

<p>Academic Senate August 30, 2011</p> <p>Present: Baker, Bettencourt, Bice, Bolton, Broadwater, Buhler-Scott, Burroughs, Colnic, De Vries, Espinoza, Filling, Foreman, Garcia, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Hauselt, Held, Keswick, Khodabandeh, Lindsay, Manrique, Marcell, Marshall, M. Mayer, McCulley, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Silverman, Stone, Strahm, Strong, Tan, Vang, and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Diane Crayton for Judith Keswick</p> <p>Guests: Mark Thompson, John Sarraille, Shauna Keeler, Lauren Byerly, Robert Marino, Annie Hor, Kevin Nemeth, Halyna Kornuta, Jim Tuedio, Kathy Norman, June Boffman, Linda Nowak, Glenn Pillsbury, Betsy Eudey, Gina Leguria, Wendy Smith and Brian Duggan.</p> <p>Isabel Silveira Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Consent Item: 12/AS/11/SEC Standing Rules of the Academic Senate. Approved.</p> <p>First Reading: 14/AS/11/SEC Resolution on President Searches (Sense of Senate).</p> <p>INFORMATION ITEM: Shared Governance PowerPoint (M. Thompson)</p> <p>INFORMATION ITEM: College Reorganization Report</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>September 13, 2011 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by: Chris De Vries, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. Call to order
2:04pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Added item 9 as first reading item: 14/AS/11/SEC Resolution on President Searches (Sense of Senate). Filling motioned and O'Brien seconded. Approved as amended.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of May 10, 2011 (distributed electronically)

Approved.

4. Introductions

Speaker Stone asked the Senators to introduce themselves followed by all guests present. Guests present were as follows: Lauren Byerly, Interim Dean of CNS Robert Marino, Interim Dean of the Library Annie Hor, UEE Dean Kevin Nemeth, AVP of Academic Affairs Halyna Kornuta, Interim Dean of CHSS Jim Tuedio, Dean of COE Kathy Norman, Interim Dean of CHHS June Boffman, Dean of CBA Linda Nowak, Dean of COA Daryl Moore, Campus Instructional Designer Glenn Pillsbury, FDC Director Betsy Eudey, Human Resources Manager Gina Leguria, Campus Compliance Officer Wendy Smith, Director of Learning Services Brian Duggan, ASI University Affairs Representative Shauna Keeler, Professor of English Mark Thompson, and CFA President John Sarraille. Welcome everyone.

5. Announcements

a. WASC Visit Announcement

Kornuta announced that on November 7 and 8, 2011 the WASC team will be here. She noted that these dates were a change from the previous September dates. They will place the information on the following website: <http://www.csustan.edu/wasc/specialvisit.html>. The special visit report will be posted on August 31st.

Each member of the special visit team is familiar with the CSU system. They've had a collaborative contribution of faculty members and many individuals working on the WASC visit. She encouraged all to review the report and visit with the team members. They are arranging multiple opportunities for faculty to address the team. She recommended the faculty forum scheduled the afternoon of Monday, November 7th.

b. TRPC Report

Speaker Stone announced that the TRPC is meeting every other Tuesday morning. They met on August 18th and 30th, and they discussed a number of carry over items: UEE policy, UBAC membership, Committee membership in general and the Endowed Professor policy. All of these have been delegated to various faculty committees for their input.

They also discussed the process of implementing Recommendation #6 of Resolution 9/AS/11 K. Jasek-Rysdahl, K. Stone, J. Strong, D. Shimek Recommendations of the Trust Restoration Planning Committee.

They're in the process of implementing TRPC recommendation #6 as follows:

Recommendation 6

The Speaker, URPTC, and FAC will work with administration to develop a process to gather information regarding RPT from the provost, deans, department RPT committees, department chairs, and candidates who are going through the review cycle or have just completed the review cycle.

The goal will be to gather information about the perceptions people have about the RPT policy and procedures. This information will be used to examine our policies and procedures to determine if any steps can be taken to reduce the conflict that is created every year on this campus. Any recommendations will go through the normal faculty governance evaluation process.

Rationale:

Faculty members perceive that administrators want to increase research expectations and that administrators are applying their own criteria and definitions for acceptable research when evaluating faculty for retention, promotion, and tenure. There have been questions from deans and other administrators regarding elaborations and their role in reviewing the elaborations.

Process indicators:

This process will begin in Fall 2011 and will be ongoing.

They're in the process of gathering data for RPT and will work with FAC, URPTC, and the Provost. The Provost will have doodle poll in the making.

We were joined by Interim Dean Marino to hear his perspective of the Fall General Faculty meeting. We have two upcoming Trustee visits: Lou Monville on September 27th and Peter Mehas on November 21st. They realized that TRPC has not been posting notes and agendas on the Senate website and we will be working on posting them soon. Speaker Stone reiterated the importance of holding the dates of November 7th and 8th for the WASC special visit, and she thanked the Research Team and Assessment Team for all their work. Applause.

c. Clickers

Speaker Stone announced that Clickers are coming and she's working with Brian Duggan. They will save time and money and will be fun. They will be used for voting anonymously. The votes will go into the computer and be calculated.

Mehran Khodabandeh said that in ASI votes can't be done anonymously without breaking the confines of the Gloria Romero Act. ASI votes are subject to Gloria Romero and Mehran Khodabandeh recommends that the Senate look into whether or not they fall under any of the public record acts in California to avoid potential future legal action.

d. Reading day, 12/7/11 (Bill Foreman)

Foreman explained that December 7th is a day off. It's a regular work day, but we do not hold classes that day to even out the number of MWF. Foreman's personal perspective is that there's no reason to call it a reading day. The purpose is to even out the number of class meeting days and meet the policy obligation.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

None.

7. Information Items:

a. Introduction to Shared Governance PowerPoint (2:30PM Time Certain, Mark Thompson)

As the Senate is taking on new Senator representatives, it should be noted that you are the representative body of the general faculty and this role should be taken seriously. We don't approve personnel policy we recommend with the strong expectation that our recommendations will be followed. We have a statement on shared governance which is a decade old (resolution 21/AS/01/SEC). The Senate approved it and it has not been endorsed by the administration.

The system's former Executive Vice Chancellor, David Spence, provided these ideas as "Critical Elements".

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 understanding, and,
3. Substantive and forthcoming explanations of decisions when agreement cannot be reached

WASC has said that on this campus "long-simmering tensions between faculty and the senior administration have risen to levels of potential disruption to academic operations." Shared decision making is a means to try to remedy that. Applause.

Thompson's slide show will be shared with ASnet electronically prior to the next Senate meeting.

b. College Reorganization Report (David Lindsay)

David Lindsay was a member of the College Reorganization Committee and Ian Littlewood was chair but unable to attend today.

On August 19, 2010, UBAC made the following recommendation to the President:

"UBAC recommends that the President constitute a committee, as specified in the Academic Reorganization Policy, to explore the financial and pedagogical impact of combining two or more of the current colleges. " The Ad Hoc Reorganization Exploratory Committee was formed by Speaker Jasek-Rysdahl and Provost Strong on November 23, 2010. It was comprised of a faculty member from each college, the Director of

Retention Services, the Director of Institutional Research, a Faculty Affairs Specialist, the AVP of Academic Affairs, the President of ASI and the Senior Budget Analyst from the Provost's Office.

The Committee's activities were divided into two phases. From its formation until April 2011 it attempted to estimate the cost/benefit of reducing the number of colleges by one, possibly two. The Committee then moved to the second phase of its operation, to develop one or more proposals for further consideration. During its second phase the Committee solicited information from members of the campus community. A survey was developed and distributed to all members of the campus community for individual feedback; and a campus wide forum was held in May of 2011.

The Committee estimated that the elimination of one college would yield an ongoing cost saving of between \$125,000 and \$300,000. There would also be a one-time cost to making the transition to fewer than the current six colleges.

The Ad Hoc Committee was charged with developing one or more proposals for further consideration by a separate committee in the Fall 2011 semester. The Committee developed four proposals. The Committee did not attempt to evaluate the relative merits of the proposals, or even to determine that the university should change its current college structure. The Ad Hoc Committee did not consider any changes to the existing departments and programs; the same 29 departments are in all proposals.

In summary, the Committee is not recommending any particular change to the college structure; it is not evaluating the merits of any structure or structures; it is not making any recommendations about action to be taken; and it is not considering any changes to departments or programs.

The Ad Hoc Committee makes the following four proposals for college structures. The decision as to which department or program goes in which college should be made principally by the departments and programs in collaboration with administration.

1. The current 6 college structure

The first proposed structure is tantamount to proposing that the UBAC recommendation to reduce the number of colleges not be pursued any further. The six existing colleges would remain as currently constituted.

1. College of the Arts
2. College of Business Administration
3. College of Education
4. College of Human and Health Sciences
5. College of Humanities & Social Sciences
6. College of Natural Sciences

2. A 5 college structure

In this proposed structure the number of colleges is reduced by one by eliminating the College of the Arts, and redistributing departments in the College of the Arts, the College of Humanities & Social Sciences, and the College of Human and Health Sciences to form two new colleges with a focus on Art and Humanities and on Social and Behavioral Science.

1. College of Arts and Letters
2. College of Business Administration
3. College of Education
4. College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
5. College of Natural Sciences

3. An alternative 5 college structure

In this proposed structure the number of colleges is reduced by one by eliminating the College of the Human and Health Sciences, and redistributing departments into the College of Humanities & Social Sciences, the College of Education (to be renamed as College of Professional Studies), and the College of Natural Sciences.

1. College of the Arts
2. College of Business Administration
3. College of Professional Studies
4. College of Humanities & Social Sciences
5. College of Natural Sciences

4. A 4 college structure

If both the College of the Arts and the College of the Human and Health Sciences are eliminated, and their departments redistributed to other colleges then a four college structure can be obtained.

1. College of Business Administration
2. College of Professional Studies
3. College of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences
4. College of Natural Sciences

The Ad Hoc Committee has not attempted to evaluate any of the above proposals. A new committee will be evaluating these proposals during the 2011-12 academic year.

Garcia asked if there is a time table for the new committee and work they will be doing. It seems to be urgent as we're still doing Dean searches.

Lindsay stated that the trigger hasn't been pulled and policy dictates that they will have a limited amount of time to conclude their recommendation.

Khodabandeh suggested that he didn't want to take quick action on this topic. We already made one transition and we don't want changes to the college structure to occur again in another 5 yrs. This needs to be well thought out for the next 20 yrs. and not just 5 yrs. This shouldn't be hurried.

Provost Strong thinks that the Provost and Speaker need to prepare a reorganization committee. He'll email the Speaker in the next few days.

8. Consent Items

13/AS/11/SEC – 2011/2012 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate (Sense of the Senate)

Speaker Stone noted that SEC made a few changes to reaffirm that you must be present to speak at Senate meetings. You can send someone to read your statement but we're not able to Skype anyone in. She also noted the 3 minute limit. The resolution is as follows:

12/AS/11/SEC--STANDING RULES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE INTRODUCTION

The General Faculty has delegated to the Academic Senate the authority to act in its behalf on matters

related to policy and advocacy. All actions of the Academic Senate are subject to referendum by the General Faculty. In the absence of a call for referendum, Academic Senate actions are General Faculty statements.

The Standing Rules of the Academic Senate are intended to supplement the Constitution and Robert's Rules. Their purpose is to facilitate the orderly and efficient conduct of Senate business. The Speaker may appoint a Senate Parliamentarian for any scheduled meeting or meetings of the Academic Senate.

The Standing Rules will take effect when approved by the Academic Senate (a two-thirds majority of the voting membership is required). They will remain in effect until amended or rescinded by the Senate (the same two-thirds vote is required).

RESOLUTIONS AND OTHER ACTION ITEMS

Resolutions and other items that are intended for consideration and possible action by the Senate are to be submitted in finished form to the Senate Executive Committee for placement on the Senate agenda.

It is expected that the necessary research, writing, and editing of resolutions will have been completed prior to their submission to the SEC.

Committees and others proposing a resolution should be prepared to address the following:

- a) the issue that prompted the resolution;*
- b) the degree of urgency, if any;*
- c) the salient features of the resolution;*
- d) the resolution's relationship to established CSU and/or CSUS policy;*
- e) the contribution to a learning centered University and strategic goals;*
- f) the resolution's relationship, if any, to other previous or pending actions by the faculty;*
- g) the fiscal implications of the resolution, if any;*
- h) the probable consequences of Senate action;*
- i) whether the resolution should be a "sense of the senate" or should go to the President for signature*
- j) the desired effective date, if approved;*
- k) the wording of the policy as proposed.*

Administrative liaisons to Academic Senate and General Faculty Committees, including Subcommittees and Ad hoc Committees, will inform the Speaker of the Faculty via a memorandum, with a copy to the Speaker's Executive Assistant, of all proposed agenda items, including estimated deadlines for action, before, or at the same time, they are presented to that particular committee.

To assure expeditious treatment, resolutions should be submitted to the SEC a minimum of 10 days prior to a Senate meeting and should follow the format of resolved clauses followed by a rationale in paragraph form.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

The schedule of Senate meetings for the year is approved by the SEC. The Senate will meet at least once each month during the academic year. Regular meetings are scheduled on Tuesdays from 2:00 – 4:00pm in the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center Reference Room.

Academic Senators unable to attend a Senate meeting may give a proxy to a full time faculty member in their department. The proxy should be in the form of an email sent to the Clerk by the absent Senator or by memorandum, signed by the absent Senator and handed by the proxy-holder to the Clerk before

participating in the Senate meeting. Members of the SEC also elected to be a representative of their department will have the right to cast two votes; one for their department, and one for SEC.

The agenda for each Senate meeting is prepared by the SEC. The agenda, copies of resolutions, and the minutes of the previous Senate meeting are sent to each Senator approximately 5 calendar days prior to each Senate meeting.

The quorum for Senate meetings is 60% of the voting membership of the Senate. (In 2010-2011 there are 46 voting members; thus, the quorum is 28.)

TYPICAL AGENDA FOR A SENATE MEETING (see explanatory notes below)

- 1. Call to order*
- 2. Approval of Agenda*
- 3. Approval of Minutes of previous meeting*
- 4. Announcements*
- 5. Questions concerning Reports*
- 6. Information Items*
- 7. Consent Items*
- 8. Regular Business*
 - a. --First Readings*
 - b. --Second Readings (Action Items)*
- 9. Discussion Items*
- 10. Open Forum*
- 11. Adjournment*

"Announcements"

Limited to brief statements on matters which may be of interest or concern to the entire Senate.

"Questions concerning Reports"

Committee Chairs will disseminate brief reports electronically to Senators a day or two before meetings. Senators will have the opportunity to raise questions in response to the reports.

"Information Items"

Any non-action item that might be of interest to the General Faculty. Sometimes an item is placed on the agenda under "Information" for clarification or notification before being placed on the agenda as a First Reading item.

"Consent Items"

This is an assemblage of presumably routine or non-controversial agenda items. They are scheduled early in the meeting so that they can be dispensed with quickly, i.e., without extensive discussion or debate. Items on the Consent Agenda that elicit objections will be shifted to the regular agenda.

"First Readings" and "Second Readings"

Resolutions will be handled on a "First Reading" - "Second Reading" basis. Normally, the "First Reading" will occur at one Senate meeting and the "Second Reading" at the following meeting. This procedure provides for: a free and open discussion of resolutions and their underlying issues in a relaxed and informal atmosphere; sufficient pause for reflection and consideration; and timely debate and decision.

First Reading: *Committee chair bringing forth the resolution will move the resolution. Speaker will*

ask for a second. Then the maker and seconder of the motion will introduce the resolution and provide a briefing. The Speaker will ask for questions, comments, discussion, and possible straw votes--but no amendments or any other formal Senate action. When recognized by the speaker, each person will have the floor for up to three minutes. Only people who are physically present at the meeting will be recognized. People who are unable to attend may give a prepared statement to another person who can read the statement to the senate when they are recognized by the speaker. After the First Reading, the committee or individual sponsoring the resolution will consider the questions raised and recommendations made in the discussion and make any appropriate revisions, this will facilitate expeditious handling of the resolution during the Second Reading.

Second Reading: Discussion/Debate/Decision-- Ordinarily, time limits will not be strictly enforced. As a general guide, however, thirty minutes of discussion/debate should be sufficient for each resolution being considered; and two minutes should be sufficient for each speaker. During the discussion/debate a speakers' list will be maintained. Preference will be given to those who have not yet spoken. If a direct question is asked to someone who has already spoken, that person will normally be given the chance to respond briefly. At the conclusion of the discussion, Senators will vote on the resolution. Tabling and referring are also possible during the Second Reading, please refer to table 1 on the next page.

"Discussion Items"

An opportunity for discussion of emerging issues and policy questions.

"Open Forum"

An opportunity for input.

SUSPENSION OF RULES: Any of the above rules may be suspended at any Senate meeting by a two-thirds majority vote of those present.

Table 1. Dealing with Common Actions in the CSU, Stanislaus Academic Senate

There is some variation in the interpretation of Robert's Rules of Order. To avoid confusion and lengthy parliamentary discussion, it would be helpful to have agreement within the Standing Rules about how to handle certain common actions and what some of those actions mean:

Motion	Floor?	Second ?	Debate ?	Amend ?	Vote
Amend	Y	Y ¹	Y	Y	Majority
Amend Amendment	Y	Y	Y	N	Majority
Call for previous Question (end debate and move to a vote)	Y	Y	N	N	2/3 ²
Challenge ruling of the Chair	N ³	N	Y	N	Majority
Debate, limit	Y	Y	N	Y	2/3
Divide the question ⁴	Y	Y	N	Y	Majority
Division (provide a countable vote)	N	N	N	N	N/A
Point of information/parliamentary inquiry	N	N	N	N	N/A
Table to a certain time	Y	Y	N	Y	Majority
Table indefinitely ⁵	Y	Y	Y	N	Majority
Refer (e.g. to a committee)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Majority
Waive 2 nd reading--move to action item	Y	Y	Y	N	2/3

Floor? *If yes, you must have been recognized by the Chair and have the floor to take this action.*

Second? *If yes, the action requires a second.*

Debate? *If yes, the action may be debated.*

Amend? *If yes, the action may be amended.*

¹ *For any amendment, the proposer may ask if the amendment is “friendly”, meaning acceptable to the senate without the need for debate. If it is “friendly”, it is simply incorporated into the resolution. Any senator may object to an amendment, thus making it “unfriendly” and causing the proposed amendment to require a second and majority approval.*

² *Requires a vote by show of hands to allow counting. Vote is 2/3 of those voting (rather than 2/3 of those present) and excluding abstentions. Outcome is determined by taking the number of “no” votes, doubling that number, then seeing if it is greater than the number of “aye” votes. E.g. 23 aye, 12 no; 12 x 2 = 24, motion fails **OR** 24 aye, 12 no, 12 x 2 = 24, motion passes.*

³ *That is, you may interrupt.*

⁴ *For example, in a resolution on program review an amendment is proposed adding “that the program reviews will receive written feedback from the Provost and the President to the program under review.” Someone might wish to “divide” and consider separately whether the Provost provides feedback and then whether the President provides feedback.*

⁵ *Table indefinitely means the resolution is “dead” for that college year but may be proposed again in the following or subsequent college year.*

Amendment by Substitution: *Occasionally action is proposed to replace an entire resolution with a substitute. The process is:*

- 1. Move to substitute (require second).*
- 2. Perfect the substitute motion (i.e., open to amendment)*
- 3. Perfect the original motion (i.e., open to amendment)*
- 4. Vote whether to substitute. (If yes the original motion is no longer under consideration.)*
- 5. Vote whether to approve the substitute (no substantive amendments).*

Underlying documents: *The document under consideration for action by the senate is the numbered resolution itself (e.g. 7/AS/2007/UEPC). Resolutions are often accompanied by attached documents. For example, the senate may consider a resolution to endorse a policy regarding online courses. The policy normally is attached to the resolution for review by senators. While the senate may amend or take other action on the resolution, it cannot amend the attached policy. If a policy is incorporated as part of a resolution, the policy can then be amended.*

Approved by the Academic Senate on 8/30/11

9) First reading item

a. 14/AS/11/SEC Resolution on President Searches (Sense of the Senate)

O’Brien made a motion to bring forth 14/AS/11/SEC Resolution on President Searches (Sense of the Senate). Seconded by Petrosky. O’Brien read the resolution as follows:

14/AS/11/SEC Resolution on President Searches (Sense of the Senate)

Resolved: *That the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus urges the Board of Trustees [BoT] to continue the past presidential search policy and current practice of having on-campus interviews for finalists as a part of the selection process, and be it further,*

Resolved: *That this resolution be distributed to Chancellor Reed, the Board of Trustees via Chair Carter and to Academic Senate, California State University Chair Postma.*

Rationale: *The Board of Trustees is currently considering changes to extant policy on presidential compensation and hiring policies. Historically presidential candidates have visited the campus they were candidates at and held targeted meetings with administrators, faculty and staff and also held open forums for the campus community. The loss of campus visits ensconced in proposed policy changes would greatly diminish the role of the campus community in the presidential search process and would rob candidates of the ability to meet all members of the campus community, including administrators, faculty, staff, students and community members. Campus presidents are presented with a wide variety of difficult challenges, and clearly we should take advantage of any opportunity to allow those presidents to build support in their respective communities.*

O'Brien said that this came up recently at the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting to change the way president searches are handled. This might be voted on at the BOT meeting, so SEC moved it up so we can have a first reading today get input before going to a vote at the next Senate meeting. It's a sense of the senate resolution. If approved it will go forward to those folks noted in the resolution.

The new policy would eliminate president visits to campuses. Those meetings are extremely important for the candidates, students, staff and campus community. O'Brien is putting this forward for your consideration and hopes that you support it to let the BOT know that to have these visits is an integral part of the process.

Petrosky echoed O'Brien. The new policy is equivalent to the Chancellor appointing a viceroy.

Filling said that Chancellor Reed noted that a couple of presidents would withdraw from a search when they would have their names known. He's puzzled that someone that wants a job is embarrassed to have it known. A President who does not meet with the campus would likely fail to be able to work with the campus. He's mystified why they wouldn't want as much interaction as early as possible.

Provost Strong noted that the University of Florida had serious difficulty recruiting a president because eligible candidates didn't want their names out there for a variety of reasons. There is a trend and problem across the campuses. He hasn't read the proposed policy, so does it say they won't come to campus or may not come to campus.

Filling noted that the entire section that addresses campus visits was deleted from the policy.

O'Brien said that maybe the Provost raises a question beyond the purview of how this works. We don't think that simply cutting out any meetings with future presidents is good, and he hopes that other campuses do similar resolutions. If nothing else they may make the BOT pause and think so that everyone gets a bit of what they need and desire. Maybe this resolution may include more than simply saying don't do it, but ask them to think about what they are doing.

McGhee noted that one problem for not having a requirement for campus visits is for the campus to

understand the candidate and the candidate to understand the campus. When people don't have to see where they're going it could lead to misconceptions. Our campus once showed a few pictures of palm trees to potential student athletes. A student was seen walking on main street looking for a beach as he expected it from the pictures he saw. If it's a problem to be willing to lead they shouldn't take on high power positions. Presidents come here with tenure, and we can be stuck with them even if they don't want to leave.

Nagel asked if we knew when the BOT might act on this issue.

O'Brien said it could be at the September 20th meeting. It was discussed this summer and it is going to happen soon.

Colnic noted an issue of double standards that separate faculty from administration. When we go on the job market we have to say we're on the job market within our depts. The same standards should be held for administration.

Khodabandeh is speaking for the everyday student and there's not much interaction with the president in that regard, but from the perspective of ASI it's very important that the president should visit the campus from a leadership standpoint.

Petratos offered another alternative which allows the Presidential candidate to visit the campus whilst maintaining privacy through a non-disclosure agreement.

Regalado thinks that visits or non-visits just give us an opportunity for us to see who they are. He's curious about the Chancellor's Office rationale for doing this. Is there a suggestion that they're not getting the top recruits and results may be worse than the ones we already have?

O'Brien said that part of it resulted from a hire of the president in San Diego, and the outcry of that person's salary including the governor weighing in. This committee was created to weigh in on compensation and now it's expanded. They're arguing that they're having a difficult time filling those positions.

Petrosky said that there are legitimate concerns of having their names out there. We didn't release their names until they were finalist. This was our situation and we want to know who the finalists are.

Filling noted that the president's search we ran in our campus gathered 80+ applications. Other campuses gathered 90+ and he doubts the inability of finding candidates. It's reasonable to attach some costs so we don't get casual surfers applying and then returning to their campus saying they want a raise.

Mayer said that any person applying should visit the campus. They ought to stand for the same standards that all of us abide by. They need to come to campus to familiarize themselves with the community. They need to know the people they will work with and the community.

Tan said that this sounds like an arranged marriage. Someone selects a spouse and you don't get to meet the person until they arrive. We should be able to look at the choices and have a look and have some time with the candidate. This current policy is not a good idea.

Gomula asked if we still check the references. Yes, the Chancellor's Office does that.

Provost Strong said that presumably they would select references who would know they were on the job market already. He thinks visiting the campus is a good idea. On the other side, candidates looking may be deterred if they know that this may damage relationships on their home campus and they may be hesitant to

apply. This is a factor that has been reported on. Look at Division 1 Athletics. Oftentimes when high profile coaches are being recruited it's done by the athletic director in a confidential manner. The very best coaches because of their position with their schools could not apply. I may be different if they could apply in a confidential fashion. This maybe where this is coming from. He thinks that it's a good idea for folks to come to campus and both sides to have that interview.

Tan said that what the Provost is saying is that it will encourage people to apply with no costs as it won't hurt their current position. Will this encourage hopping from campus to campus and maybe only staying for 1 year? That type of behavior won't make them committed to stay in the campus and make contributions. She doesn't think it's a good idea and prefers they renew their commitment to the university.

Regalado said that there may be cases of a president that is beloved at the campus they're at but for the most part they're seeking because they're not happy, and he can think of examples where the campus would be thrilled if the president looked elsewhere.

McGhee said that this happened with the current coach at Southern California. The deal was kept quiet until it was announced and there were and still are a lot of bad feelings. Some folks in Tennessee planned on naming a sewage treatment plant after him. This is academics and it's expected that people move around and do other things. It's normal as it's a method of growth, and there is not a negative factor for them to be looking.

Tuedio wants to call attention to what remains on the policy on pg. 2, bottom of the 2nd paragraph of the last draft. (*The consultative procedures are to be conducted in a manner designed to generate confidence in the selection process and garner local support for the eventual appointee*). Tuedio recommends that consultative procedures ought to be in a manner to get local support. It needs to be affirmed as very important for the local campus to have a sense of their support. There are lots of strikeouts in the policy that pertains to other things besides the campus visits.

Filling said that the phrase Tuedio cited references notions that there are people on campus defined as local support. Presumably in this case the only way to garner local support would be through those individuals from the campus who are on the search committee. How many of you would be interested in hiring with no recommendation from the people at the place of employment?

Provost Strong thinks this policy targets recruiting as opposed to applying. We're going to successful candidates who may not be sitting presidents and enticing them to consider applying with the prospect of confidentiality. This is becoming more of an issue in the current labor market.

Mayer said that this is not the Navy Seals or a covert operation. We don't see what the problem here is and presidential candidates should be abiding by the same standards that we are. The president needs to know his public and community and we need to know him or her.

Sarraille said that it's obvious if you're against this that you prefer and condone a model that is very top down and things are run by a dictatorship telling you what to do. If you are for this resolution, you believe that an academic environment should have decisions built up by consensus with groups of people discussing and making decisions. This shouldn't be a leadership class as this is a person that is going to be a president of a university. They should be of that background and have the support of the community, not only faculty but students and those living in the community. It should be someone you have some confidence in.

Petrosky directs the question to O'Brien thru the Speaker. Is there a time sensitivity and should we move to a second reading?

O'Brien said that as general rule the Senate doesn't like to waive the first reading. This enables people to take it back to their depts. and discuss it. It's not an emergency to waive it this time, but the BOT need to get it by September 20th if it gets passed so that they will hear our voice.

Garcia channeled Mark Thompson in seeing this as an issue of simple collegiality. You would expect that the president would come to campus for an interview.

Speaker Stone directed the Senators to take this back to their depts. and get feedback from their colleagues. If you have suggestions for rewording the resolution send it to Pierce or Stone. She noted that some of the things that Tuedio mentioned could possibly be incorporated.

10. Open Forum

Dean Nowak said that they just got word from WASC that the online MBA was approved. She thanked AVP Kornuta and faculty members Kim Tan, David Lindsay and Al Petrosky.

Provost Strong wanted to make a few comments on the concepts and practice of shared governance. It's an extremely important topic and very important for this campus. There are different interpretations and views on how to operate with shared governance that has caused conflict on many campuses and certainly on this campus. He will address the issue and offer some thoughts to the Senate soon. He got a book titled "Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance" from AVP Kornuta. Some of the issues related to what we are dealing with shrinking budgets, increasing costs of higher education and different perceptions from 30 yrs. ago from society and legislature. All of those cross currents have made this topic more difficult, and he will let the Senate know that he's thinking about it and would like to present some ideas in the near future.

Provost Strong also echoed the comments by AVP Kornuta that Terry MacTaggart, chair of the WASC special visit team, has much expertise in shared governance. He'd like to further discuss and explore this as a way to move the campus forward.

Khodabandeh is starting a project and has a running wager that 10% of our students will register to vote this semester. The key resource is faculty and he would like to send student representatives to bring literature to your classes. He introduced Ms. Shauna Keeler as the ASI University Affairs representative. Her email address is asiunivaffairs@csustan.edu and she will contact you to register to vote.

O'Brien thanked the Provost commenting on the book. B. Eudey is here and maybe we can make the book available through the FDC.

Eudey said that the Faculty Center has not yet received its budget but maybe later we will see.

Marcell said that the RSCA week is an event which is run by faculty, and it is coming up soon. He encourages everyone to get involved and develop a display. The event will be in early October, and he would love to see more fellow faculty there to learn what each of us are doing.

O'Brien said that in tradition of last year he motions to adjourn. McGhee seconded the motion.

11. Adjournment

3:25 pm