Academic Senate  
February 23, 2010


Guests: Eric Arvizu, Lauren Byerly, Pamela Contreras, Susan Clapper, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, Brian Duggan, Dean Ruth Fassinger, Erin Littlepage, Dean Roger McNeil, Dean Daryl Moore, Dean Gary Novak, Kristin Olsen, Herb Smart, Dean Carolyn Stefanco, John Sarraile and Steve Stryker.

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

First Reading to draft a Resolution in Support of Reconvening the Strategic Planning Work Group

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, March 9, 2010
2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

1. Call to order  
2:37PM

2. Approval of Agenda  
Addition of 6A, Heredia to provide a video presentation titled “Electronic Text Book Affordability”.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of January 26, 2010  
No changes offered. Accepted as written.

4. Announcements  
Heredia distributed handouts about Intramural Sports, Chess XV, and the March 22nd California State Student Association march to the state capitol building.

Filling reminded senators to send proxies if they cannot attend. Senators need to notify Isabel Pierce by email if they are going to send a proxy.

5. Committee Reports  
Littlewood has three items from UEPC. The first is on the summit program. In order to participate, students have to sign up for two courses and only get credit if they complete both courses. There have been problems with the students’ ability to enroll in two courses, so Susan Marshall has requested that students still get credit if they’re only able to enroll in 1 class. UEPC has approved this and Lisa Bernardo will carry it forward. Littlewood indicated that if you’re aware of students who have this problem, please send them to see Susan Marshall.

Littlewood noted that the Academic Calendar will be discussed again. The 2010-11 calendar is online, and UEPC is working on calendars through 2015. He welcomes comments, requests and suggestions to bring to the UEPC meeting. UEPC will be meeting next Thursday, March 4th. Specific questions needing answering...
are the position of Spring Break in the semester, and the dates for Commencement. Spring break in 2011 is set for the third week of March, half way through the semester. Alternatively Spring Break could be timed to coincide with local school calendars. Commencement for Spring 2011 is set for Friday and Saturday, but could cause a conflict with the Memorial Day weekend. Holding commencement on Thursday and Friday in future years is a possible alternative.

One other topic UEPC will be discussing on March 4th is the issue of students enrolling for a class once the class has started. For some faculty it is difficult to start a class and later find that students have enrolled on their own. UEPC will look at whether students can enroll themselves or if they need a permission number or instructor approval once the class has commenced. If you have input, please share with Littlewood.

Garcia noted that FBAC is attempting to prepare some sage advice to share with the president and the campus community about making the budget planning process more functional. He referred to the FBAC report dated February 17th that was sent out to ASnet. The president has already talked about problems with UBAC. FBAC agrees that the problems are larger than UBAC. This report will offer a beginning of a list of ideas about how to deal with the concerns on campus. Many points address the strategic plan, transparency and openness, and issues related to UBAC. He asked that everyone pay attention to FBACs draft and offer ideas and suggestions related to what FBAC has submitted.

Filling welcomed the guests: Eric Arvizu, Lauren Byerly, Pamela Contreras, Susan Clapper, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, Brian Duggan, Dean Ruth Fassinger, Erin Littlepage, Dean Roger McNeil, Dean Daryl Moore, Dean Gary Novak, Kristin Olsen, Herb Smart, Dean Carolyn Stefanko, John Sarraile and Steve Stryker.

Filling noted that Sarraile escorted the California Assembly Majority Leader, Alberto Torrico, around campus today addressing support for AB 656.

Filling announced that on March 9th President Shirvani will be attending the Academic Senate meeting to respond to questions at 3:30 pm. Please gather questions from your colleagues. We look forward to having an enlightening and frank exchange of opinions.

6. **WASC Video**

Stryker noted the WASC team will arrive on Sunday, February 28, and they will be here Monday thru Wednesday of next week (March 1-3rd). Almost everyone here has met with someone whose group will be meeting with the WASC team to share the parts of the document that have direct relevance to specific committees. The campus community was provided with the handout titled “Top Ten Ways to Prepare for the WASC Visit, Educational Effectiveness Review” that reminds everyone of the following four themes: Engagement and Learning for a Diverse Student Body Infrastructure to Support Student Learning A Community of Teachers in Support of Learning The Role of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity

They have tried to anticipate the kinds of questions that the WASC team is likely to have for almost everyone. The team will try to focus on student learning issues. This report is the effectiveness report, and is on the quality of student learning on this campus. Some of the questions anticipate the kinds of questions they will ask, skewed to student learning. On the front of handout is a list of 10 points that are important about the meeting. Stryker highlighted the student and faculty open forums and encouraged people to participate in the forums. There is also a confidential email that was opened by WASC two weeks ago. The campus is allowed to give input to WASC in advance of their visit.
Stryker introduced a film he appreciates very much. This film was made possible with a team led by Kristin Olsen. As chair of the self-study team, Stryker appreciates that the filmmakers captured the spirit of the report. The chronology of the film follows the four chapters and essays in the EER, addressing students and faculty development. The film does a nice job of capturing the spirit of the report and of the campus. It’s made up of interviews with students and teachers and they all did an outstanding job. They will be showing the film to the WASC team next week.

Kristin Olsen said that about 9 months ago Diana Demetrulias and Susan Clapper asked them to produce a documentary for the WASC visit. Until then, the largest video they had was a brief marketing video but they agreed to create this video. It was a privilege and an opportunity to get involved with the WASC team. Usually the community and University Advancement wouldn’t be involved in WASC and this was an indirect way to be involved. The video follows the sequence of the EER, focusing on how CSU Stanislaus is effective in student learning and engaging students in the learning process inside and outside of the classroom. Eric Arvizu was the Art Director and Editor. Herb Smart wrote the script and was the Project Manager. Cary Edmondson was very helpful in taking raw footage for the video. This was a collaborative project between the Office of Communications & Public Affairs and the Vice Provost’s office. She hopes everyone will enjoy it. Some of the interviewees are in the room with us. She noted that this is not the final version of the film. There are a couple of technical problems with the DVD which will be fine tuned with titles, credits, etc., but most of it is here. The video was screened for all to view.

Olsen said that from doing this project they learned the value of having video interviews of members from the campus community. The Office of Communications & Public Affairs wants to build an archive of interviews with faculty, staff and students that they can incorporate into future projects. Please contact Herb Smart at 667-3660 if you’d like to be interviewed.

Filling thanked all those involved with the video, including Dean Moore who served as narrator.

Marcell asked for clarification if the Academic Senate meeting on March 9th will still start at 2:30pm even if President Shirvani is coming at 3:30pm. Filling confirmed that we will address other Senate matters beginning at 2:30pm, and then we will have a time certain for President Shirvani at 3:30pm.

6a. Textbook affordability
Heredia introduced a 5 minute video that was prepared by the Technology Officer from CSU San Francisco on textbook affordability. It’s an initiative to bring affordability to the students, and this is one of their best campaigns. Heredia knows that a lot of professors have already done this, and she thanks those who have already included this option for students to save on text book expenses.

The link for Emily Switzer’s video on Affordable Learning Solutions is now available on the CSSA YouTube site and can be found here: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZEQuej6hGRQ.

Held noted that in the library many students come to the reference desk to see if the text book is offered in the library. The librarians look to see if it’s on reserve. It’s important for students to have alternatives, and he hopes that faculty can put books on reserve if they have an extra copy.

Marcell says faculty can sometimes request purchasing text books in their discipline to be placed in the Library, but are told that they can’t purchase textbooks. Perhaps purchase of textbooks could help the students. Held noted that textbooks go out of date quickly, so they tend not to order textbooks.

Schoenly said when he graduated from College he prided himself for being able to keep textbooks for use in graduate school and jobs. He is a bit concerned if students are using electronic books throughout four years
at a university and can’t access these books later. What will they bring to a new job or position that may require them to review their books? There is a lot of information in the sciences that one does not want to memorize. If they know where to look in a book, and it’s not available online, they might be in a difficult position to access the information.

Filling said you may notice that when the do publish in an electronic version, it’s dated for 6-9 months and then is removed from the website. They still charge 80% of the regular price, so pay attention to the economic realities and the digital era.

7. Discussion Items:
   a. Budget Planning Process

Garcia noted a few points that FBAC has raised about what they see as a disconnect or a lack of discussion about the strategic plan and its connection to the budget planning process. It’s an issue they continue to look to for advice from the campus community. He’s already identified issues related to UBAC. FBAC is concerned that there was a planning process in the fall that was named detailed planning where Academic Affairs required all divisions to develop scenarios for a 15% cut from their budget. FBAC was told that this request for information was to get people to think outside of the box and to look at vertical vs. horizontal cuts. We’re still trying to figure out why 15% was chosen and what was done with that detailed planning. None of that information was shared with UBAC or the broader campus community. The budget planning process will call for a budget call soon, and FBAC is concerned with the strategy being used where Academic Affairs is the central or the focus of that call. We’re worried about the connection between Academic Affairs and the other divisions and how that is being handled in a fair and coordinated fashion. The FBAC report dated February 17th outlined 8 ideas. FBAC is open for advice and suggestions from this body. He encouraged senators to talk to others to get ideas on how to make the process more functional.

Tuedio thinks that some may or may not know that colleges were involved in some way in the detailed budget planning. In some cases, a core group looked at ways to conceive budget scenarios where colleges would have reductions which paid attention to the impact on the curriculum and the ability to offer what is needed for student progress which is a high priority. In the FBAC document there is a reference of a desire to include UBAC’s consideration of these scenarios when their being looked at collectively or given attention outside of the college core faculty. He’s wondering what connection the provost’s interest in bringing the deans together with a chair to that group to discuss or to be refreshed in thinking about what kind of a budget situation we’re in and how to think about these scenarios within the context of colleges. He’s interested in the provost explaining the processes that might relate to the concern in the process. Department chairs are wondering what to participate in, and a direction of deliberations could help them.

Lujan said that department chairs were asked to meet, and if we’re going to meet we need some weight and content to discuss. The feedback he gets is that our communication system is broken. That we aren’t talking and we aren’t doing. What kind of conversation could we start with? He’s sure that things will come up to allow us to have an open, honest discussion. We’ve been asked why we didn’t use the formal structure. The formal structures aren’t working, so we’re using informal structures. Deans have met with their college colleagues and chairs however they felt comfortable. Some have met more than once. We have some ideas, and now we are coming together with proposals for 5%, 10%, and 15% scenarios.

Deans will make presentations to each other and will bring a department chair since they have been useful to get conversations going and in how to evaluate the proposals being brought forth by the departments. Next week the deans and members from the academic departments will come together and begin discussions. We will need to have 2-3 conversations in March and early April. There’s a difference of opinion on target dates
which may be at the end of April or early May, and when to forward ideas from these meetings to faculty governance. That’s where we’re headed at this time.

McGhee said from a budgeting process, budgeting should be done based on sound theory, logic, and reasoning. It should be tailored to the circumstances people are dealing with. Based on his background, he has not seen that happening on campus. The numbers provided to us recently noted a 3.5 Million cut, but you’re asking for an arbitrary 5%, 10%, 15% cuts. Asking for these numbers is like giving students a range of assignments and telling them they didn’t need to do them all but we just want to make you think outside the box. This creates anxiety and causes groups to be unwilling to work together out of fear. This is counter-productive. Budgeting should be done based on sound principles. We have individuals with this expertise in our college who know the sound principles. McGhee noted that 15% of our university budget is 12 Million and he sees no reason to have a 15% number to make people look at vertical cuts. It’s not just the amount of the cut it’s the direction people are being given to help go through this process. He doesn’t see any transparency and that’s very difficult. Transparency is dictated by law to be involved in financial activities. Our process is mindboggling to him as he’s done budgeting for big corporations and he doesn’t understand what is going on. We need a stronger and more relevant system than what we’re seeing now, and we need better leadership.

Lujan suggested that McGhee bring that to discuss at UBAC. McGhee noted they hadn’t met for three months. Lujan said we can’t meet if we’re derailed by discussions of process. Filling noted that UBAC’s last meeting was on December 10th.

Dean Moore said that from a logic standpoint, if he never had to prepare a scenario he would like that. He’s prepared many scenarios since the summer because there is no number. Even in the private sector typically with sales people are dealing with projections and have some way to plan. Maybe there is someone who knows the numbers from Sacramento but it’s an unknown thing. He also stated that while meetings are supposed to happen to try to manage the colleges, we’ve worked with department chairs on budgets but there haven’t been any decisions made about anything. The meetings being referred to are primarily to have discussions and that’s how he’s approaching it with his colleague deans and faculty who choose to be involved in that.

Colnic is a relative outsider to the budgeting processes but he has a couple of questions primarily to Lujan but perhaps to include others. He’s assuming when it was stated that the formal structures are not working that you’re referring to UBAC. He’s curious as to what is not working. What’s broken and what’s wrong with it?

Lujan said the standing committee for budget is UBAC. UBAC’s responsibility is to provide a recommendation. It’s very difficult to get this group to focus on the kinds of topics we have to discuss. He’s not saying it is the faculty members in the committee but we haven’t been able to blame the foundation. The process is critical and one way to get something done is to get the numbers from Financial Services. He hopes that the conversations with the department chairs will help to clarify the problems.

Petrosky is concerned that we have gradually been redefining representation on these committees over the past years. When we discussed the winter term the president ignored our elected members of UEPC and created a new committee and that recommendation was followed. When doing search committees we’ve taken away faculty representation from those elected by faculty to those appointed by administration. He sees a gradual discussion of budget from those elected by faculty like FBAC and UBAC, and now administration is trying to create a new provost’s committee which includes the provost, deans and whomever the dean likes from among chairs. He thinks that this is dangerous.
S. Davis agrees with much of what Petrosky says. S. Davis said members of the budget and planning committee are elected in CHSS and noted Tuedio is chair.

Filling gave the gavel to Jasek-Rysdahl. Filling was recognized. Speaking as someone who’s been a part of FBAC for the better part of 10 years and UBAC for the last several years he confesses that he finds the provost’s remarks deeply troubling. He has serious doubt that things are not working so they should be ignored. This is not an effective mechanism for solving problems even if concerns are well founded. As Garcia and McGhee can attest, this year more than in prior years, we’ve asked for data repeatedly. Garcia has made a career of asking for some way to relate the discussion to the strategic plan and meeting core objectives. The answers are as diverse as silence, being told that strategic plans don’t matter when we have a budget problem to maybe next year we’ll look at the current strategic plan. It doesn’t make a lot of sense. It’s also true that budgeting is intended to be a two-way communication channel. It works best when in a bottom up environment, when the people get involved in where the resources go. It’s a mechanism for channeling information about the institutions’ priorities. Not going on. The process is not working because the information is not provided to us in the first place.

Dean Moore says there seems to be an idea that the discussions that he has in his college are going to undermine these processes and formal committees that have been in place for many years in the university. He’s referring to the discussions that the deans are having collectively. He doesn’t see it that way at all as it makes sense to have these discussions. He assumes that these other committees will continue to meet and make recommendations related to their charges. It’s important to him to have input from the other colleges as to what their challenges are and perhaps we all can learn something that can be helpful.

Filling agrees. When they were told in November that the deans were given permission to meet as a group we were for it. Petrosky is supportive of those conversations as well. But when you have a set of committees with elected representatives and another that is appointed and you listen only to the latter that is dangerous.

Dean Moore doesn’t dispute that in regard to committees. He noted that deans don’t need permission to meet formally or informally to discuss budget or other issues. We’re not being given permission to meet.

Saraille has nothing against the deans meeting and exchanging information. However, the problem he sees is with UBAC. We asked for the simple courtesy of being told what is going on and we ask for data and it is refused. If you are assuming when you hear that things will go to UBAC and be dealt with, if you’re taking this on an evidence based approach you will have some shattered illusions.

Colnic hears that there is no formal group that is looking at all units and putting them together. The deans are having conversations and other groups are meeting. He had understood that UBAC’s job was to take all of this information and apply them to the strategic plan. If that’s not being done that’s kind of scary.

Novak said his view is similar to Colnic's. UBAC is the university advisory committee looking at all divisions of the university. Academic Affairs is the largest. So a process that involves Academic Affairs developing ideas and concepts would also need to go to UEPC. Whatever Academic Affairs and UEPC finds they are able to support is the Academic Affairs portion that goes to UBAC. Then UBAC’s function is to see what data they are missing. As someone who spent time on UBAC and got sick and then left, it doesn’t seem we’ve progressed much since a year ago. Maybe we need a process where Academic Affairs comes up with some ideas, concepts, principles and the other divisions do as well which all go to UBAC.
Heredia said that as a student she feels she has learned from almost every committee she’s served on, but she has not learned anything in UBAC except how different personalities cannot work together. We didn’t have the information at time it was needed. She know what it’s like to run a budget as she’s done it for three years in ASI and USU. UBAC needs restructuring before the next student is asked to participate. She’s spent a lot of time on UBAC that took away from her work and studies and it’s unfair to everyone on that committee.

Bender says it seems from various discussions that UBAC doesn’t have an ineffective committee structure but has difficulty obtaining information. Committees function well and meet their charge if given the information to do the job. Is it an ineffective information gathering issue or availability issue?

Filling noted if you have thoughts on how we might resurrect or develop a budget process that works more effectively, please contact FBAC or UBAC and we will be happy to listen.

Tuedio wonders if this might be a body to recommend in favor of reconvening the Strategic Planning Work Group if we feel that this is an important structure and its role is not limited to good times. The strategic plan was conceived and sold to WASC as the strategy we would use in this process. He encourages this body to move and recommend to the president that this group be convened at the earliest possible time. Tuedio made a motion.

Saraille asked about the charge of the body if reconvened. What do we want it to accomplish?

Tuedio noted that when reading the FBAC report the strategic plan keeps coming up. It was a response to the master academic plan and then became the core represented effort of the collective voices representing collective units. It refers to how to measure the distribution of resources. It had a charge which seems to have been suspended but why not bring it back.

Filling said the last charge he can find for the strategic plan reads as follows. “The Strategic Plan Working Group will seek input on prioritization and implementation from the larger campus community, including the Academic Senate, and make recommendations for prioritization and implementation to the President’s Executive Cabinet. Approved by the Academic Senate on April 24, 2007 and by the President on May 22, 2007.”

Colnic noted that item #2 in the FBAC report includes a request that the Strategic Planning Work Group reiterate the core values of the University. This sounds like a charge.

Tuedio moved this motion and S. Davis seconded. “Recommend to the president that he call for a reconvening of the Strategic Planning Work Group in the interest of addressing the ambiguities and uncertainties of this budget crisis in a collective and respective manner that would give each constituent a voice.

The rationale is that there is a loss of trust and this is a group with a charge. With the implied amendments in the FBAC Charge, this is a place to begin with what the president says he wants. This is a place where that could happen.

Filling suggested the following: “The Academic Senate recommends to President Shirvani that he reconvene the Strategic Planning Work Group as soon as possible to seek input on prioritization from the larger campus community, including the Academic Senate.” Perhaps also addressing the FBAC recommendation as follows.
Request that the Strategic Planning Work Group reiterate (or, if deemed necessary by the Committee, engage in a process to update) the core values of the University and urge that all groups who create budget scenarios articulate how their recommendations address these values.

Nagel confirmed a first reading of this action item.

Garcia noted we have talked about why the formal structure is broken. It’s having difficulty because of a lack of vision. The information structure will suffer from the same process. We don’t have clarity about our priorities. If we don’t have clarity about priorities, they will be imposed upon us. This is what leads to mistrust. This group can advocate for priorities as a collective university, not Academic Affairs but the collective university. These are the priorities and these can be the focus of formal and informal groups.

Weikart asked if this group is supposed to construct a new strategic plan. It was noted that it’s not that we need a new strategic plan; it’s that we aren’t following or implementing the one we have. We’re not dissatisfied with the strategic plan we have. It might make more sense to have existing committees articulate budget priorities to the current strategic plan.

Filling clarified that this group is the body that has custody of the strategic plan and implementation and it is not in favor of creating a new strategic plan.

Petrosky moved to waive a first reading and continue to a second reading. Seconded by Tuedio.

Saraille thinks we should slow down. Due to the budget situation we’re in, we’re supposed to have a budget finished by April 15, before the May revise. This is like we’re on a boat hit with a torpedo and we want to redesign the boat. Even if we want to redesign the boat, we need to know how this committee is constituted. He doesn’t know much about how the Strategic Planning Committee is constituted, and is not sure what it would mean to vote for or against it.

Filling noted the membership of the committee consists of the Speaker, Speaker Elect, one faculty member named by COC, the Director of Institutional Research, the VP of Student Affairs and the Provost.

Jasek-Rysdahl agrees to slowing down as well. We can address questions as to the Strategic Planning Work Group the next time we meet for a second reading.

By voice vote, the second reading did not pass.

Morgan-Foster said, as the last administrator from the prior Strategic Planning Work Group, she’d like to clarify its purpose. They took the existing strategic plan and were asked to identify top priorities to guide the University for the last 5 years. This happened before we were under the current budget pressure. It makes sense to look at prior work and try to make additional recommendations as to whether or not the top priorities should be maintained as originally selected. There are 5-7 priorities from the strategic plan to focus on. Their perhaps no longer the best ones now given the size of the hole in boat. Should we be heading to port somewhere else or head out to sea.

Filling ask Tuedio to consult with SEC to formalize language on this for our second reading in March.

8. Open Forum

9. Adjournment
4:30 PM