

<p>Academic Senate March 9, 2010</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Bender, Bice, Borba, R. Brown, Colnic, Cotton, C. Davis, S. Davis, Dunham-Filson, Eudey, Fair, Filling, Floyd, Gomula, Heredia, Hight, Jasek-Rysdahl, Jones, Keswick, Littlewood, Provost Lujan, Manrique, Marcell, Mayer, McGhee, Morgan-Foster, Mulder, Nagel, Peterson, Petratos, Phillips, Regalado, Ringstad, Schoenly, Silverman, Strahm, Tumolo, and Tuedio.</p> <p>Proxies Jennifer Helzer for Ellen Bell, John Sarraille for John Garcia, Ian Littlewood for Julia Sankey, Ann Strahm for Paul O'Brien, and Theo Chronis for Petrosky.</p> <p>Guests: Alex Cantatore, AVP Carl Whitman, Michael Carillo, Brian Duggan, Angel Sanchez, Nancy Burroughs, Mark Grobner, Steve Stryker, Susan Marshall, Sandra Barnhardt, Lauren Byerly, Susan Clapper, Renee Giannini, Tammy Giannini, Pam Hooker, Neil Jacklin, Erin Prevette Littlepage, Sarphiny Sok, Darin Skalinder, Mike VonDohlen, Vice Provost Diana Demetruvias, President Hamid Shirvani, Deans Fassinger, Moore, Novak, McNeil, Nowak, and Stefanco.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Second Reading 02/AS/10/SEC Resolution to Convene the Strategic Plan Work Group, Passed unanimously as a Sense of the Senate.</p> <p>First and Second Reading 03/AS/10/AS Resolution of Appreciation for Vice President Morgan-Foster, Passed unanimously as a Sense of the Senate.</p> <p>First and Second Reading of 04/AS/10/SEC Resolution for Commendation of Self-Study Process, Passed unanimously as a Sense of the Senate.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, March 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**  
2:38 PM

**2. Approval of Agenda**

Moved Discussion item #6 on UEPC Winter Term until after item 8 the WASC visit update.

**3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of February 23, 2010**

Approved with some grammatical changes.

**4. Announcements**

Filling announced that our students will be having a fee referendum on the 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> of March related to a \$26 Million dollar upgrade/renovation and extension of the student union building. There will be more information sent out and the director of the Union Board, Bryce Davis, will join us at our next Senate meeting to give us a summary of what's happening.

Sonya Renee is this Friday (March 19<sup>th</sup>) as part of the Slam Fest in the Carol Burke Lounge – Heather Raffo will be performing *Sounds of Desire* on March 30<sup>th</sup> on our Main Stage – She has performed at Berkeley Repertory Theatre and New York's Lincoln Center – The play is about the lives of Iraqi Women in the aftermath of 9/11.

Mayer also noted that we'll have a guest speaker Soya Renee on March 19. This will be a spoken word performance which Dean Moore is spearheading.

Maryann Hight reminded us that the library is hosting a discussion on how books and information in electronic formats are affecting higher education. There will be workshops next week in the FDC. At the workshop they will have some electronic book readers for hands on use. They have lots of implications for

higher education. We should be the ones to control the marketing models, and we can discuss how to use these materials for our students' benefits.

Eudey announced that the University Union will be sponsoring a discussion on the topic of Marriage and Parental Rights for same-sex couples. This campus dialogue will be held on March 24<sup>th</sup> from 4:30-6:00pm in the Carol Burke Lounge.

Mayer noted that he will be performing in Big River/The Adventures of Huckleberry Fin at the Playhouse in Merced. This is a chance to see John and his son working together on March 5<sup>th</sup> and March 21<sup>st</sup>.

Renaë Floyd thanked Speaker Filling for the opportunity to speak. Floyd said that she has been privileged to work with many of us for the past 15 years. For nearly two-thirds of that time, she's been fortunate to be able to work closely with Vice President Stacey Morgan-Foster. Simply stated, she will miss her terribly. Stacey has many commendable attributes, but today what comes to mind is her incessant and ferocious protection of the Division of Student Affairs and the counseling faculty. Floyd has always appreciated how Stacey "got it" when it came to the needs of counselors in an academic setting. Her departure is a great loss for Floyd, for the counseling faculty, for the entire division and for the campus community. Floyd was honored to move 03/AS/10/AS Resolution of Appreciation for Vice President Morgan-Foster. Seconded by McGhee. Floyd read the resolution out loud:

#### 03/AS/10/AS Resolution of Appreciation for Vice President Morgan-Foster

*Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus acknowledges the tireless work of Vice President Morgan Foster on behalf of our students and our university over the last nine years, and be it further*

*Resolved: That the Academic Senate thank Vice President Morgan Foster for her tireless efforts in helping our university community thrive, for her dedication to our mission, for her advocacy and tenacity during very challenging times and for her willingness to engage with her colleagues both as an administrative officer and as a member of the Academic Senate, and be it further*

*Resolved: That the Academic Senate wishes Vice President Morgan Foster all the best as she departs our university for new challenges and opportunities at Eastern Washington University.*

C. Davis moved to waive the first reading. Moved to a second reading.

Stacey Morgan-Foster indicated she did not expect this at all and is truly and absolutely moved. She noted that R. Floyd and she have been through a lot in Student Affairs and they have done a good job keeping the ship pointed in the right direction and all of you have also. Morgan-Foster offered thanks for your friendship, professionalism and talents. This faculty is just amazing. It's always been a delight to host the American Association of State Colleges & Universities (ASCU) and the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) to brag about the things that you do. Student Affairs really appreciates working with all of the senators. It has been a joy to come to work and work with people like you and the fabulous students and cherished professionals in Student Affairs. She will never forget Stanislaus. She will frame this resolution and put it in her new office if it passes. Passed unanimously. Standing ovation.

Filling welcomed all the guests. Alex Cantatore, AVP Carl Whitman, Michael Carillo, Brian Duggan, Dr. Angel Sanchez Director of Institutional Research, Dr. Nancy Burroughs, Dr. Mark Grobner, Dr. Steve Stryker, Dr. Susan Marshall, Sandra Barnhardt, Lauren Byerly, Susan Clapper, Renee Giannini, Tammy Giannini, Pam Hooker, Neil Jacklin, Erin Prevette Littlepage, Sarphiny Sok, Darin Skalinder, Mike

VonDohlen, Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias, Deans Fassinger, Moore, Novak, McNeil, Nowak, and Stefanco. A special welcome to Dean Linda Nowak as the new Dean of the School of Business Administration. Filling noted that President Shirvani will join us at 3:30 PM.

## **5. Committee Reports**

Littlewood wanted to remind folks of the report from the last Senate meeting regarding issues involving the academic calendar, closing of classes on the first day of the semester, and the order in which students register. UEPC needs your input in the next couple of days as UEPC is meeting this Thursday, March 11<sup>th</sup>.

Brown noted that the Graduate Council has approved the initial Academic Program Review policy for doctoral programs, the EED program. This item will come before the Senate in 2- 4 weeks.

## **6. Discussion:**

### **a. UEPC Winter Term – moved to after item 8 (WASC)**

Filling noted all should have received the reply from R. Giambelluca that was solicited by Littlewood. Giambelluca was invited to attend, but he replied that he would not be able to attend. He had hoped that we would come to closure on this topic.

Dunham-Filson asked about discussion from the last UEPC meeting on March 4. The discussion in regard to spring break and the outcome of that discussion. Littlewood indicated that UEPC is still taking input on the placement of spring break at the middle of the spring semester (the third week in March), or if we should follow the local schools' lead and have it later in the semester. This will be addressed again at the March 11<sup>th</sup> UEPC meeting. There is no final decision as of yet. Dunham-Filson asked if 2010-2011 academic calendars are finalized. Littlewood noted that it is and they are looking at calendars now thru 2015 and the academic calendar policy.

Colnic noted that when reading some comments that there seems to still be considerable disagreement between what has been heard in UEPC and other areas and what the VP of Business & Finance, R. Giambelluca is asserting. Is there any consideration of UEPC preparing a response to Giambelluca's response which appears somewhat futile? For example, the statement "that after considerable lobbying on the part of faculty with students, no specific pedagogical or other reasons have been brought forward to justify the winter term other than preference for the old calendar..." Littlewood indicated that the response from Giambelluca came after the last UEPC meeting. UEPC will be discussing whether or not they will respond on Thursday.

Brown noted a couple of things: He is sorry that Giambelluca is not here. Some comments Giambelluca made struck him as odd. One being, "students being able to register for more units and moving toward degree completion more quickly or at least at the same rate as before." Brown noted that we are not going to be able to offer more courses, so if they're registering for more and we're offering less, the only outcome is increasing class size and we faculty haven't agreed to that. Giambelluca also talked about a new calendar providing students with better quality teaching with two additional weeks. That seems to be along the same lines as the argument put forward by the Provost's letter to the Turlock Journal. Giambelluca states "students will get better quality teaching with two additional weeks of instruction each semester." Brown stated that we're not teaching more. What happens is that students get two more weeks of driving to school but no "better quality" of teaching. The "oddity" continues in the next sentence when it indicates that students will take more courses in the intersession. That session has been shortened, so by his logic that should mean lower quality teaching since we shortened it. Brown is sorry that Giambelluca isn't here to address this seeming contradiction.

Saraille said another point to consider is that the new winter session will not be state supported, and it's unclear if we will offer even a fraction of the courses we offered in the state supported winter term. When people assert they will be able to take all of the same courses, they are expressing a certain confidence in something that is unwarranted.

Jasek-Rysdahl says for him part of the issue is that this is the VP of Business and Finance making strong statements about the academic side of the university. He shares concerns about the specifics that Brown and Colnic brought up, but that our VP of Business & Finance is making comments about the pedagogy and taking that out of the hands of the faculty is a concern for him.

Tuedio asked if UEPC talked about the significance seen by the compression of the winter term into a 3 week term and the impact on faculty who teach full loads in the regular term. Is there thought about the role the committee or someone in that structure might have over the questions of quality that might come up if it's not our traditional faculty teaching but adjunct professors pulled from other places. He has questions about when compressing courses to 3 weeks for the sake of making sure we have our graduation before Memorial Day weekend.

Littlewood said the most direct answer is that there was considerable discussion about intersession, especially in relation to the special session policy regarding that is related to curriculum, assessment, choosing instructors and the department is indeed responsible for that.

McGhee asked if the intersession would be treated like summer in regard to faculty workload or would it be part of the overload taught during the year. Littlewood said that the intersession is not part of the academic workdays so it is being treated like the summer.

Schoenly hopes that in years to come we can track the cost and savings of this new academic calendar year and be able to compare it to what figures were provided by both of the academic calendar reports.

Strahm said it's stated that there is no data or proof that winter term and time to degree are related, and hopefully Institutional Research can keep track of that and we can see some comparisons.

Tuedio has a question about a comment by Giambelluca regarding implications relative to enrollment, "if students who take winter term register for more units in the fall or spring that will represent more revenue to campus in fees but not an increase of marginal cost allocation." To the extent that enrollments exceed our tenure track faculty teaching capacity that may require the addition of part time instructors but it will be for far fewer courses than 95% of the courses currently taught in winter term. Is he suggesting that if we get enrollment transferred to fall and spring that the workload is going to distribute to faculty that are teaching? Tuedio would like some clarification on this.

Eudey shared some statistics she received about the winter term 2009 and 2010. She noted that there's lots of ways to count how many people are teaching in winter term. The Lecturers headcount was 85 and the tenure track was 76 in 2009. For 2010 the lecturers went down to 40 and the tenure track were at 77 so we lost half of the lecturers who taught in 2009. Giambelluca indicates that only 5% of tenure track/tenured faculty are teaching winter term, but this is not accurate, and certainly at this time 2/3 of faculty teaching in winter term are tenured or tenure/track. She noted that 77 tenure track faculty are consistently teaching in winter term.

Eudey also noted that the timeline is way too short to convert courses to the new schedule. This campus is not involved in conversations about how the institution will support the increased workload as every department needs to rethink their curriculum. There are courses that won't be taught and the schedule causes

faculty to have fewer days to teach and less time. How do we change a 15 week lab to a 13 week lab? Most campuses take 2-3 years to convert their calendars. We're being asked to accomplish this in 6 months. This is an extraordinary amount of work and we don't know how we'll be able to accomplish this in one week in June after the end of classes. Faculty are overloaded as it is with the furloughs and the timeline is way too short.

## **7. Action Item**

### a. Second Reading Item: Strategic Plan Implementation

Filling read the following resolution out loud.

#### *02/AS/10/SEC Resolution to Convene the Strategic Plan Working Group*

*Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus urge President Shirvani to convene the Strategic Plan Working Group as soon as possible to seek input on prioritization from the larger campus community, including the Academic Senate, and be it further*

*Resolved: That the Academic Senate requests that the Strategic Plan Working Group seek to fulfill its charge as enunciated in November, 2007 and affirmed by our WASC visit team:*

*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.*

Filling opened this resolution up for discussion. Nagel asked if the implementation lists the numbers of people in the workgroup. Will they be the same officers as in the current strategic plan work group? Filling said yes, they will be the Speaker of the faculty, Speaker Elect of the faculty, a faculty member recommended by COC, the Director of Institutional Research, the VP for Student Affairs and the Provost. The Senators are ready to vote. All those in favor signify by saying Aye. Passed unanimously.

## **8. 3:00 PM Time Certain, Diana Demetrulias to provide post WASC visit update**

Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias said that the true leader of WASC, Steve Stryker, is unable to speak today as he has a bad cold. She asked S. Davis to speak on Stryker's behalf. S. Davis thanked everyone on campus for all their contributions during the two and a half days of the WASC visit. From his perspective we had a high degree of success. He's looking forward to the response from the WASC team in about one month. He noted that the final decision from the committee will be in June.

S. Davis noted that the person who kept us on track was Vice Provost Demetrulias. We couldn't have done it without her leadership. S. Davis thanked everyone that assisted in the WASC process, including Ronald Noble, Priscilla Peters, Angel Sanchez, and Diana Heredia as members of the Self-Study Team. He also thanked Kathy Shipley, Pamela Russ, Lynn Johnson, Chau-Pu Chiang, Betsy Eudey, David Lindsay and Juan Flores as the Inquiry Circle Chairs; and the wonderful support of Susan Clapper and Erin Prevette Littlepage. He also acknowledged the early members of the Self Study team Gary Novak, Armin Schulz, Geoff Hatfield, Matt Moberly, and the fabulous Jeanne Elliott!

Vice Provost Diana Demetrulias does not wish to summarize the WASC Visit based on her interpretation or the oral report by the WASC team chair. When we receive the final written report, it will be distributed to the campus. She just wanted to mention the categories or topics of the commendations and recommendations. For commendations WASC expressed admiration for the commitment of all sectors of the campus community in support of student learning; the innovative and effective research methodology used by the Inquiry Circles; the excellence of the Faculty Development program and the greatly enhanced

assessment and the culture of evidence that permeates the campus, including the Student Success Committee and Institutional Research; and the comprehensive academic review of the General Education program and the employment of high impact practices engaged in including active pedagogies, service learning, and student/faculty collaboration for Research Scholarly and Creative Activity (RSCA).

Regarding the recommendations, WASC cited five major ones:

We were asked to continue to define the criteria and standards for the RPT process at department, college and the university levels;

Continued attention to assessment including use of direct methods for assessing student learning;

Enhanced evidence-based Academic Program Reviews with a strong recommendation to include external reviewers in the process;

Continued refinement of General Education, including assessment of GE goals and looking at GE's vitality and centrality to the university, especially for the First Year Program and the Summit Program; and

WASC encouraged us, administration and faculty leadership, to employ collaborative governance processes and strategic planning to advance the university.

Vice Provost Demetrulias noted that these recommendations were few and generally those we had anticipated from our self-study inquiry. We're hoping for a long accreditation extension; the maximum is ten years. We will not know the final decision by the WASC Commission until June. She expressed appreciation to the campus community and the pride she has for CSU Stanislaus and the quality of its students, faculty, and staff. She invited the campus to a celebration this Thursday, March 11<sup>th</sup>, from 10-12 in the South Dining Room. The DVD documentary will be shown, which is a joy to watch. Please join us for some modest refreshments and a celebration.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that Speaker Filling passed the turkey leg to him so he could speak. Filling moved the resolution being distributed around the room 04/AS/10/AS – Resolution for Commendation of Self-Study Process. Seconded by Nagel. Filling read the resolved and the final sentence of the rationale.

*Resolved: That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus commend the Self-Study process, and those who participated in the process, in support of consideration for reaccreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). We recognize that such a laborious, resource-intensive process was successful because of the campus community's commitment to engaging students and supporting their learning, and our desire to learn from our past to build our future. We recognize the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) and Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) as documents that reflect the mission and vision of our university, and faithfully represent the work engaged in to support student learning and academic excellence.*

*We recognize that the quality of the CPR and EER, and the engagement of the campus in the self-study process, is a direct result of the extraordinary work engaged in by the self-study leadership and inquiry circle membership. We especially celebrate the leadership of Diana Demetrulias, Stephen Stryker, Scott Davis, Susan Clapper, Ronald Noble, Priscilla Peters, Angel Sanchez, Armin Schulz, Diana Heredia, Matt Moberly, and Geoff Hatfield as members of the Self-Study Team; Kathy Shipley, Pamela Russ, Lynn Johnson, Chau-Pu Chiang, Betsy Eudey, David Lindsay and Juan Flores as the Inquiry Circle Chairs; and Susan Clapper, Erin Prevette Littlepage, Lori Phillips, and Jeanne Elliott as staff support. Special appreciation is offered to Associate Students Incorporated and University Communications for their work on the "Learning is..." posters and the Learning is Paramount DVD.*

*We celebrate the inclusive, reflective, evidence-based process that encouraged all members of the campus community to participate, while drawing especially upon the insights and expertise of the inquiry circle members. The "participatory inquiry" method utilized throughout the process helped to foster and*

*reinforce relationships throughout the campus while affording opportunities to better understand our university and reflect upon means to maintain quality.*

*The Academic Senate, California State University Stanislaus, acknowledges the role of faculty governance in advancing progress on many action items and findings presented within the CPR and EER, and identified through the Inquiry Circle process. We look forward to addressing these issues in support of student learning and advancement of our mission and vision.*

***Rationale:***

*The campus was obligated to engage in a Self-Study process; however the means by which that process was enacted was not prescribed. The Inquiry Circle process was intentionally designed to afford faculty, staff and students to work collaboratively as issues of capacity and effectiveness were considered. The process has been recognized by those on campus, and many external to the campus, as a valuable method for inquiry as well as for community-building while engaging in self-study.*

*The participatory inquiry process allowed for careful consideration of data, opportunities to develop new understandings, and the engagement of appropriate individuals, offices, committees, and processes to review and act upon action items. As noted in Key Exhibit One of the EER, participatory inquiry emphasizes:*

- engaging in a reflective investigation with others who are simultaneously members of the University community and researchers for the self study;*
- testing perceptions through analytical data complemented by participants' experiential understanding, often exposing multiple and sometimes contradictory, views; 1*
- employing a recursive process that allows participants/researchers to investigate "reality" in order to affirm it, change it, re-investigate it, and re-change it; 2*
- evaluating campus findings within a broader context through selected relevant research literature and benchmarked information, where available, for each specific query, and*
- structuring a research study that allowed us to establish a "learning community": that is, a social dimension in which members of the University work together to consider real campus issues related to our themes of communities for learning, infrastructure support, teaching, and scholarship*

*Although the campus reaccreditation review will not conclude until early Summer when WASC completes its report on our effectiveness and offers information about our reaccreditation status, the Academic Senate wishes to acknowledge the quality of the process engaged in regardless of outcome. This inclusive, evidence-based process was built upon trust, and enhanced trust as it unfolded.*

Littlewood moved to waive the first reading and move to a second reading. Jasek-Rysdahl seconded the motion. No discussion. Passed unanimously with an ovation.

Filling announced that in appreciation of the work involved with WASC, let's take a moment and have some cake and a bit of champagne to celebrate. He noted we also have apple cider and water. The Senate took a brief recess.

**9. 3:30 PM Time Certain, President Shirvani to provide President's Remark's and Q&A**

President Shirvani noted that he appreciates the time that has been allocated to him. He thanked Speaker Filling for accommodating him based on his request to attend this Senate meeting. He knows he hasn't been in the Senate for some time, and he hopes that this will be a good meeting. The kind of conversation we start today will continue into the future. President Shirvani will cover some broad points that reflect on the variety of issues that have been raised in the past 6-7 months, and then he will talk about the budget which is the most important issue we are facing.

President Shirvani said he believes in a loyal opposition and a healthy debate. Through this process of disagreement and debate he believes that bad ideas are filtered and good ideas remain. We need to effectively address the main issue we are facing, the budget cuts thru constructive, realistic, pragmatic and timely conversation. What is not effective is to place our entire efforts on job security rather than the students' education. He does not want to continue with continual dialogue with the same people who are framing the argument and slowing down the open dialogue and transparency. Also not effective is the constant denial of the reality we are facing of having significantly less funding or passing the cuts to others. What he does understand is the anxiety surrounding the uncertainty of budget cuts, of who is getting cut, and how it will impact you and each one of us based on the real and very personal way the state budget has affected all of us and this institution. He does understand that no one is happy about it, but this is the reality of the times.

He's challenging all of us to be better, including himself. We can begin doing this by engaging in a constructive dialogue and discussing our differences respectfully. This is the only way we are able to move forward. He wants us to know there has been much conversation about collegiality. The definition of collegiality has been subject to debate across the country for many years. He has never questioned that faculty should have a voice in decision making. He's always believed that faculty should have a voice in decision making and translate university goals and values into action. He also believes that the truly collegial process values participation by all stakeholders. Some individuals choose to believe that the role of the University President is to receive and implement the recommendations and advice coming from faculty governance and to be a rubber stamp. The fact that he has not stamped every single recommendation or resolution coming to him doesn't suggest a lack of respect or collegiality. It's his prerogative as president to make the best decisions for the institution.

Shirvani noted that there have been emails going back and forth regarding MPP searches. He believes that the current policy is being used as a way to throw up some roadblocks at every turn and make it difficult to move the searches forward in a timely and constructive manner. He noted that the Committee on Committees recommendations have to be respected. However, when some individual faculty did not accept his invitation to join he exercised his presidential prerogative to reach out and appoint others and there is not any policy that stops him from doing so. In fact, when he agreed to change this policy he thought we could create a more flexible, collaborative approach but that was not his experience during the prior provost's search. That's his opinion. So if the Committee on Committees gives him names and these individuals don't want to serve he appoints other members. They are still faculty. Besides the current policy as has been approved requires that he appoint the chair of the search committee. Shirvani stated that MPP search committee chairs had been MPPs until he came here; he is the first to appoint a faculty member chair.

Thompson indicated that this was not correct. Thompson indicated that President Hughes normally used faculty as chairs for MPP search committees. Shirvani said he has heard from his office staff otherwise, but there might have been an error. He noted that there is no policy that says that the chair of the search committee has to be a faculty member. Even though, President Shirvani has tried to be a fair person by naming a faculty member as chair. Shirvani said that the policy doesn't state anything about interim appointments. Besides, right now the chair of the provost's search committee is a faculty member.

Shirvani noted that our campus had 79 MPP positions in 2008 and currently has 73 in 2009 which is a reduction of 6 MPP positions. Sonoma State had 176 MPPs in 2008 and 180 in 2009. Channel Island is half of our size, with 3,800 students, and they had 80 MPPs in 2008 and now have 81 in 2009. He noted that we are not very high on the number of MPPs. He said that even though we're currently hiring a few more MPPs there are others who are leaving. We'll revisit this every October when the Chancellor's office provides this information.

Shirvani stated that regarding faculty cuts, the statistics put out by the faculty leadership is incorrect. It has been noted by the faculty leadership that there was a 16% reduction in the part time faculty. The 16% was when Long Beach put together the stats, but now that figure is at 14% because some part time faculty were rehired with the stimulus funds. Shirvani explained that we have to use the numbers received from Long Beach regarding cuts but maybe 1-3 days later you may rehire additional people.

Shirvani shared some very interesting points regarding staff numbers. He noted that in 1992-93 a total of 95 staff were laid off and about 4-5 MPP positions. Not a single faculty was cut. In 2005, 65 staff and 3 MPP positions were eliminated and faculty remained untouched. He noted that in 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08 he approved faculty salary increases above what was negotiated. He gave an average of 6.12%, totaling \$412K, and some faculty received as high as 12%-14% pay increases. Also since his arrival in 2004-05, assistant professors pay was increased by 10.39% and full professors were increased by 14.74%. These are all things from the past that he's kept until today to share.

He also noted that CSUS has the highest percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty at 67%. He brought reports to distribute that show this. He noted that this is what every campus wants to be able to say. San Luis Obispo is second to us at 64% in terms of the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty. We are number one. This is information from the Chancellor's office and these statistics are clearly identified by campus. We are committed to our faculty. The reason we got more part time faculty is because we had less cushion and more tenured and tenure-track faculty. The cost of part time faculty is less than others so we have more cushion to do fewer cuts.

The governor's budget is \$305 Million of new money. This is a proposal that we hope becomes the reality. However, there are several scenarios to consider. One is if the governor's budget becomes a reality we won't need to worry about any budget cuts and we will have money to spend. If the governor's budget is not approved, and if there are no further cuts, we still have \$4.5 Million of furloughs to deal with. We balanced our budget cuts this year because we had \$4.5 Million in furloughs. We all have contributed 10% of our salaries to make this year's budget work. If we continue the furloughs again with no budget cuts we may be okay, but what he is hearing is that the continuation of furloughs is unlikely.

So to assume we have no furloughs, no new money, no cuts, and then we're talking about a \$4.5 Million cut for next year as well as the cost of benefits. Every year the benefits cost increases. They're usually \$1 - \$1.5 Million. So assume \$5.5- \$6 Million dollars if no further cuts, no furloughs, and no new money. There could also be fee increases and one time stimulus funds and winter term savings. Shirvani stated that there has been much debate over the winter term savings. He just talked to Russ Giambelluca and was informed that if we achieve our next year's target of 6665 FTES; we're talking about \$900K- \$1 Million dollars in savings. We are feeling that we may not make the 6665 FTES target. If the FTES is less then we will have less than \$1Million in savings. We'd still have somewhere around \$3 Million to cut and that is not that bad. He doesn't think there should be so much anxiety. It will still affect individuals and departments but it won't be as extensive as it could be.

Shirvani said that what we don't know is if there will be additional cuts and whether there will be mid-year cuts. That's why we have asked the deans to look at 5%, 10%, and 15% scenarios. We've talked about it and we're planning just in case we need it. He hopes we never will need it. He's not interested or wanting it but we have to be prepared.

Also, you may have heard that East Bay has laid off some staff and reduced the time base for other staff. Humboldt has done some type of adjustment as well. Shirvani's intention is to postpone this as long as possible so we don't create additional anxiety. Deans were asked to deliberate and they met with department

chairs. We wanted to open the process as best as we can, as pluralistic, collegially as we can. We asked the deans to bring a department chair to make the process more open. We had to look at the juxtaposition of plans to see how they affect each other so we can come up with a total plan.

Deans were given the following three criteria:

1. No across the board cuts which means no horizontal cuts. We don't want to hurt all the programs. Programs like nursing, biology, psychology, and math that if we cut across the board will hurt the program dramatically and damage the enrollment target and the Liberal Arts core.
2. Protection of the Liberal Arts core. Regardless of the major, the Liberal Arts courses and GE courses are needed for students to graduate.
3. No more cuts from operations will be permitted because all of the colleges have very dismal operating money. We don't want to cut that further. We can't take away travel funds, lab equipment funds etc. That was the idea behind this cut. This notion of cuts is different because we are reducing enrollment.

Shirvani explained that the budget cuts proposal from a committee of 12 will be shared with the Senate Executive Committee and UBAC. SEC can share this information with the Academic Senate, UEPC and FBAC. UBAC will not interfere with the details of the cuts. UBAC will look at cuts from non-academic vs. academic divisions, but it will not go into detail and micromanaging the cuts. This will be left to faculty governance; they can review the Academic Affairs cuts and make recommendations. Time will be of an essence as we'll only have 1 month and a few days. We must have the plans ready by May 1<sup>st</sup>.

Shirvani said that some people may say that the budget will not be ready, but we still should have an idea of the cuts from Long Beach by that time. The cuts will consist of non-reappointment and a possibility of layoffs, so there has to be notices given in order to have the savings for next year. Shirvani shared that he met with SEC, and SEC indicated that as long as they have consultation they will work with the time frame. Shirvani is going to leave it completely in SEC's hands.

Shirvani brought with him a sample proposal from the University of Nevada that includes a plan for a similar one-month time-frame. It shows the criteria established to review programs and the whole process they used. He's not saying we must follow this process as there are so many other models available to us. This is just an example of the type of models and criteria available to us. That's all about the budget.

Shirvani said that he shares our anxiety and does understand that this is most difficult for faculty and administrators to deal with. When it comes to cutting or giving notice to anybody it is very difficult. Faculty and staff are all human beings and to have to tell them they don't have a job is very difficult thing to do, but this is the reality. From his perspective, it's not as severe as we might think. That's his impression, but it doesn't mean that it doesn't affect anybody. It does affect a lot of people.

Shirvani appreciates the time he's been given to make remarks but feels he's talked enough. He's open to questions.

Sarraillé asked if the format will be Q&A. Filling responded yes.

Sarraillé said he thought Shirvani painted a picture that was not accurate. He opined that there were statements that hurt feelings and did injustice to members of the faculty. However, he indicated that he wanted to put that aside, it being of greatest importance now to stress the need for a transparent budgeting process. As a UBAC member, from his perspective, he's seen an effort to rule out discussion of the big picture, and to focus only on certain areas of cutting where the chairs of the committee wish to focus attention. Sarraillé would like UBAC to be able to get information about all of the areas of the university and be free to discuss all aspects of university budgeting and spending. UBAC members have endeavored to

do this but have been obstructed. Sarraille wants a transparent budgeting process, for all stakeholders to know what's going on. He wants to see a complete examination, rational discussion, and rational decisions.

Filling noted a rule to limit comments and questions to three minutes or less. Filling also noted that if a question is posed, he'll ask the president for a response.

Thompson noted Shirvani's reminder of the faculty salary raises and thanked the president for that. He knows that the president thinks we don't thank him enough for that. Thompson also wants to apologize for interrupting earlier, but he wanted to get back to the point they were at earlier. Thompson noted that the president talked about the searches at length so that means the president understands how important this is. The president noted places he feels he is not bound to by policy for the expediency of making appointments as soon as possible.

Thompson noted that what is the most disheartening to him is the loss of trust in the search processes when new MPPs come to our campus. Thompson needs to have the feeling that the faculty have been fully involved and present in the process, and he doesn't have that feeling. Thompson said in light of item #5 from WASC, he's looking for a gesture from the president aimed at repairing shared governance. The president cannot compare having a member he selected as opposed to having a faculty representative nominated by the COC. The way to have proper representation is by going thru the COC for appointments.

President Shirvani appreciates Thompson's remarks. He is here to say he accepts the principle of shared governance and agrees with a lot of things Thompson is saying. He thinks we have to work together and we have to put this intensity aside. What he has done today is consult, as he started the consultation for the appointment for Dean of CHSS. He noted that at certain times with certain situations one has to make a decision that may not be a popular decision. One cannot look at the micro level of every single thing, but he will do his best to work with us and when the permanent provost is here he will be working more closely with us. He is committed to working with us.

Regalado noted that our current 4-1-4 calendar and our pedagogical record has received high recommendations from Princeton, WASC etc. Regalado wants to know if the president can provide statistical evidence that the new calendar format will in fact lead to an advancement of our educational effectiveness and that we'll be able to live up to the high praise and achievement we've had all these years.

Shirvani said he can't provide hard evidence for something that hasn't happened.

Regalado said that the president made the statement that this would improve.

Shirvani can point to a number of models in the CSUs and other institutions that have educational effectiveness without a winter term but provided no specific examples. The notion of winter term is a done deal. The Chancellor has approved it and Shirvani prefers not to dismantle and deconstruct it. Regalado is concerned for the future and Shirvani is as well.

Shirvani stated that he's proud of our faculty, proud of their achievements and makes a point of that. He's sure that with the commitment our faculty have we will continue excelling in that arena. Regalado asked if the models the president said were successful were made available to UEPC. The president said that he was unaware of any examples that were made available to UEPC. Shirvani, without providing specific analogies with other university winter term formats, said that many schools have received a good review from WASC, and they have gotten 10 years accreditation without a winter term.

Schoenly noted that one of our continued areas of concern is the use of consultants on campus. He noted that UBAC and FBAC filed a California Public Records request with the President's office and they responded two weeks ago. They noted that a total of \$6,300 was used in 2009 for consultants, but this amount seemed minimal compared to comments we've received. Schoenly asked the president if this \$6,300 amount is correct, and will the president make other records available?

Shirvani doesn't know what has been given to UBAC and FBAC. He has no idea and what is going on, but is happy to look into it and respond to Schoenly. He promised detailed responses.

Nagel indicated that as a lecturer representative, although we have a high ratio of tenured and tenure-track faculty which is certainly an important goal, and a good goal, and one that AAUP and CFA have recognized this as a way to maintain quality education, strength of shared governance and academic freedom, this ratio on this campus was achieved by eliminating 44% by FTE the number of lecturers. Shirvani says he thinks Nagel is correct. That is the reason the healthy balance is very important. Why the criteria of not across the board cuts is important, because if you do across the board cuts these percentages will get worse.

Sarraille pointed out that Shirvani mentioned we had fewer administrators than a couple of other campuses. Sarraille stated that over the last 5 years there has been only a slight decrease overall in the number of administrators on the Stanislaus campus, and the number on this campus is in fact about average compared with the rest of the CSU. On the other hand, over 5 years we have lost 1.7 times more faculty as the average CSU campus. Sarraille stressed that he was speaking of a properly normalized measure of faculty: FTE faculty per FTE students. The one year loss seen this fall was even greater: 2.7 times the percentage lost by the average CSU. These are important facts. There is a problem with the funding of the CSU system, but our problem is a lot worse on this campus. It may be partly due to local management, and other things related to treatment by the Chancellor's Office, but somebody should do something about this. We don't deserve to be 1.7 times more in the hole than the average CSU campus.

Shirvani is not sure where the 1.7 and 2.7 come from and has no idea where Sarraille is getting this information. He explained very clearly the 16% which is now at 14% shortage of part time faculty and he doesn't believe that we're being treated differently. We have the highest ratio of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Sarraille offered to meet with Shirvani to explain it.

R. Giannini doesn't think that anyone deserves to be laid off or have cuts. The 95 staff that were laid off in 1992-93, and the 65 in 2005 she's sure they felt the same way that they didn't deserve to go. We all need to accept where we are in our state right now and that things are changing. As a result she might not have a job next year or whenever. She accepts that as part of what is better for the university and what's going to keep this university going. She doesn't think deserving has anything to do with it.

Sarraille says deserving is an imprecise word. He clarified that he meant to say that if our finances are worse than the CSU average we should do something about it. We should identify the problem and solve it. He doesn't think it would be unrealistic to try to follow that strategy. The system has the ability to identify things like that and make adjustments to help the problem.

McGhee said if he understood Shirvani's comments properly, the president is concerned with undue anxiety and fear being brought about by faculty, staff and students. The president talked about directions about how to prepare for budget cuts by using an arbitrary 5%, 10% and 15% numbers and multiplying those out. Wouldn't it be less traumatic if more guidance and actual dollar amounts were being given to all divisions? If you're looking at a \$3 - \$4 Million cut rather than percentages it could allow people to be more strategic in their calculations because they would know the dollar amounts to deal with by unit. Dollar amounts are easier to work with than arbitrary percentages. This could lead to be a more transparent process and provide

better directions for people to work with using dollar amounts. The most reasonable scenario would be tied to actual dollars. That type of direction from the top of the administration down would help building budgets from the departments up.

Shirvani appreciates what is being said. The deans were given these numbers, and it's very simple. You take the budget for the college and use the percentages. It's not that we have a problem giving a dollar figure. It's not appropriate for upper administration to give percentages to departments. McGhee indicated he meant departments outside of Academic Affairs.

Shirvani noted all divisions have been given 5%, 10% and 15% cuts. All those cuts from all divisions including Academic Affairs will come to UBAC. UBAC is not to micro manage it. They can turn around and say we don't want to close down this area but not going thru at a micro level.

Brown commented that given the reality of the budget cuts and scenarios, he wonders if the president would consider a temporary and symbolic reduction in administrative staff if due to attrition and not layoff.

Shirvani noted they are considering this and looking at restructuring.

Petratos said following an entrepreneurial approach, would you encourage all programs to offer UEE certificate programs. Shirvani welcomes this and this is his 5<sup>th</sup> year and you have heard him say this a million times. We don't have a cushion because we don't do much entrepreneurial activities. Sacramento State is 20 million and ours is 2 million. If you go to other campuses they generate so much money so when cuts come they apply their profits towards the cuts so it goes unnoticed. Even those people are considering program elimination because they are talking about cuts in the future. Shirvani is very supportive of UEE and has asked the deans to offer more of these programs. He noted that we just hired an experienced UEE director. The more revenue we have the less we need to talk about these issues.

Regalado asked Littlewood regarding the turnaround time to create the new calendar. There was news that there was a request to ask for an additional year to turn around the calendar. Littlewood indicated that they asked for a 1 year delay in implementation of the new academic calendar, and the president wrote back and denied the request.

Shirvani said there is no earth shattering reason to delay the implementation of the new calendar. We changed the calendar and are moving forward. Whether it takes one or two years it needs to be adjusted. The adjustment to 15 weeks from 13 weeks is something that other campuses have done. Every CSU has had some calendar changes like Chico and they were able to accomplish it in the next year.

Regalado asked if there were substantive reasons to make the request. Littlewood said this was based on requests about making changes to courses, courses tied to the old calendar like the Child Development Center program and the 3 year MSW program. The president responded with no substantive reasons why the request was denied.

Strahm is concerned about UEE as a panacea. If we look at historical patterns in most states, when schools start going to outside funding including fundraising, UEE, entrepreneurial things, it allows the state to divest more funds from systems of higher education. This maybe a short-term band aid. Shirvani asked how it diverts. Strahm said if you study systems in the US, when governments notice that higher education are doing fundraising and being entrepreneurial, that tells the legislature that they can divert that little bit more. There is lots of data out there to show this. It might be okay to use UEE for short term cuts but what happens in the long term?

Shirvani said the reason we're using UEE is that students pay a full fee rather than a portion. He agreed in principle that the public institution should pay and support us, but if they're not doing it we have a choice. We can serve the students who desperately want to come for programs we're not offering, and are still willing to pay more since it's still half the price of a private institution. So are we to deny students and not collect the revenue? This is a win/win solution. What will happen in the future? If we cannot offer UEE courses the students will go elsewhere and we lose the revenue. If at a later date, the state gives us more money we can move the programs stateside.

Filling noted we are at closing hour. We are adjourned.

Shirvani said he is looking forward to working with the Senate to work towards achieving better results.

**10. Open Forum**

**11. Adjournment**  
4:30 PM