

<p>Academic Senate January 25, 2011</p> <p>Present: Andrews, Baker, Bice, Bettencourt, Broadwater, Burroughs, C. Davis, De Cocker, Drake, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Grobner, Held, Jasek-Rysdahl, Keswick, Manrique, Marcell, McCulley, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Noble, O'Brien, Seong Soo Oh, Peterson, Petrosky, Poole, Provost Strong, Regalado, Rogers, Sarraille, Stessman, Strahm, Stone, Wallace, and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: McGhee for Petratos, Sarraille for Silverman, and Stessman for Drake.</p> <p>Guests: Lauren Byerly, Brian Duggan, Dean Goodwin, Dean Moore, AVPAA/ALO Kornuta, and student visitors.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, February 8, 2011 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>Betsy Eudey, Clerk</p>
--	---

**1. Call to order**  
2:05pm

**2. Approval of Agenda**  
Approved.

**3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of December 7, 2010**  
Will update attendance to include Andrews, Burroughs, Korunta, McCulley and Wallace to those present. Minutes approved with the modification noted above.

**4. Announcements**  
**a. Additional RSCA Funds**

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that this item relates to the last semester when the President identified \$100K in additional RSCA funding. An ad-hoc committee was created to develop a process for distribution, and it was brought to Senate and concerns were raised. The update is that the Provost has met with SEC and will be working with the RSCAPC to develop procedures and guidelines for handling these funds. The Provost has already met with David Lindsay and is meeting with the RSCAPC on Friday. We should have something to share by the end of February. The Provost doesn't want to delay this, but he is working with the governance process.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that the Trust Restoration Planning Committee (TRPC) notes and agendas are now available on the Senate website. They can be found under the "Academic Senate Handbook" on the left hand column at this link <http://www.csustan.edu/facultyhandbook/>

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that Whitney Ragsdale, the Administrative Assistant, in the Senate office is expecting and will be on maternity leave soon. We held a shower for her last week. Diana Bowman will fill in for Whitney on a temporary basis to assist with the spring IDEA evaluation process and the UEPC Subcommittees. Diana will be using Whitney's email while in the Senate office, so you can reach her at [wragdale@csustan.edu](mailto:wragdale@csustan.edu)

Eudey thanked the 37 people that attended the Instructional Institute Day. She distributed announcements that were sent out during the winter intercession. There are several book clubs in session that meet after the Senate Meetings. There was information shared on yoga classes being offered in FDC118. They will have additional items that will continue to come up and a full schedule of activities will be sent out in the next few days.

Marcell confirmed that the Kinesiology club will have Dr. Marta van Loan with US Department of Agriculture and UC Davis whose research topics include obesity, nutrition, exercise, and women's health. She will be speaking on Wednesday, March 9th at 4:30 PM in FDC 118. All students are welcome to attend.

Jasek-Rysdahl welcomed the guests as Deans Goodwin, McNeil, Jaasma, Moore, Nowak and Tuedio. Also present was Dennis Shimek, AVP/AA Halyna Kornuta, Marjorie Jaasma, Brian Duggan, Gina Leguria, and Al Khade.

## **5. Committee Reports/Questions**

O'Brien noted that SWAS met last week. There was lots of discussion regarding the budget and the potential cut to the CSU of \$500 million. Per the discussion, this may not be exactly correct numbers. He believes that Sarraille sent out numerous emails from the legislative office. Not only is this cut likely to happen, but the legislative office is saying how they think it should happen. We'll see how this plays out. In the past, the CSU has received a reduced budget to work out on its own, but now the legislative office is making suggestions as to how to make the cuts.

## **6. First Reading Items**

### **a. 3/AS/10/RSCAPC/GC -- Amendment to Policy on Human Subjects Research**

Poole moved the motion, seconded by C. Davis. Poole deferred to C. Davis.

C. Davis walked us through these changes. In 2007 the current policy was approved and used by the UIRB. They discovered some needed changes, and some were cosmetic and some were not. On the description under the rationale; the first refers to a director of Research and Sponsored Programs. This has been changed to the Institutional Research Board Administrator since it changes over time. Whomever the administrator happens to be, the policy works without changing as people change. If you notice one that wasn't changed, please let her know.

C. Davis noted that in the policy the chair is elected in the fall thru May, but this only works if the chair is on the committee and can be informally present over the summer. At the end of one academic year, before the UIRB elected a chair, the chair was off the committee and not available in the summer. They need someone in place in case there is a dispute or a full board is needed. She was pre-elected chair in May and officially elected in fall. She agreed to serve over the summer, but she was not elected chair until the fall semester. UIRB wants someone serving as chair throughout the summer, so the chair should be selected to start in May and not in the fall to have a clear transition.

C. Davis referred to item #3 on page 5. The GC proposed some language change for proof of UIRB compliance. This is the procedure they follow; and now the policy is connected to the graduate school procedure. Item #4 is on page 6 under UIRB review criteria. They added a bullet that indicates the graduate projects that don't have human subjects but still require UIRB approval according to rules for thesis projects. We currently have no policy speaking to the cases when there are no human subjects. The faculty members would read it and give their approval. It's added here that someone looks at it and the UIRB Administrator or Chair notes no human subjects and gives the approval. This speeds things up and reduces the work for the committee. Anything with human subjects still goes to the faculty, but others that don't get dealt with

quickly.

Item #5 is on page 6. This assumes that there were hard copies of forms being used, but now they refer to website and how to submit applications. So now we're in line with the technology. She noted that the rest is cosmetic. Also, under risks to subjects, the text was originally a text box and not the normal text of the document which led to confusion, so it's moved from a text box and into the document. No words were changed, just the placement. Those are the basic changes, and she's happy to answer questions. These revisions have been approved by the UIRB, GC and RSCAPC.

Marcell thinks this might be a GC issue, but wondered why GC didn't change the process and not to have the UIRB change. Poole said this is a graduate school policy and not a GC policy. It's not in GC purview. Marcell asked how to change it. C Davis said it's up to the graduate school. It's easier to say it comes and gets approval. Poole said to get clearance from the Library; we need evidence that they are approved by the UIRB. Possible language modification in the Graduate School policy can now streamline the process.

Baker asked when did the Graduate School change? There was a push for every thesis to go through this process but he has students who do other things now. He doesn't know if it is within policy or what to do about it, but it seems important to him.

C. Davis said the easiest thing is to say that it comes to the UIRB Administrator to be cleared. There might be language that tells students that they don't have to come to UIRB, but we're telling students in the MBA that they need UIRB approval. If things change we want to deal with it quickly so as to not to give the students the runaround.

Baker clarified that not all Thesis must go thru UIRB. C. Davis said that no matter what they appreciate them coming thru UIRB.

McGhee said that it will be helpful to have this developed pattern to distinguish people in situations that may not be have consistent patterns. You would have one location that it has to go thru to establish consistency so that no one can say it was a human subject and it wasn't approved by UIRB. This could cut down on potential problems in the future.

Strahm thinks we live in a risk society, and it's wise to have it go thru UIRB.

C. Davis said that you must have approval before you start any human subject's research. If it's not a human subject you must have approval from the dept.

Bender supports approval of this as many grantors require that you've been reviewed.

McGhee said if it's done to meet Library requirements, and that everyone should do it just in case someone didn't think it met UIRB. We shouldn't be allowed to do it at the end. A standardized approach would offer consistency; especially if they change what they would do in the process. If they change what they do in their thesis; it may start out with it not being human subjects and then migrate into a gray area. An approval would help and create consistency creating a defensible stance at the beginning.

Marcell is in full support of the policy for 99% of it. He uses the UIRB and has gotten his research approved. He thinks that we're going down a path where the UIRB is adapting to what the Graduate School should be doing. If we're studying rats, it's not a human subject's research. He's glad that the UIRB has a line where they can decide this doesn't require full approval.

C. Davis said they don't get animal ones, they get archival data that looks like human subjects but aren't. Someone interviewing experts into the field as sources, not human subjects. They're using the people as others would use a journal article or book. This is looked at by the committee members. Others are using human archival data that are outside of the UIRB. When it's animals it automatically goes to the Animal Welfare committee.

Marcell withdrew his last statement, as it seems there is a policy at the Graduate School that works. He gives it his full support.

Burroughs supports the changes and clarifies that if a proposal is submitted to the UIRB, the committee can now have a reaction that it is beyond their purview. The amendment is not creating new policy, but creating a means to respond to possible IRB proposal. She supports other changes in the document to make it more clear and consistent. Having been on the committee for a number of years, this will smooth out the process for whatever reason. Other issues may be worth discussion by GC or GS. This is simply a mechanism for the UIRB so people are not held up or delayed in doing their research.

Garcia said that as a current UIRB member he wants to support this. He clarified that our confusion over research and non-research under federal guidelines all human subjects' research must go under URIB which includes archival data or existing data without contact with human subjects. UIRB can decide it is exempt from further purview, but this decision must be made by the UIRB and not by the researcher. The other point is that this policy covers theses and projects. Thesis involves research; a project doesn't necessarily involve research. It may be someone putting together a musical piece, program, or curriculum. What is the role of UIRB in those instances? He wants to provide the UIRB with the language to say that projects of this nature are outside of the review of UIRB and that the student may proceed. The revised policy provides the UIRB with this option.

Strahm emphasized Garcia's point. When in graduate school a woman a year ahead of her was doing archival research on a New York radical. She interviewed journalists and people who knew her. She finished her dissertation and the family of the subject sued the school because she hadn't gone thru the UIRB, and she didn't get a Ph.D. because she didn't go thru UIRB at that school. It's important that we have this in place where people can go and be ensured that their research can pass the muster, and questions can be addressed in that appropriate area instead of having something extreme happen at the end.

C. Davis said the information was accessible public data and wasn't human subjects. Some were hypothetical projects that were beyond the purview. Some was data available from city governments that wasn't necessarily about people, so they were not human subjects by any sense. Right now the UIRB Administrator doesn't see human subjects but still sends it to the UIRB member. Even our RSCA grants note in the letter that you must have UIRB approval to get funds released. These need to happen quickly, so that's why the term of chair is changed so they can happen quickly and over the summer if necessary.

Regalado asked for clarification under the definition of archival research. Most if not all archival research has something to do with humans, some who have been dead for years. Does that fall into the purview of what is discussed under these guidelines?

C. Davis noted that on page 5 it mentions public use of data files. When identifiers have been stripped, review is not allowed. When using information where items are explicit, it falls in other areas.

Baker appreciates clarification of the difference. He's looking for a procedural term to reword item #4 in the

rationale that doesn't state that all research must come to them. It also occurred to him that that this applies to dissertations as well but thesis is noted everywhere. He wonders if dissertation should be added.

**b. 8/AS/10/UEPC/GC -- Pre-Health Professions Certificate Program**

Stessman moved the motion, seconded by Grobner. Stessman deferred to Grobner. Grobner said that this certificate program is designed for students with a bachelor's degree that have a change of career objectives, and want to enter into a professional program. This is a post-baccalaureate program to fill in the science part of the application. Five to six years ago, the sciences had many of these post-baccalaureate students apply to medical school. With the current budget problems and the increase of majors, it's virtually impossible for these students to return as post-baccalaureate or as Open University students. There is still a demand and this is addressing that demand. This program is tailored for those in the workforce who want to return to go to medical school. There is current interest from graduates in psychology, sociology, x-ray techs, nurses, etc. who need this core set of courses. It is an accelerated program offering 42 units in 15 months with evening and weekend schedules. This program has been approved by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Committee, the CNS Curriculum Committee with all the Dept. Chairs involved, the Dean, GC, UEPC and FBAC. Because of the length of the process, Grobner asked to waive the first reading and go to a second reading. Seconded by Bender.

Nagel asked if there was urgency to move to a second reading. Grobner said there was a survey done, and there are a number of students interested who are losing interest because of the delays. He has faculty set to teach the courses, so if we change timelines there is some urgency. Bender said that maybe if we got this approved the students could take the prerequisites this spring.

Stessman said there were concerns about the proposal and wondered if these have been addressed. Filling also wondered if the concerns have been addressed.

Sarraille doesn't think that there is irrefutable proof that these concerns won't cause problems in the future, but in the FBAC statement they didn't feel that these concerns present an impediment to the initial implementation of the program. It's up to the Senate to follow up on any concerns, but that's not what FBAC was directing or requesting the Senate to do.

Eudey clarified what Bender said "that maybe if we got this approved the students can enroll for these prerequisites in the spring." Eudey noted that even if this resolution passes today we can't forward it to the President for 10 days after today's minutes are approved. This process can take up to three and a half weeks and the President has 30 days to respond.

Petrosky asked if moving to a second reading would preclude making changes. Jasek-Rysdahl said it would allow making amendments. Nagel clarified that the amendments could only be made to the resolution and not the documents.

Filling said he's not sure if the MOU in the packet is the most current, and if we approve this we might not be approving the correct MOU.

Grobner said there were changes in a different version of the MOU that had been signed, and he didn't realize the MOU in the packet was not the most current one. Grobner said that a statement of contention was removed from the MOU.

Petrosky spoke against moving to a second reading if we can't make changes to the MOU. Grobner said some paragraphs have been reordered, and there are some differences.

Eudey encouraged removing the motion until we have more information.

Petrosky thinks any time a college enters into a weak MOU that it has implications for others. We must be cautious when substituting courses offered stateside with the same courses taught in self-support. We may see some rationale because some people can't get into those classes, but it's the same classes. He noted that there is no stipulation about what percentage is taught by tenure or tenure-track faculty. Grobner noted that somewhere in this MOU it states some minimum that with sustained enrollment should result in hiring of new tenure track faculty.

Grobner removed the motion, agreed to by Bender. Grobner dismissed himself to copy the revised MOU to share with the Senate.

Poole said that the students who are targeted are those with a bachelor degree, who want to come back, but this is not a master's program and there is no current category for them to come back in. While she understands what is being said about displacing; the problem is that students don't have a way to enroll because they already have a degree. This is trying to make it work for that unique group.

Marcell said that with the two-pass system, these students fall at the end of the line as they're classified as post-baccalaureates in the system.

Sarraille said that is a technical matter, and we do have a classification to put them as post-baccalaureate. He knows that the CSU is discouraging admission of those students by giving them a low priority, but the classification does exist. It's not a classification issue.

Petrosky said that we have low priority students who can't get in because there are not enough seats available. So are Biology and Chemistry faculty stipulating that future demand is taught by self-support?

Grobner said this is specifically for students who have bachelors. There is no stipulation that anyone has to teach, as all faculty involved are volunteering to take on this load. He's also been told to watch that this does not hamper RPT. The way classes have been filling up; this is one way for the post-baccalaureates to get into the courses. We are admitting post-baccalaureates, but it's few and far between.

Grobner noted that they have faculty volunteering to teach courses in the first go-round. If they're not interested in teaching in the second round, the dept. chairs have the authority to search for and select others to teach.

Dean McNeil said this program is for providing access to professionals, and this is not a way to sift off demand at the undergraduate level via self-support. We have growth in other courses and are adding sections as needed. We have added substantially to these courses at the undergraduate level because of growth in Pre-Med, Pre-Dental and Pre-Pharmacy. This need is being covered on the stateside. We'd like to also cover those who want to return to fulfill a dream of attending a professional school of medicine. Students want access to these kinds of programs.

Sarraille pointed out that FBAC looked at EO #1047 which regulates the conditions under which programs can be offered. One question was under what provisions of EO #1047 this certificate would be allowed. A couple of things have to be true. Getting something beyond what is available with state support possibly does apply. FBAC expressed concern about another aspect, which is that classes comprising the proposed program should not supplant or limit offerings of state supported programs. He's less sure that would be the

case. There is a possibility that these courses might compete with other courses offered on campus. We couldn't rule that out so we expressed a concern.

New copies of the Pre-Health Professions Certificate MOU were received, and Grobner pointed out the changes. On page two, the "Instructional and Academic Responsibilities" section is new. Also new are the signatures on the MOU.

Strahm asked what happened to the information about the requirements for a baccalaureate. Grobner stated that this is the MOU, and that information is contained in the program proposal.

Dean McNeil noted that they would not push or bump stateside courses in order for this program to take place, and the Provost would back that up. They would utilize open labs and classroom facilities on weekends and evenings to ensure that. We have lab rooms that are available at night. This is a program for 24 students so can accommodate it in non-occupied rooms. Categorically, this program will not bump stateside courses.

Provost Strong said supplanting is a violation of the contract and we wouldn't do that. Special Sessions is basically a different revenue stream using non-state funding offering the same academic programs or those designed for a specific market segment. The program is controlled by the academic unit. Special Sessions can move stateside if funding comes available. If this turns out to be a program that grows, we can hire faculty to support that program. The notion that we have to put ratios in the MOU takes control away from the academic units that govern these programs, so he doesn't encourage it.

Filling said that another question about the MOU is that it does not include the compensation table that UEE passed a couple of years ago. Due to the high cost of the program exceptions should be made. You can make the case that some faculty may not want to give up a Saturday to teach at the lower pay scale.

Grobner said there is an additional \$250 per WTU available to bring salaries up, and no one is being forced to teach in this program. If they're not feeling they're being compensated appropriately or are not available, the dept. chairs will aid in identifying a suitable faculty member to teach in the program. Most faculty will be making the 1/30 salary and this is noted in the budget for this program.

Garcia said that in the new MOU the planning and review section and discontinuation was removed. Why was that? This is a MOU between the college and dept. chairs, and there is a different one between the college and UEE.

Dean McNeil said that in the documents Ms. Pierce sent out, there is a policy between UEE and the college that includes the discontinuation information. The MOU between the College and the Departments addressed assigning faculty, grades, surplus fund distribution, etc. This is a unique MOU within the college and participating programs that also includes stipends for faculty pay.

Poole said that it mentions the MCAT preparatory course, but it doesn't say who teaches it or who decides who is teaching it. Are there other tests they might need for other professional schools that might need to be included, like GRE? Grobner said the MCAT course generally is taught by Kaplan. He's hoping to get a Kaplan course here for our own students and these students.

Stone noted that the MOU makes it sound like this is a done deal and we don't have that yet. Grobner said this MOU is between the dept. and college, and the MCAT is part of the program.

Marcell said there are Kinesiology students that don't take these courses and many end up in private school. Majors have a choice to take these courses at local community colleges which cost a lot less. If we want to be competitive and keep these students here, we need an undergraduate certificate with these courses. This is a great opportunity for our students to return to their Alma Mater to take classes they need to move forward to graduate school.

Poole asked if you could take out the sentence about the MCAT course. Grobner said it can be deleted.

Grobner moved for a second reading, Bender seconded. The vote on the movement to a second reading was 22 in favor, 13 against and 4 abstentions. The motion did not get sufficient votes to move to a second reading. This item will be a second reading at the next Senate meeting on February 8th.

Jasek-Rysdahl asked Grobner to ensure that the Senate office receives the most recent information and all the MOUs.

## **7. Discussion Items**

### **a. Administration's Response to 9/AS/10/SEC Resolution on UBAC**

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that in the fall semester the Senate passed a resolution regarding UBAC, identifying items the Senate thought needed to be addressed. Provost Strong responded at the end of the fall semester, but he was not able to get to everyone before break. He got a request soon after the Governor's budget came out, and he wanted to act quickly. Provost Strong asked SEC to respond to what was forwarded to us and said that he needed input. We sent out information over break, and we received some responses which have been copied and made available to the Senate. He wants feedback from the Senate on this as a discussion item. KJR took names off the emails.

Sarraille has been thinking about this and noted that we already have a process by which we select membership in university-wide committees. What good will it do at this time to consider a different way to choose members of UBAC? The situation with the budget is something that is going to create workload for us, so why try to reconfigure ways of doing things.

McGhee has no real problem with changing of the numbers and makeup of UBAC, but he has a problem with the recommendation that we elect our representatives by college. This is especially true since the change that was proposed increases the number of people with budget knowledge on administration side by adding a budget director. This approach has the potential, although not guaranteed, to restrict the faculty from putting the most qualified people on the committee who understand the process. Having been on the committee forever it seems; he's seen the situation where statements made espousing budget knowledge that goes counter to accounting and budgeting processes. He finds it to be a problem to potentially restrict the number of people who know how it works from a faculty standpoint. If we decide to this on our own, fine, but don't allow it to be dictated to us how we select our critical faculty members for long term success of our University.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted to Strong that he had offered modifications.

Strong proposed to Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl and Koni Stone to add a member from the Senate and another MPP to the committee because it was a suggestion from Kelvin that there was not representation from the Senate with this current configuration when electing faculty from the colleges. It seemed like a reasonable point, so he responded to it.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that he did not suggest this. He provided the same email that indicated that there was no connection to governance, but he didn't suggest we make this change. Strong retracted the comment.

Filling was a member of UBAC for years and echoed that he's not sure this makes a significant improvement in how UBAC operates. He wonders if it's better for the Senate to decline to participate. It is broken and we need to fix it. The problems are tied to the current leadership. We asked for meetings and financial information and were told no. It's clear that it's broken and adding more people requires a substantive change in the leadership of this committee.

O'Brien had a general question. He agrees with the leadership issue since having been a UBAC member for two years. It seems strange what we're supposed to do with this. On the back page it says the President will appoint students and staff. Are we as faculty being asked to impose that on them? It seems we should all be elected to the things we do. If we say yes, does it mean we impose conditions on students and staff? He wouldn't agree with that.

Eudey noted her concern of how representation of staff and students has been done in the past. It's inappropriate for us to make recommendations of how this should happen. This should be left to conversations for ASI and the staff Labor Council. She also appreciated the email comment that indicated that not all areas are represented such as Counseling and the Library. College representatives can't appropriately represent our faculty colleagues in these areas.

Shimek said the practice in the past for administration is to get nominations from ASI to get members to serve on UBAC, and they will continue to do that. Also, they've gone to the Labor Council to consult with staff to obtain representation on the committee, and there is no intention to change past practice.

Nowak still wants to see students on this committee. This is a great learning opportunity for them, and to help to prepare them for leadership positions in the future in nonprofit or profit. How they're selected is less critical than having students there sitting and listening and learning.

Moore said faculty come from the colleges so wondered why Eudey felt they were not. Eudey noted library, counseling and coaching faculty are not in the colleges. Moore asked if they wanted to serve. Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that some have.

Regalado asked if there is anything more that is not listed here from SEC? Jasek-Rysdahl indicated that there was not anything more.

Strong said that the structure of the co-chairs has been effective. He doesn't think the system is broken based on what he's seen. He sees this as in the best interest of the University. A Presidential committee is not a Senate committee.

O'Brien returned to Shimek's comment, and wanted to thank him for that. When on UBAC the staff had an election and Dawn McCulley, Phil Rojas and Frank Borrelli were elected.

Filling said UBAC's initiation was an attempt to get the campus together to deal with a difficult budget. We had a representative committee with bargaining units. This is not the President's committee, as it was a committee that advised the President. It appears to be on its way to becoming the President's committee. If that's what the President wants he's welcomed to do that, but it shouldn't be speaking for the university community because it does not.

Moore said we should note that the last two years and especially last year we've had interims, and we do in fact have new leadership. If you look at that process, we don't have interims as co-chairs now. Those things make a big difference for us. That's where his optimism is with the committee structure.

Peterson feels should speak up because Pahal took the time to address how people are selected, and it's important to faculty and students. She's disturbed because the past process wasn't indicated into the documents. She saw the word "Select" and wants it to be clearer that it would be a process where students are chosen by the students and not the President. The selection of who is on the committee is a very important part of the process. She also thinks we're seeing a lot of frustration because people who have worked on the committee, and it takes a lot of work to understand these budget documents, and they do feel that they need a lot of information. She can see how there can be disagreement about people not getting enough information. This is the same as when students come to us and say they don't understand the instructions; we have to understand they are not sufficiently clear. If they think things are missing, we need to go back and look at it. If people with Ph.D.'s in accounting ask for more information, we disparage their expertise.

Eudey said it is also important to remember that there are some positives in the plan, such as the commitment to monthly meetings, and agendas and minutes will be made available. She's still concerned with the suggested membership and leadership which needs to be addressed. This may be the dawn of a new day, but it's hard to look at it positively when looking back at past experience. There is a lot that is positive, but there is still more to do to improve on it.

Moore acknowledged Eudey's comments about positives. Too often we go back to past history, and some bad past history. He's hopeful that we can do more to mention the positives because it will take this to get thru the cuts to come.

Sarraille is concerned as to what Jasek-Rysdahl will accomplish with this discussion in 10 minutes. It's important if there are Senators here who want to see a change in the way of doing the selection of faculty representatives for UBAC to change, then we need for them to assert that now. In his opinion, if he doesn't hear some pretty strong recommendations to move to a college model then he will assume that the Senate is supportive of the current process. Please take the time to let us know how you feel.

McGhee said that in some cases some aren't aware, now the only continuing members in the proposal are the co-chairs assuming they are not replaced. The Provost and VP of Finance will be the same year to year. From our standpoint, we have a process where some continuity is established. We had the chair and chair-elect of FBAC to allow a two-year history of people working with the budget. This allows the faculty to have some continuity. We also had a representative from CFA and one elected person from the faculty at large. Some continuity is a process that works. We may have discontinuity and more things can fall through the cracks. There is a learning curve involved with the process. We want people there who understand the process so they can do a better job. He's speaking against faculty not being allowed to create our own structure.

Eudey clarified the elections issue. We have lots of committees on this campus with representatives from colleges elected by all general faculty. In reading the proposal, it indicates that the UBAC representatives will be elected only by the colleges. Maybe they're not aware that they are leaving out other groups, and only those college groups will have a say. She's not saying that one model is better, but this is changing two aspects of what is done in governance.

Garcia said we should hold strong to the existing/current process of selecting faculty representatives to

UBAC. He's not sure why we are considering a change to faculty representation since there was never a concern raised by the Senate about the selection process of faculty on UBAC. He thinks there are other issues that are much more important. For example, the co-chair structure, allowing students to have a much stronger voice about who represents them. He doesn't want to just focus on what is a non-issue.

Dean Nowak likes the idea of someone from each college since each college has its own budget challenges and issues and some programs are different than others. It's a good idea to have a faculty voice to express the differences when things become challenging.

Dean McNeil noted the uniqueness of the colleges and that each college carries a large footprint in the University budget. He would like to have members from each college who are considering the uniqueness in art, sciences, and humanities in discussions, as tough decisions will be made this year. McNeil trusts the faculty from his college to pay attention to the skills and experience of people they elect. Nothing precludes the colleges to continue to elect people. McNeil noted that he is speaking from a college with representation on UBAC already, but that we should be looking at the diversity of the colleges and make sure they are included in these discussions.

Provost Strong responded to the question in the Senate resolution about faculty in each college, which constituency group on UBAC and how many each should have. They were responding to that. There is an executive order about local responsibility for student participation. The EO talks about how the process should happen and says that nominations of representatives are made and appointed by the President. That is how they are proposing the decision to be made. It is in keeping with the coded memorandum from the Chancellor's Office.

Werling spoke on the consortium meeting that he and Strahm attended in Merced on SB1440. They found out that the community colleges believe that whatever they choose as our GE requirements for our four-year degrees will be the GE requirements. They will tell us what the GE requirements are. This was according to the people who were there and interpreting what SB1440 says.

Strahm said that on February 25th, discipline input groups from Accounting, Business Management, Marketing, English, and Political Science said that our departments should take this very seriously.

Strong said that SB1440 was on the Provost's agenda last week, and everything in the bill is local. There is no forced articulation with the community colleges, so they must have misunderstood the situation. We should take this seriously and be involved, but the community colleges will not tell us what courses we will articulate.

Bender said the community colleges cannot dictate CSU requirements. GE requirements go through a review process by the CSU and Community Colleges cannot circumvent that process. SB1440 establishes a community college transfer degree with a minimum number of units in a specific major that guarantees admission to the CSU. It does not say anything about GE. It does establish some language about the number of units degrees must be. Bender is involved with statewide Ag initiatives and working on this Transfer Degree process and that the CSU needs to be part of the discussion. He will share more information with Jasek-Rysdahl to share with the Senate.

## **8. Open Forum**

## **9. Adjournment** 4:00pm