sarraille said last time we met he had questions partly directed to Lujan about whether we decided to levy a per unit fee on students taking classes in summer 2010. The Chancellor's Office has proclaimed it's permissible for semester campuses to charge up to 80 additional dollars per unit and he's wondering if we will do this. Sarraille also wants to know how much of the stimulus money was spent on new classes, what was received, and what will be spent on other initiatives.

Lujan said most of this discussion has taken place and he will share this information later. He's asked Jane Bruner to tally up what has been spent and where, but it's still in an early stage. He was gone for 8 days, but he is back now and will look at that report as soon as he can.

**10. Adjournment**  
4:20 PM