

<p>Academic Senate September 22, 2009</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Bender, Bice, Borba, Brown, Colnic, Cotton, C. Davis, S. Davis, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, <u>Hauselt</u>, Heredia, Hight, Keswick, Lujan, Manrique, Marcell, McGhee, Vice President Morgan-Foster, Mulder, Nagel, Nainby, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Phillips, Regalado, Ringstad, Sankey, Schoenly, Silverman, Strahm, Werling</p> <p>Proxies: Dunham-Filson (C. Robbins)</p> <p>Guests: Brian Duggan, Dean Ruth Fassinger, Dean Roger McNeil, Dean Gary Novak, Roger Pugh, John Sarraille, Dean Carolyn Stefanco, Mark Thompson, Associate Vice President Wendt</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>15/AS/09/SEC Resolution to Support of CBA Resolution Supporting Dean Nael Aly, APPROVED</p> <p>16/AS/09/SEC Resolution for Faculty Support of SEC Action Plan at August 7, 2009 Faculty Meeting, APPROVED</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, October 6, 2009 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	---

1. Call to order

2:35 pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Speaker Filling apologized for the late distribution of the agenda. Approved with no changes.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of May 12, 2009 (to be distributed electronically)

Filling requested postponement of approval to give all more time to review the minutes. All agreed.

4. Announcements

Filling announced that the general faculty passed the following two resolutions at the general faculty meeting on September 8th.

15/AS/09/SEC Support of CBA Resolution Supporting Dean Nael Aly

16/AS/09/SEC Faculty Support of SEC Action Plan at August 7, 2009 Faculty Meeting

Mark Bender announced the Ag Studies Speaker Series on October 15th. The annual Taste of the Valley Wine and Cheese Event will be on October 22nd at the Assyrian American Civic Club, 6:00 – 9 pm. This event includes great food, wine, and a silent auction. Mark passed a form for ticket purchases or to donate a silent auction item. He asked everyone to share this information with their departments.

Dave Colnic announced that the Sustainable Futures conference will be held all day Friday - Sunday morning October 15-18th around broad themes of sustainability. This offers something for everyone as it is widely defined for business, art, natural sciences and the social sciences.

Chris Nagel noted that CFA is hosting the annual Employee Union Picnic on October 3rd. You may RSVP to John Saraille.

Brian Duggan announced that the Tech Fair has moved from spring to fall to better enable folks to take advantage of the technology all year long. This event will be held in the MSR lobby. Vendors and faculty will be demonstrating technology.

Eudey made several announcements related to her work as Director of the FCETL. Eudey reminded all that Emiliano Ayala from Sonoma State University will be on campus on Thursday to present a workshop on Universal Design for Learning. The program will run from 2:30-4:30, and will immediately be followed by a session for faculty engaged in a learning community that will be working on implementing UDL in courses. One more space is available for the grant project that supports this community. Eudey noted that the Pedagogy Book Club will be reading *The Art of the Brain* this semester, facilitated by Kelvin Jaskey-Rysdahl. Portions of the text will be addressed over three sessions running 12-1:30 pm on October 1, October 29 and December 3. The next Non-Fiction Book Club book will be Jared Diamond's *Collapse*, to be discussed on October 6 from 4:30-5:30 pm, facilitated by Dean Roger McNeil. The next Fiction Book Club Book will be Louise Erdrich's *Plague of Doves*, discussed on October 17th from 4:30-5:30 pm and facilitated by Molly Crumpton Winter. Limited free copies of the books are available on a first-come basis.

Dean Stefanco and the Center for Portuguese Studies will host a talk on Tuesday September 29, lecture from 4:00-5:00 pm and a reception from 5-6 pm in the South Dining Hall. Mr. Jose Lucio will be speaking on Homelessness in Lisbon. In 2005 he was a visiting Fulbright scholar. Filling wished him Godspeed in addressing homelessness in Turlock.

Diana Heredia noted ASI is putting together a student forum for students to tell their story, provide comments and the hardships their facing about finding classes. This will be during the regular ASI meeting. She will speak to the President, the VP of Finance, maybe student trustees and ASI senate members. Please announce to your students to join us on Tuesday, October 6, at 5 pm, in the Carol Burke Lounge.

Diana Heredia read a prepared statement: We are talking so loud but no one listens. We have created divisions within the campus community based upon self-interest and perceived need. Instead of building and transforming we are tearing the fabric of our university apart. Ultimately no one wins...we all lose.

When I say we I definitely include me as a part of we. If I have offended anyone I sincerely apologize. As the President of ASI, "The Voice of the Students," it is my duty and responsibility to be that voice. I take my role seriously. I clearly understand in addition to representing the students I represent the University as well. At this point we can do the blame game as to how we got into this financial mess. Not a very productive use of time. We can continue to shout each other down. Not a very productive use of time. We can decide not to participate within the process. Not a very productive use of time. I want us to be productive in our work recognizing "we are all in this together." This is our opportunity to transform our university not because it's fun to do but because we must. We need to go back to the table to develop our "guiding principles and values" to help direct us in our work and keep us focused on what we must accomplish. As the voice of the students I stand ready to work together to make the difficult decisions that are necessary to move **us**: students, faculty, staff, administration and alumni forward in these most contentious and difficult times.

Filling followed a tradition established last year by noting visitors. Visitors included Deans Fassinger, McNeil, Novak and Stefanco, CFO, Brian Duggan, AVPFA Ted Wendt, CFA President John Saraille, and immediate past speaker Mark Thompson. Welcome to one and all.

5. Committee Reports

Filling noted that none of the committees have met at this point with the exception of UEPC. Paul O'Brien and Filling are trying to write a report from the SWAS meeting they attended last week and this report should be sent out soon.

UEPC Report to the AS on the Academic Calendar was given on behalf of Ian Littlewood by Renae Floyd. Floyd read from Littlewood's prepared statement. "The UEPC has finished its data and feedback gathering and are now in the report-writing phase. The committee met 6 times during the summer. Input was also received from many staff employees over the course of the summer. In addition, the UEPC received feedback and reports from:

Interim Provost Herman Lujan
Vice President Russell Giambelluca
Associate Vice President Roger Pugh
Dean of Admissions Lisa Bernardo
Dean Carolyn Stefanco

"The committee has also met all of the Thursdays in September and will have its last meeting on this topic this Thursday. We hope to be able to have a vote of approval of the report at that meeting and to refer the report to the SEC soon afterward. To help gauge the impact of winter term on the core educational mission of the university, the UEPC conducted an online survey of the campus community. There were 1214 total respondents. These included 986 students, 146 faculty, 73 staff, and 9 administrators. Discussion of the survey vote will be included in the UEPC report and these results will be formally submitted to the Speaker, the President and the campus community.

"There are some of you that have spoken to the chair and the members of UEPC regarding the fact that many on campus did not become aware of the survey until the survey was concluded and taken off line. The UEPC certainly regrets this and had many discussions about the process issues inherent in this proposal and our rapidly approaching target date. It was felt by the committee that the number of responses to the survey is large and increasing the numbers would be unlikely in the extreme to affect the discussion in our report.

It is safe to say here that it was the opinion of the membership of the UEPC that the time constraints for considering this proposal were inadequate. But the committee did what governance committees here at Stanislaus have always done. Those who were available worked through the summer and throughout the month of September to reach a recommendation. (it is notable that including the present analysis of winter term by the UEPC, that this makes the eighth review since AY 1979-1980)."

Floyd indicated that it seems appropriate for any other questions to be directed to the chair, as Floyd would not want to misrepresent him. Littlewood is on furlough today. Please feel free to e-mail or call Dr. Littlewood at your convenience.

6. Consent Items/Resolutions

- a. 17/AS/08/SEC—2008/2009 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate (sense of Senate)

Filling noted that the rules are on the 6th page of handout and provide structure on how business is conducted. Jasek-Rysdahl moved to approve, Eudey seconded. Approved unanimously. We now have a set of rules to operate under. Page 4 is a list of the senators, page 5 lists the meeting dates, and page 9 includes acronyms. Filling noted that pursuant to our consideration of winter term, we will probably be convening an extra Academic Senate meeting on October 20th at the same time. The President has asked us to expedite the review, so moving the consideration a week ahead is the thing to do.

7. Discussion Items

- a. EER, Educational Effectiveness Review Draft Report (3:00 PM Time Certain for S. Stryker & S. Davis)

Filling introduced Scott Davis and Steve Stryker and Susan Clapper. Steve Stryker sent another email with information about the location of the draft of the EER on the campus website and everyone should have received the following:

Dear Campus Community:

The Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) draft report and several key exhibits for reaffirmation of accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) is available for review on the Self-Study website, http://www.csustan.edu/WASC/Pages/documents/EERReportdraft090309withKeyExhibitsABCD_001.pdf

This is not a final nor copy-edited draft. As we are restricted to a total of 50 pages for the report, we will continue to reduce and tighten text, as well as work on the integrative chapter. This draft has been prepared from work completed by the four Inquiry Circles and extensive campus participation during and since the Capacity and Preparatory Review phase.

To address recommendations for revision, we ask that all individual feedback be submitted to the team by Wednesday, September 30, 2009. The confidentiality of any feedback will be observed if requested. Individual feedback may be given directly to any member of the team (members listed at <http://www.csustan.edu/WASC/>) or emailed to selfstudy@csustan.edu. Members of the Self-Study Team are happy to meet with any campus groups; please email sclapper@csustan.edu to schedule.

As we move toward concluding this final phase of the self study, please calendar March 3-5, 2010 for the WASC EER site visit.

Stryker thanked everyone for their contributions to this important reaccreditation process. The final working draft is available and they invite everyone to respond in whatever way they want to. There are many Inquiry Circle members in the room today. All four inquiry circles will meet in the next two weeks. This brings us to the end of a very long process which first began when Marvalene Hughes was here. Fifty to sixty staff, faculty, and students have worked on this project. In 2006 we published the institutional proposal, which was well received by WASC. In 2008 we wrote our Capacity and Preparatory Review, leading to the last step, which is coming upon us soon. The EER is the product of all five of these years of work. It's not a snapshot of the university, but an overview of a decade in a larger sense and of 50 years of our experience. It's our 5th or 6th reaccreditation process. We're looking at a broad perspective, and we're in final editing. The content runs thru June 2009, exactly 10 years from the last reaccreditation. It will go to the publisher within a month. We welcome any comments and want to thank all those involved. We're about 95-98% there, essentially finished. The report will be submitted to WASC in December of 2008. The site team will be here from March 3-5, and it's the same team as last time. Keep those dates open for participation in the various meetings that will be held for the visiting team. Especially thanked Scott Davis for his work as writer -ovation. It's been quite remarkable. Also thanked the major logistical support person without whom this wouldn't have gone as well as it has. She's made all the arrangements for the site visit in March including lots of electronic evidence and hard copies. I want to thank Susan Clapper for her work. Ovation.

S. Davis said this is the third of three reports. As we did with the CPR, the writing team began with reports from inquiry circles in April and May, and elaborated what was there to create the final draft document. Stryker, Demetruvias, Clapper, and Inquiry Circle Chairs provided a great deal of input. He appreciated the teamwork. S. Davis used the institutional proposal as a guideline to evaluate if we accomplished what we said we would. Distinguished between capacity and effectiveness. We report on the latter, but present the former in "key exhibits." Exhibit B focuses on the three major issues from last site visit. Did not spend EER pages rehashing CPR issues, we moved them into this exhibit so the EER can focus on effectiveness of teaching and learning. It's customary to provide recommendations to the campus, but we didn't, mostly because we were concerned that it seemed odd to be recommending something to ourselves. Instead, the EER report takes recommendations made in other documents and by various governance groups and the Inquiry Circles and outlines areas for further inquiry and action. S. Davis commended the work of the Circles and hoped that all of their work would remain on the website for future reference. These were a way of maintaining key institution values.

S. Davis noted that if you have read the report, you found a primary document with 6 chapters. Thematic essays correspond to the inquiry circles. The EER is written in the present tense as of June 1, 2009. Davis realizes things have changed since then, but the analysis of the past remains vital and the work of all of the people who participated in the process need to be recognized as well. All information was tied to the strategic plan. This makes the SP a mechanism for consultation, deliberation, and meaningful action.

O'Brien thanked all for working on this. If it was edited to 50 pages, where are they now via the page count? S. Clapper said the translation from Word to the publisher's layout has the effect of reducing the page number count. We're hoping that they won't have to do that much editing. We may need to move tables to the appendix. We're very close to completion. S. Davis said the integrative essay needs to be filled out a bit, and thematic essay needs to be streamlined a bit. Less than 10% needs to be cut. O'Brien wished them all well, and a good night's sleep at the end.

Thompson noted that he was allowed to be on an inquiry circle last year and was thankful. What's the fate of the inquiry circles now? S. Davis indicated that this was an excellent question, and it was asked by one of the visitors last October. At that time he said that the inquiry circles are a project-specific organization and their work should be restricted to the project. What they should do is offer their recommendations to the ordinary bodies and let them do their work. However, the form of the inquiry circles is a really good form and maybe we can use that as a model for arriving at consensus on difficult issues.

Eudey indicated that it's really important to pay attention to the key issues mentioned in the report. These issues indicate what we value and what we believe to be the time and resources needed to be expended on these issues in the future. Prior documents like this have supported the creation or reaffirmation of programs and activities and led to such things as the creation of this Faculty Development Center. We need to make sure that the document says what we want it to say as it will serve as a reference for choices we make in the future.

b. Introduction to Shared Governance (M. Thompson, PowerPoint Presentation)

Thompson shared his PowerPoint presentation and expertise with us. Thompson thanked the Senate for having him as a guest. This fall he'll be delivering a lecture much longer and duller than this and hopes that you'll attend. He identifies the role of the senator with an idealized vision of the classical Greek rhetoricians' involvement in the polis. Shared responsibility and collegiality. Who says that faculty has a share? The legislature recognizes that we have a share based on the statements in HEERA. The Board of Trustees recognizes collegial governance and assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the institution in accordance with basic policy as determined by the board. This includes admission and degree requirements, the curriculum and methods of teaching, academic and professional standards, and the conduct of creative and scholarly activities. The Statewide Academic Senate's Statement on collegiality is a response to the Senate's statement adopted by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, in September of 1985. It affirms our role, as does our Constitution of the General Faculty.

Thompson noted that he has heard discussions and statements that the way some processes have been carried out and recent committee structures is an attempt to equalize all advisory voices. The Board of Trustees recognizes the primary responsibility of the Faculty in personnel, curriculum. We don't emplace policy but we should have a major voice. Thompson noted that he also heard a lot about civility: the first step is to recognize the process to allow faculty, and especially the Senate and standing committees to perform their civic duty on this campus. Allow us to perform our civic functions on campus. We have strong expectations that recommendations from faculty governance will be accepted. Until recently, I haven't seen any academic policy put in place that was not recommended by the faculty. There's tradition and a strong expectation that our academic policy comes from the Senate, and in the case where the President rejects recommended policy, we go back to work on consultation. Why should we have authority on curriculum? Again, faculty have the professional responsibility for making curricular Recommendations. Note the collegiality Academic Policies, from 1985. It's interesting to look back at 1985 to compare the ideas and areas that faculty had primary input and compare it to today. For example, campus policy which governs Auxiliary Institutions, Campus Foundation and Bookstores. I haven't seen any resolution coming through the Academic Senate regarding the Campus Bookstore, Student Affairs policies, co-curricular activities, nor any discussion on the Athletic Program. However, we do still lay claim to the academic calendar. It's not just here on our campus, it's across the institutions. Academic Senate is critical. It's noted that consultation on academic and personnel policy must include dialogue between administration and faculty. The following is from 21/AS/01/SEC/ Statement on Shared Governance:

1. Early inclusion of faculty in identifying issues and in agenda setting.
2. Ongoing consultation, much of it face-to-face, as an iterative process between faculty and administration to reach an understanding
3. Substantive and forthcoming explanations of decisions when agreements cannot be reached.

Consultation on academic and personnel policy must include dialogue between administration and faculty. The basic tenets of the policy approved by the Senate come from our Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer, David Spence. We as a faculty know our institution, our core, our primary mission. We deserve respect for the Academic Senate, for this body. Consultation on academic and personnel policy must include dialogue between administration and faculty. Thank you.

D. Heredia asked for a copy of the slides. Thompson will distribute on ASnet.

S. Regalado appreciates the presentation. It's very important for incoming senators especially. He would also like to add to the section about identifying issues and responsibilities. He would take issue with the ASI president for ignoring past actions as historians would take issue with ignoring past actions. We need to consider them and hold them accountable for decisions that take place; for without doing so you can't make plans for the future. We must take it on a collegial manner to construct a better future. To do less would be irresponsible.

c. ACAC, Academic Calendar Advisory Committee

Filling stated that the report went out to ASnet. We can ask questions or have a discussion or we can wait until UEPC produces its report which is likely to be at the next meeting. No comments, deferred until our next meeting when we have input from the UEPC.

d. Roy McTarnaghan, Chancellor's Office Consultant's visit

Filling announced that as a result of the actions approved at the General Faculty Meeting on September 8th and as a result of O'Brien and Filling's visit to Long Beach, the Chancellor's Office has sent a consultant that will appear throughout the semester. We don't know how McTarnaghan selects who to talk to, nor who McTarnaghan talks to. Filling hopes McTarnaghan will visit with this body to share his progress with us.

Nagel asked whose budget is paying for the consultant and do we know how much it costs. Filling said we were not provided with any of that information albeit we did ask.

8. Open Forum

McGee asked, given the problems we are facing on this campus, and discussions with members of his department and other people, whether or not we want to start a discussion here about whether or not we should have a vote of no confidence for the President and Provost for their actions at this institution. Filling elicited input, realizing that this was perhaps delicate in the nature of it.

O'Brien said it comes as a surprise, but has also heard many raise that issue in private conversations so it's no surprise to hear it here. It was one of the major reasons he and Filling went to the Chancellor's Office to see if there is another possible resolution to the problem. It seems like a vote of no confidence is always on the table, but O'Brien respects McGee for bringing it up.

Thompson asked about the item on R. McTarnagahn, the consultant. Can you give us any information about what is happening? What is projected that might affect this conversation. Filling said confidentiality was a discussion with the consultant and believes that he and R.

McTarnagahn have divergent attitudes. Filling noted that when he acts as speaker he's a public figure and has a need to report to all what he ~~de~~ does. When Steven Filling is the accounting person that's not the case. Filling would be happy to share the information he has shared with the consultant. Filling and McTarnaghan have shared some comments about processes, and Filling's comments on what should be focused on. Filling asked if the Senate wanted copies of these exchanges between Filling and McTarnaghan. Nagel indicated interest. Filling said he will forward information after the meeting and encouraged all to draw their own conclusions about the possible outcomes. Filling discussed with R. McTarnagahn the possible outcomes of the process, but McTarnaghan was hesitant to discuss that. Filling believes McTarnaghan needs to determine the situation before giving a clear answer, not that McTarnaghan is trying to withhold information.

Floyd noted that R. McTarnaghan was a member of the review team on President Shivani's 3-year review and the Chancellor submitted a letter in 2008 that might be worth looking at. Filling will try to track it down.

Saraille said as chapter CFA president he would like to add that faculty are not required to do anything. McTarnaghan is someone who has shown up and decided he wants to consult with us, if you don't care to consult; you are under no obligation to do so. There is no possibility of you being disciplined for not wishing to participate in whatever McTarnaghan has in mind.

Regalado asked if information would come to him and then he would be expected to have a discussion in his department and report back on this. What are we being asked to do? Filling said you summarized that well. Filling would like senators to talk to their colleagues about that because it has a deep impact on what we do here. Either here or via email, sfilling@mac.com is a private email. If you are a conspiracy theorist, use a different computer and off-site email address. I would like your counsel on how this might impact the September 8th decisions. Eudey reminded all that the vote of no confidence is also up for department discussion since this was brought up by McGee in the open forum.

McGee referenced the presentation on shared governance and noted that this is one issue that is being attacked and infringed upon. What is going on, are new courses being offered, not offered? Allocation of resources is critical to the ongoing survival of this public university. Either we're going to agree or disagree with the direction the President wants to go, but we need to make a decision and not let it be halfway. We need to be for it or against it. There are financial and resource based issues that are important to look at.

Filling noted that we've given everyone a lot to think about.

Eudey reminded all about the importance of reading the UEPC and ACAC reports before the next meeting, and to consult with colleagues, so we can have an informed discussion next time.

E. Peterson said that although a lot of financial information was available there is still lots of information like balance sheets with the flow of resources that are not available. E. Peterson noted that at one point we talked about the freedom of information act request. I'm wondering if we have taken that step. Have we made a request about the financials of the organization? Filling said that is in process. He's talked to the media to co-sign and it's in the process.

Morgan-Foster said that within the ACAC report, there's also a lot of appendices. If you want to read them she'll make sure that they are made available in the Academic Senate office. Morgan-Foster said it would take days to scan some of these since their from the early 1970's. She will get these to the Academic Senate office for those who wish to see it. She noted that I. Littlewood also has a binder with this information as well.

Petros said if we go by what the President said in the state of the union address, we couldn't find the figures in any of the data for Stanislaus. If we could have those figures it would be a great benefit to us. M. Bender said there's also the base and total amount and we need to break the FTES number down. It would be good to know what those subsections are so we can look at the impact of fewer FTES. Morgan-Foster said that this would be in the appendices.

9. **Adjournment**
3:50pm