

<p>Academic Senate January 26, 2010</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Bice, Borba, R. Brown, Colnic, C. Davis, DeCocker, Eudey, Filling, Floyd, Garcia, Hauselt, Hight, Jasek-Rysdahl, Jones, Provost Lujan, Manrique, Marcell, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Nainby, O'Brien, Peterson, Petrosky, Phillips, Ringstad, Sankey, Schoenly, Strahm, Tuedio, and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies Luzmaria Alcalá-Van Houten for Judith Keswick, Steve Filling for Mark Bender and Panos Petratos, Mark Thompson for Scott Davis, Rick Albert for Blake Fair and Diana Heredia, Jennifer Helzer for Peggy Hauselt, Paul O'Brien for Ian Littlewood, Ron Noble for Stacey Morgan-Foster, Katherine Royer for Sam Regalado and John Sarraille for Robert Silverman.</p> <p>Guests: Lisa Bernardo, Lauren Byerly, Alex Cantatore, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, Brian Duggan, Ed Erickson, Dean Ruth Fassinger, Marina Gerson, Mark Grobner, Dean Roger McNeil, Dean Daryl Moore, Dean Gary Novak, Glen Pillsbury, Dean Thomas Sandman, and Carl Whitman.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First & Second Reading of 01/AS/10/SEC Resolution in Support of Student Statement on the Academic Calendar Passed as Sense of the Senate</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, February 23, 2010 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
---	--

1. Call to order

2:36 PM

2. Approval of Agenda

Strahm asked if we were going to continue to discuss military students. Yes, we'll continue this discussion at a future meeting. Approved agenda as distributed.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of December 8, 2009

No changes offered. Minutes approved as submitted.

4. Announcements

Steve Stryker indicated that in order to provide time for the Day of Action and other activities, the WASC Educational Effectiveness Review site visit will be moved up to March 1-3, 2010. They anticipate that this change will allow for all campus constituents to more fully participate in meetings with the visiting team. There will also likely be some events on those days.

Eudey welcomed everyone back for the New Year. She circulated a flyer on the Instructional Institute Day 2010 facilitated by Chuck and Renae Floyd. The workshop is scheduled from 10am - 2pm (including a lunch) so that participants can complete university-related or other activities before and after the workshop, and therefore can be fully engaged in the workshop for the four-hour session. The topic will be to reconnect with passion, energy and creativity. It's an opportunity to focus and reenergize ourselves for the challenges ahead. Please RSVP by calling Ximena Garcia at Ext. 3216 as lunch will be served.

Eudey announced that flyers will be distributed to the university community for the spring 2010 Pedagogy Book Clubs. *Teaching Community: Pedagogy of Hope* by bell hooks will be facilitated by Eudey and *Developing Learner-Centered Teaching: A Practical Guide for Faculty* by Phyllis Blumberg will be

facilitated by Marina Gerson from the Biology Department. Ximena Garcia will facilitate our first fiction book club as we read Isabel Allende's *Portrait in Sepia*. The non-fiction book club will begin with *River of Doubt*, exploring Teddy's Roosevelt's journey on the Amazon. A limited number of free copies of the books are available for faculty intending to attend the book club discussions. Please contact Ximena Garcia at x3216 to obtain a book and/or to indicate your attendance at the book club gatherings.

C. Davis announced that the Liberal Studies Department has moved to the 3rd floor of DBH.

Saraille noted that there will be an appearance by CA Assembly Majority Leader, Alberto Turrigo, on Tuesday, February 23rd, during the second week of classes. The event is tentatively scheduled from 9:00-12:30, so please save the date. We're asking faculty to announce this to their students and encourage them to attend as A. Turrigo is sponsoring a bill on the oil and gas severance tax. This bill is suffering reversals and is down but not out. It'll be back next year stronger than ever. Mr. Turrigo is a very dynamic speaker. Filling encourages Mitch McGee to be there to offer his expertise as well as he's written journal articles on related topics.

Filling welcomed the guests present at the meeting.

5. Questions About Committee Reports

O'Brien mentioned that there will be a SWAS report forthcoming. Filling and O'Brien were in Los Angeles last week and are still finalizing their report. The system Chief Financial Officer gave a report and was somewhat giddy that in the governor's budget there is \$305 million restored to the CSU and UC systems. He also said that every other department in the state will be cut. If this will remain sacred is still to be seen. They're hopeful but realistic, and we'll have to wait to see how this plays out. There have been reports in the media about 5-5-5 cuts to state employees; which includes pay decreases, increase in benefit costs, and increase in health care costs. Gail Brooks, the head of the Human Resources system, gave a report on what they're doing and noted that the 5-5-5 will not apply to CSU employees.

Filling directed the senators to a packet before them titled: Academic Senate of the California State University. These are some of the more relevant resolutions that were submitted by the SWAS last week.

1. Resolution in support of reinstating research, scholarship and creative activities awards for 2010-11;
2. Resolution reaffirming the need for consultation in campus-based program reduction, suspension and elimination policies;
3. Resolution on establishment of campus-level "Presidential Enrollment Management Advisory groups" as specified by CSU enrollment management policy and practices;
4. Resolution on protecting the rights of contingent faculty who participate in shared governance;
5. Resolution in support for the appointment of an academic senate of the California state University (ASCSU) nominee as CSU Faculty Trustee and;
6. Resolution affirming shared governance within the California State University: Adoption and use of deliverology as a tool to achieve administrative action.

Filling noted that the 1st resolution is to reinstate RSCA funds and the 2nd one indicates the need for consultation in program reduction, suspension, elimination (and discontinuance). The 3rd resolution on the presidential enrollment management advisory groups notes the need for consultation. He also noted that the 4th resolution is a statement about providing support for non-tenure track faculty who engage in shared governance. The 5th resolution calls for support for nominations made by SWAS for the faculty trustee which is a matter of some contention. The governor, thru his secretary, has asked for more diversity in the nominees and SWAS said there was indeed a diverse cadre of candidates and given that ASCSU elects the proposed nominees, that diversity may not be reflected by those who win the election. The 6th resolution on shared governance in relation to the use of deliverology to increase graduation rates has been mentioned in a

Chronicle article. Unfortunately, in some press it says it is in response to substandard graduation rates but we are in the top category in the nation in that regard. Share these with colleagues and take a look at the SWAS website for additional information.

6. First Reading Items:

a. 01/AS/10/SEC Resolution in Support of Student Statement on the Academic Calendar

Jasek-Rysdahl moved the resolution, seconded by Schoenly. Jasek-Rysdahl read the resolution aloud.

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University Stanislaus commends the Associated Students, Incorporated [ASI] Senate and the student body for their professional and collegial engagement with CSU Stanislaus administration and faculty on the issue of the Academic Calendar; and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University Stanislaus urge President Shirvani to reconsider his restructuring of the Academic Calendar in light of the expressed wishes of our students to retain Winter Term and the thoughtful analyses provided by both student and faculty governance bodies; and be it further

Rationale: The ASI is a strong voice for the needs of the student body. The Academic Senate wishes to acknowledge the hard work of student government leadership as they seek to effectively represent our students. Our student body has also been active on this issue - student activists collected over 3100 signatures from fellow students on a petition calling for reinstatement of Winter Term and the 4-1-4 calendar.

Winter Term at CSU Stanislaus provides unique learning experiences for our students in a one month period, simultaneously allowing students to accelerate their progress toward completion. Stanislaus is the only CSU campus to operate on a 4-1-4 calendar, and that calendar has been an important part of the unique environment at Stanislaus. CSU Stanislaus has consistently achieved graduation rates exceeding those at most other universities and Winter Term is among the factors that contribute to that success.

Rick Albert, Vice President of ASI, said that ASI passed a resolution in support of the current 4-1-4 calendar. Although, they're still in favor of a prior proposal that would change the calendar a bit. One of their goals is to be the voice of students and surveys indicated an outcry which led to a petition. ASI has a responsibility to be the student's voice and to represent their desires.

O'Brien made a motion to waive the first reading, seconded by Petrosky. O'Brien noted that it's nice that students worked this hard to express their opinion. He noted that the student resolution was passed on December 18, 2009. O'Brien said that this body at times leans against waiving a first reading but since it's been over a month since ASI passed their resolution he thinks it warrants moving this to a second reading since we won't be meeting again until mid February. O'Brien supports the SEC resolution and recommends it being sent forward to the president, the chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

Schoenly said we're in the throes of putting together upcoming schedules, and he would like us to address this today to allow more lead time for planning for next year. Filling called for a vote on waiving the first reading and to move to a second reading. By voice vote, it passed unanimously.

Eudey is strongly in favor for two reasons. She sees enormous student support through the ASI action on this, and it affirms the decision that the Academic Senate made on this issue in fall on the Academic Calendar. She's very moved by the extraordinary number of students that voiced their opinion not only to UEPC but the 3,100 names they collected on their petition. They cared about an issue that many thought was dead. Nearly half of our student body says WAIT, we're not sure this is the right decision. She also supports

the Academic Senate vote to remain a 4-1-4 schedule as we're not convinced that it would save us money and also pedagogically for our programs. She's is strongly in favor of the resolution.

Dean Moore has questions about the resolution's information where it cites that the 4-1-4 is important to the students and cites the COA solely. He noted that it has a positive impact for all the students on campus and is not sure why the COA is the only college cited. He's sensitive to this because there is misinformation about the COA in the climate of budget reductions. He's not saying that he's against the resolution, but he questions why is it that the COA is the only college cited by name which gives a perception that it might be the most affected.

Colnic was in ASI when this was discussed and will respond to Dean Moore. Colnic noted that there were several revisions and iterations. Once there was a laundry list of programs and cuts and ASI decided to make sure that there was some specificity, which is why it was left in. It was felt that COA would be most affected by the cuts because they would be most affected by the calendar revisions. It was part of their negotiating process. The sense of ASI was not to single out COA as the only college that would be affected by the calendar revisions but was used as an example of one program as well as others.

Rick Albert said that when writing the resolution it was as Colnic said. ASI had a large outcry from the COA, 15-20 students from the COA. ASI wanted to make sure they felt their voices were heard. It was used as an example and we're sorry if it was perceived otherwise. ASI wanted to make sure their voice was heard and this was their way of affirming that. It's just an example of some programs.

Moore thinks that's great and that student voices are the most important voices and should be heard. Although, based on your response even as we discussed the possibility of winter term going away, we being department chairs and faculty, we went into that discussion asking about the impact on the college. Could those particular programs, like the children's theater program, be accommodated? If the winter term goes away the program will not disappear. Moore wants to be clear that this is heard and that there was this kind of dialogue happening for many programs that could be affected.

O'Brien moved to add an additional resolved that says "this resolution is to be transmitted to the president, Chancellor Reed, and the Board of Trustees." Seconded by Saraille. O'Brien asked to send the resolution to all of these people. McGhee confirmed that these changes were to our Academic Senate resolution only.

Marcel asked when we have to indicate to whom resolutions are to be sent. Filling suggested that when we have action resolutions they go to the president. When we have sense of the senate recommendations we often indicate to whom they should be sent. McGhee supports designating to whom since this could go only to the president. Since this is a decision that the Chancellor has to agree to then he and the Board of Trustees need to be notified as well so that they're aware that the will of the students could have an impact in the future. Eudey suggested adding ASI and the media as it was indicated in the ASI resolution. Filling asked if we accept this as a friendly amendment. O'Brien agreed, noting that the students did a good job.

Filling called for a voice vote on adding an amendment inserting a third resolved as follows:
Resolved: That this resolution be transmitted to President Hamid Shirvani; the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees of the CSU system; 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). Approved unanimously.

Tuedio was not here in the fall so he's not sure if this was worked out in the past. There is nothing here to remind people that this decision was made in a way that left a sense that all of the input that faculty and administrative faculty review groups had put into these issues was factored into the decision. It seemed

completely contrary to advice from the past and current discussions, and that should be part of our rationale. We are familiar with the problems and the ASI resolution pinpoints a number of points with respect to student interest, but it's not the crucial problem that the decision was made without our opinion and insights having a bearing. It was called a compromise, which was a startling word to put in that context. It was a harsh decision and the reaction to the criticism was harsh and is not likely to be received very well.

Thompson supports the resolution and thinks this is important because it is a reiteration of the past. The last time the Academic Calendar was studied the message to the president was that it didn't have the support of the students and faculty to change the calendar. President Hughes decided not to change the calendar. We're in the same position now and the resolution is a good enough statement that the president does not have the support of the students and the faculty. One way to address Tuedio's concerns is a cover letter from the Speaker to go along with the resolution to emphasize these points.

R. Floyd was going to speak to the same issue as Thompson. She agrees with Thompson regarding Tuedio's remarks that the resolution is a good enough statement and that a cover letter from the Speaker is a good idea. She states that the issue of the past iterations on the academic calendar has been a part of the discussion and that "that horse is very dead". However, she believes that it should be noted that on this particular study of the academic calendar, that the findings of most constituencies on campus were ignored.

Tuedio said it's not necessarily a dead horse issue especially if it's sent forward with a clear indication that Shirvani lacked student support for his decision. This puts into a new light Shirvani's claim that he had student support.

McGhee said since the resolution will be shared beyond this campus, we might add that 3100 student signatures are a high percentage of the institution's student body. This is not an election, but these students were willing to sign a petition. Others may not know that this is such a large percentage. The public may not know how big we are, but explaining what these numbers mean might convey some information on the importance of this.

Garcia said that it sounds like the Speaker is getting a lot of advice, but he would add to it that the numbers and cost savings offered in the ACAC report and expressed by the President regarding the elimination of winter term appear to be inflated. It was mentioned at one time that it would achieve a \$2 Million savings, and then it was noted as a \$1.2 Million savings, and most recently to a \$700K savings. UEPC is still cautioning against these numbers being inflated and we may soon find out the reality of this.

Saraille is not expert, but he has even heard that the savings could be as low as a \$150K. Peterson thinks that the more dangerous thing to point out from the UEPC report is that it may actually cost us a lot of money and we don't have places to make cuts. We may have less revenue because of this decision.

Schoenly supports the addition of the Speaker's memo especially in light of the open letter from the Foundation Board of Directors in the Modesto Bee yesterday. *The article notes "Suggestions from some of the University's faculty that President Shirvani excludes them from the decision-making process are misguided, false and counter-productive.* In the case of the 4-1-4 calendar, Shirvani violated shared governance processes by forming his own committee. By circumventing procedures and past practices, it makes that Modesto Bee statement ridiculous.

Filling called for a vote on the resolution with the addition of the third resolve including a distribution list with a cover letter from the Speaker encompassing the advice that he can include. Passed by voice vote (2 abstentions, 1 voice no)

7. Discussion Items:

a. Course Scheduling Blocks

Filling noted that the proposed scheduling blocks for the new calendar was added as a discussion item. We were asked to put this on the agenda because several department chairs have discovered that there may need to be some changes on how the course blocks are scheduled. Filling invited chairs to start the discussion.

Petrosky noted that there may have been some changes made since it was first distributed last Wednesday, but many were concerned with the once per week evening block time slots. One block beginning at 5:00pm and another ending at 10:40pm. The first wouldn't work for MBA students who are mostly employed, and the second is not conducive to learning so late in the evening. He has taught some courses till 10:00pm and to extend to almost 11:00pm is almost impossible. The second concern was originally that 4 unit, two-day courses were restricted to a T/R schedule. The College of Business Administration has many 4 unit courses that would cause scheduling conflicts and students would not graduate.

Lisa Bernardo noted that she had discussed the 10:40 pm time slot in Graduate Council and she's aware that it is late. They have adjusted it to 4:30-7:10pm and 7:20-10:00pm which would meet minute requirements. There were questions about the 6:00-9:00pm block, and we don't currently have one on the approved schedule but departments have requested it. To maximize space, we agreed to a 4:00-7:00pm and 7:00-10:00pm blocks. You can still request alternative blocks. We try to be flexible, but some consistency in start times helps students with scheduling. There is no MW time module for 4 unit classes. For those who often request the two-day model on MW, these are scheduled as time and space allows. Not everyone sticks to modules, but we try to do our best to have some consistency especially with the 58 minute time blocks.

Petrosky asked if there were enough rooms to stagger time blocks. Bernardo said there aren't enough rooms and there is difficulty accommodating classes in popular time blocks. It's especially hard for the two-day and mornings 9:00am-2:00pm time slots which are especially tight. The evening time slots are crowded. Petrosky indicated that current time blocks include MW four unit blocks, but he does not see that it is added to the new schedule. Petrosky noted that they have 3 concentrations with all courses as 4 unit courses. Bernardo said that current schedule allows two days a week on MW in the early morning and afternoons only.

O'Brien thanked Lisa Bernardo for coming to talk and he asked about excess rooms. Bernardo said they did not have them for fall but do have some for spring.

McGhee has a concern with what is being said that if there are time slots available things will be accommodated. In Accounting all upper division courses are four units and if all are moved to TR students would not be able to take their classes. This would also have an impact on teachers for their research. Trying to get classes offered has other repercussions and McGhee doesn't understand the logistics problem to have MW and TR two-hour blocks. The impact on students trying to get their classes at times would be mindboggling for the four-unit classes; which might prevent multiple sections for lack of time slots.

Marcel asked if the time blocks were made available, when he could see them. He teaches a majority of classes at night and wondered if the new schedule would impact these classes. He also wondered if it would affect pedagogy. Bernardo said a 10 minute break is factored into the course. For example, a 2 hour 30 minute time block would include a 10 minute break.

Tuedio said he only saw the schedule last week because someone brought it up at a department chair's meeting with the president, the provost and the VP of Business & Finance. Apparently, it was negotiated in phases and it made sense to them to send to department chairs. What role does UEPC and the Graduate

Council expect to have in regard to this proposal, and are faculty concerns going to be pulled into the discussion before it is done? It has to be done if we make a shift to the other semester system, but it doesn't have to be done without consideration of qualitative impact on student learning and quality of teaching and learning. He's not getting the sense that this is factored into the structure of the modules. We know why we're teaching at 6:00-9:00pm instead of 7:00-10:00pm. He's sure that ASI could get a petition because it's an issue that will be discovered after the decision is made. Students want the 6:00-9:00pm time slots because it's the most significant time slot for them. There are a lot of issues being raised about how this will affect programs, and they have not been able to give a concise consideration about what is at stake. We need to come back to the academic mission of what is at stake.

Filling asked senators to bring this to their department colleagues to elicit comments.

Bernardo said that before they developed the time slots she did take it to UEPC much as was done last time. She's not sure if all are familiar with a document that accompanies the current schedule that talks about the 6:00-9:00pm slot and how we schedule 2/3 of the classes that we try to schedule in regular time blocks.

R. Brown said Graduate Council brought it up but it's difficult to get a sense of how many graduate programs would do what Tuedio suggested and that is to opt for the 6:00-9:00pm time block. We don't know what the capacity would be if more graduate programs moved in that direction. We should bring that up again. We may need to poll each program if they intend to seek a 6:00-9:00pm or 6:00-8:40pm time blocks and can come back to Lisa Bernardo regarding expected requests. He agrees that the new blocks will create problems for some of the new programs.

Filling said that he suspects Marcell is not the only one confused and asked Bernardo to send the document to Filling who will distribute to Senators. Please discuss with colleagues and post comments to ASnet. Marcel asked if there is a way to find out why the decision was made to start later than earlier in the time blocks. Bernardo said to remain consistent with the morning blocks and not impede on the continuation of the daytime schedule.

Filling thanked Bernardo and appreciated her willingness to be here. McGhee indicated that Lindsay was not here because he thought some decisions were already made on the two-day a week schedule. It's important for there to be a clear indication of which is the most current version.

b. President's meeting with SEC

Filling said that last week the president met with SEC at our invitation which is something that hasn't occurred for the better part of a year. This is a useful process and among other things we discussed the need to reestablish a sense of trust between all parties on the campus and mechanisms for doing that. We talked about reasons people don't trust what goes on and that it comes from both sides (not just us). Filling noted that the president said that it's a new day and we can't change the past. Filling concurs with that but notes that he's heard those words for five years in a row. Although, he would like to believe this will happen. SEC will take it at face value and will follow up on the suggestion to meet again. The Speaker elect Jasek-Rysdahl, Speaker Filling and others will meet with the president every two weeks to address some specific issues. We're struggling to figure out how to move forward.

Schoenly said his mantra is that he is skeptical that it will work, fool me once shame on you, fool me twice shame on me.

Eudey noted that one of the items on the table was UBAC. The president did not believe that UBAC was functioning effectively and wants to look at how it can work better. His acknowledgement that it is not working is indicative that some change will occur. Members of UBAC might like to hear our ideas.

Sarraille wanted more detail about whether the president expressed approval or disapproval with how UBAC was going and whether he acknowledged his control over the situation in UBAC. Did the president indicate whether his current thinking about the UBAC is a change or the same that he's had all along, and did he bring up the idea of changing the leadership of UBAC? Sarraille would be surprised if the president expressed disappointment with how UBAC is going. It seems to him that the president has been directing the manner in which UBAC has been unfolding. He agrees that it's not functioning very well, and we need to have a frank conversation with the president to see what can be done and there needs to be more openness and transparency.

Garcia indicated that they would look for recommendations on how to make UBAC more functional. One suggestion we made was to reconsider the administrator co-chair structure.

Floyd asked if the president mentioned any comments about the vote of no confidence and if anyone on SEC asked if he would consider reinstating winter term. Filling noted that the president did not discuss the vote of no confidence but might have alluded to it. He doesn't believe that the winter term came up.

Eudey said that we only had 1 hour with the president, and it wasn't a lot of time to address a lot of items. As he had to leave for another meeting, UBAC came up as the budget is a major issue that we're dealing with right now. She has notes from the meeting to share with the senate.

Thompson stated that Sarraille raises a good point. One of the keys to addressing that is the one that Garcia raised. The co-chair structure of the committee. He suggests that SEC think about how much they want to be involved in making these recommendations. From UBAC staff, faculty members recommendations. Does the Senate want to be involved to making those recommendations to the president?

Thompson noted that Sarraille and Garcia raised a good point; the co-chair structure of UBAC and how that is controlled. SEC could think about how much the senate would be involved, and the senate can discuss how much they want to be involved in making recommendations. Would we like to look at the UBAC report and the report from the Budget Consultative Committee? Would the senate want to be involved in making those recommendations to the president?

Tuedio noted the sentiment that the president brought up about a new start. It might be nice to invite him to the senate and discuss specifically what he thinks is not working about UBAC and what we think as well. We have different things to say and we can probably have a fruitful exchange of views about what's at stake for both sides. UBAC represents one of the few places where these views can come to the table and where we can make significant decisions.

Filling said he would likely be here today if not for Chancellors meeting taking place in Long Beach.

Eudey noted that the president said that the budget is what is connecting us for future collaboration. He indicated promoting trust in budget planning and was frank about UBAC. He noted that UBAC is not an overseeing body and served as an advising body only. He wants to make it more congenial and collaborative.

Colnic asked about the timing and process of administrative searches, particularly the provost search. Did the president mention anything about the timing and process, especially about faculty representation on search committees? Filling said that in respect to the appointment of Annie Hor, as interim library dean, the crux was that regarding interim appointments the policy statement does not require consultation for interim hires and that's its entirety at the discretion of the president. SEC indicated that faculty are to be consulted and that we don't need to interpret the policy line by line. Eudey indicated that the discussion was more tied

to the outcome of the search deliberations and not the process. We came out of the meeting with a sense that we'd try to move forward. This was not satisfactorily resolved but it's on the radar.

Jasek-Rysdahl said this was the first meeting with this president with this SEC, and we're starting a process that will hopefully continue. All of these specific issues are really big issues and we only had an hour with the president. This was the first time we had any communication between us, and we were trying to lay some groundwork to have a follow-up meeting. There was very little discussed in terms of detail on specific searches. In regard to UEE and searches, many were mentioned but not addressed.

Floyd asked if the president had agreed to continue to meet with SEC. Filling said there was reference to continuing meetings and conversations. Dean Moore asked if there were minutes taken. Filling said they are still being coordinated among Eudey, Pierce and Filling.

c. Administrative Search Processes

Filling said that SEC has made attempts to keep folks aware of searches in process and where we think the policy statements were not complied with, which may be a judgment call sometimes. Are there things you care to share or discuss regarding searches?

Mayer is on the Enrollment Management VP search committee. They had a candidate pool with no internal candidates, and this was the worst pool of candidates he has seen. Out of 40 applicants, there were only 5 worth considering. The searches are a real problem because there aren't qualified candidates applying for the positions. We are on hold and not sure what the status of the committee is as it hasn't met for about 6 weeks.

Filling said outstanding searches include the AVP of Enrollment Management, the AVP of Human Resources, Provost, and the Executive Director of UEE. Finalists are coming to campus this week and later for the Executive Director of UEE position. Filling noted that the UEE search is being treated differently with a difference on committee makeup. The CBA Dean's search committee may have made an offer to a candidate. He wasn't sure about the status of the CHHS Dean's search. Novak reported that a candidate was here in December, and another will be coming in January. He shared that tomorrow another interview is being scheduled for a candidate from Australia with virtual meetings. It was noted that the compliance officer position is also open as Lauren Gee is leaving.

R. Floyd thanked the SEC for keeping us up to date on the present day search processes. She noted that we should all be vigilant and convey to the SEC what we know about searches going in our respective colleges and departments. She stated she had been on the provost search committee in 2006 (Covino). She took extensive notes during that search. She notes that when the president charged the committee at that time, that he noted that he wanted to change campus search process policies. She notes that most likely, he still feels this way.

Schoenly asked the president about new consultants being brought to campus which sometimes go unannounced. The president did reveal that there is now a new person in media relations, which is the third individual into that office answering to the president. We're not sure how many others may have been hired. Schoenly thinks we should scrutinize these positions and what they are costing especially in our troubling financial times.

Saraille doesn't know if all have heard this so it may bear repeating. A number of faculty in CHHS and in CNS expressed interest in the idea of postponing the hiring of a replacement dean for CHHS because it would save quite a lot of money since the current dean is going to retire and all of his salary would be salary savings for the college. We're canceling classes and these savings could pay for 30 course sections. Unfortunately, not to belabor the point, we didn't get a serious hearing of this. They got a look, but people

higher up just weren't interested in following up on it and they're going forward with the hiring of a new dean in CHHS. He regrets that an alternative was not suggested. It's important for people to be aware of this. He's not claiming that all felt this way but there was a considerable interest in it.

Mayer asked about the alternative. Saraille said another dean could take CHHS under his/her wing for a while as CHHS is a relatively small college. Also, it could save some but a little less to have someone from within CHHS to be appointed as an interim dean.

Lujan said that option was followed and turned down by the inside person they asked. O'Brien said that this was a UBAC recommendation when he was on it last year -- to collapse a college.

d. Deliverology Project

Filling noted that in terms of where this came from, it's a term crafted by Michael Barber who earned fame by helping to make trains run on time in the UK. He's now Sir Michael Barber, a confidante of Tony Blair's, and he did a rationalization of the K-12 educational system. Opinions differ as to his effectiveness. Last summer Michael Barber met with Chancellor Reed. In October Barber met with the provosts and presidents, and a plan was developed to increase graduation rates. Schools with lower rates than us had to move up their graduation rates. Those of us doing well were asked to hatch plans to increase rates by 6-6.5% (from 52-58% for us). The idea was that each campus would have a plan following the deliverology methodology which looks like an operation management process where you flog the employees to make them work better.

After the October meeting, provosts and presidents were directed to consult and think long and hard to develop a plan due on Christmas day. At our campus the provost and Student Affairs folks submitted a plan to make a timely submission; it is now public and will be sent to ASNet. O'Brien and Filling were told that these were drafts and were expected to evolve as the folks in Long Beach didn't think we could come up with a plan in less than six weeks. It will be an emphasis item for the campus. Lujan needs the names of three faculty so they can build on the draft. Filling noted that COC is dealing with this as we speak.

Schoenly asked how many faculty will be involved in the committee. Lujan is not sure yet on the number, but it will be at least two. Schoenly said that if we gave two names that should be enough. Lujan said two was okay but would like the symbolic flexibility of an additional name. Filling noted that we would like to select our own representatives.

Saraille asked Lujan to imagine if the shoe was on the other foot. If you submitted three names and we included only one or two you wouldn't like it. Lujan felt that there were only a few faculty who had the depth of enrollment experience needed for this committee on campus.

O'Brien followed up that this project didn't go over well with SWAS. We're looking at cutbacks, furloughs, gutting contingency faculty but yet let's start a whole new thing. It's going to be a hard sell.

Ron Noble said those working on the proposal didn't feel we needed to revise the campus graduation initiative based on the elements in Barber's Deliverology. When looking at the content of what they were asking for, we looked at the graduate initiative and at what we proposed in 2005. Then we indicated what we had done on our own initiatives. Deliverology is asking us to pick up on the things we're already doing. When selecting faculty to assist in this project, it would be helpful to have folks to assist who have background in our graduation initiative that we've worked on since 2005. Creating a whole new deliverology is not our intent.

Thompson asked if this is really about what we've been calling facilitating graduation, and if so can you tell us anything that is different about deliverology than graduation? Thompson posed a question to speaker, are we assuming that there is a plan that will go thru this body for approval?

Noble said having done the original draft, it is an extension of the facilitating graduation plan and deliverology is a method for campuses that hadn't delivered on what they said they were going to do. We don't really need a new method. Our 53.7% is ahead of where we should be. It's a review of what we proposed and really it would be an update on where we are and what we've been doing. Lujan said the Board of Trustees has the access to excellence as an overarching goal, with facilitating graduation and plans to move us along to get to be 6% ahead of where we are. We're to meet once a month and report progress with the plan in place by June.

Filling suggests looking at AS2925 speaking to presidential enrollment management advisory committees.

Garcia would like to connect items C and D with B in the President's call for a new day and trust. For this committee and others, we need people with the skill set to serve on these committees, but he wonders if there is a concern being raised by administrators with COC not doing their job. If that's the case, let's call on the president and the provost to name it. That the COC is not doing its job and not identifying qualified people. Hence, that is why they are requesting multiple names--so that they can identify a qualified person.

Eudey said that SEC discussed the deliverology team and what it was tied to. It seems we've been asking if this is attached to the Student Success Committee. Do we need to create another committee with processes? and procedures that are new rather than using an existing committee whose role is established? It's not clear why SSC is not handling this as a group or with a subcommittee consisting of some faculty already serving on the SSC. Why are we creating yet another adhoc committee so we can bring questions back to this body? When SEC was first informed about the deliverology project there was not sufficient time to select names and we asked for an extension as there wasn't time to do this work. The administration did not reply to our request for an extension and moved forward without faculty representation.

O'Brien asked Noble about the effect of the loss of winter term on graduation. Did the committee look at that or might it look at it in the future? Noble said the group did not look at winter term. We looked at the graduation initiative and where we were on that plan, and at those numbers and actions in an attempt to get a report turned in.

R. Brown said that getting rid of winter term is decreasing graduation rates. When he first heard of deliverology, he wondered if it's a methodology and will we set up departments in deliverology with majors in this. He doesn't mean to be flippant, but the idea seems squirly.

O'Brien wanted to defer this to our marketing colleagues. Filling noted that we have been getting a lot of literature of late saying we need to respond to the market.

Gerson is serving her second year on the Student Success Committee. She noted that if Stacey Morgan-Foster were here she would say that the Student Success Committee doesn't create policy. Gerson is not sure how this deliverology committee is being formed, but if it includes creating policies than the Student Success Committee may not be the right place to look for members. The Student Success Committee did produce the study considering how winter term influences graduation and retention and some faculty comments weren't as strongly emphasized as she would have liked. We don't have data about how not taking winter term helps us to retain students because the students usually work for a solid month. It's complicated and we lack sufficient data on this.

Rick Albert said in UEPC and SSC, he sat in with ACAC with regard to winter term retention and the information was inconclusive. SSC did meet in summer to go over how the winter term affects graduation, but it was inconclusive so there's currently nothing that ties this to the winter term. Although, some inferences could be made.

Noble says deliverology is not the issue. Access to Excellence and graduation rates are the issue. To get a report done by December 25th; the emphasis was to show the campus was following its plan, not to create a new plan. No new policy is to be made. We're reviewing what we have decided to do and updating and reporting on it.

Filling said the characterization is at variance to what the Executive Vice Chancellor said to faculty. There may be noise in the information channel that needs to be cleared up. Saraille has noise in his communication channel as well. He would like to ask about what he just heard in regards to some reference to an increase of 6.5% to our graduation rate. Are we under the gun to reach this increase and by when? He's hearing Lujan saying we have a bar to jump to, and Noble is saying we're ahead of where we should be and just need to stay the course.

Filling said campuses that are at or above the top quintile for graduation rates need to increase their rate by 6-6.5% within six years. If we are at 52%, we'll need to be at 58-58.5% by 2015.

Noble wasn't disagreeing with the provost's numbers, he just commented on how we're asked to report on what we're doing.

Strahm asked if we need to do all of this. Filling said our chancellor has been elected to be head of an association of heads of universities and this association has been plugging this stuff big time. Filling also has a genuine concern to help our students to graduate, hopefully with information and not just a piece of paper. Strahm asked how pushing them out the door faster provides them that information. Filling doesn't know, we will try to find out and a committee will be trying to find this out.

Saraille said we should investigate whether it is possible to increase our graduation rates by 6.5%. He asked if there is a campus that has a graduation rate that high and what that campus is like. We should look at whether this is possible and look at a model of what it would look like if we get there. O'Brien said that the model they're using is San Luis Obispo.

Thompson asked if funding is attached to this. Lujan said he hasn't seen or heard of any. Marcell asked to clarify that if we're speeding up graduation or increasing the percentage of graduates. Filling said both, part of the push is to get those completing in 8 years to 6 years, and another part is getting folks who don't stay and complete to do so.

8. Open Forum

9. Adjournment 4:28 PM