

<p>Academic Senate September 27, 2011</p> <p>Present: Baker, Bettencourt, Bice, Bolton, Broadwater, Burroughs, Colnic, De Vries, Drake, Espinoza, Filling, Foreman, Garcia, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Hauselt, Held, Keswick, Khodabandeh, Lindsay, Manrique, Marcell, M. Mayer, McCulley, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Silverman, Stone, Strahm, Strong, Tan, Vang, and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Bill Foreman for Susan Marshall, Shauna Keeler for Taylor Buehler-Scott.</p> <p>Guests: President Shirvani, John Sarraille, Shauna Keeler, Lauren Byerly, Robert Marino, Annie Hor, Kevin Nemeth, Halyna Kornuta, Jim Tuedio, Kathy Norman, Linda Nowak, Glenn Pillsbury, Betsy Eudey, Wendy Smith and Brian Duggan.</p> <p>Isabel Silveira Pierce, Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Second Reading: 15/AS/11/SEC Resolution Reaffirming the University Educational Policies Committee's Responsibility for Curriculum and Programs. Approved.</p> <p>Second Reading: 16/AS/11/SEC Resolution Concerning Recruitment of Deans (Sense of Senate). Approved.</p> <p>First Reading: 17/AS/11/SEC Position on Shared Governance. Will return as a second reading at next meeting.</p> <p>First Reading: 18/AS/11/SEC Reaffirming the Graduate Council's Responsibility for Graduate Curriculum and Programs. Will return as a second reading at next meeting.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>October 18, 2011 2:00-4:00 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by: Chris De Vries, Clerk</p>
--	--

1. Call to order
2:02pm

2. Approval of Agenda
Approved.

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

4. Introductions

Deans Marino, Moore, Norman, Nowak and Tuedio were present. Other guests were Dennis Shimek, Kilolo Brodie, Lauren Byerly, Shauna Keeler, Annie Hor, AVP Halyna Kornuta, Kevin Nemeth, John Sarraille, Wendy Smith, David Tonelli, and Brian Duggan.

5. Announcements

Khodabandeh attended the Trustees meeting and spoke. They made one change to the president search committee. They semantically changed the policy to consult the campus on these confidential visits. Fifteen Senates made resolutions and two ASI's were in the loop and made resolutions. They also made public that 4 presidents are retiring or leaving office this year.

Held announced the open house events at the Library on Wednesday, September 28th, from 11am – 3:00pm.

Students can enter a raffle to win a Kindle E-Book reader. There will also be APA Citation Style workshops for graduate students that will help you learn how to properly format your in-text citations and bibliographies. The emphasis is on becoming an independent user of the APA manual and online APA resources. He will leave handouts in the back of the room. For more information check out the Library on Facebook and online.

Marcell announced that next week is RSCA week, October 3-6, 2011. If you are conducting or have conducted scholarly work and creative activities, the Display Presentation exhibition offers the opportunity to show off your work to your on-campus colleagues. RSCA Week is the campus event that brings together all colleges and disciplines to celebrate faculty and staff RSCA activities and achievements. There is still time to submit your poster by this Thursday, September 29th at 5pm. We hope to see you all next week here in the FDC 118.

Duggan announced that next week is the 8th annual CSU Stanislaus Technology Fair. It will take place next Wednesday, October 5th, from 10 am to 2:00 pm in the lobby of the MSR Administration Building. The Technology Fair is free and open to all faculty, staff, and students.

Sarraille announced that tomorrow between 12:00- 1:30pm there is a CFA event in the Event Center including a webcast, lunch and announcements. All faculty are invited to the event anytime they can make it between 12:00 and 1:30pm. This is an event which will be duplicated 23 times up and down the state on every campus simultaneously. It is important that all faculty take part.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

O'Brien said that he and Filling just sent out the SWAS report to ASnet.

7. First Reading Items

a. 17/AS/11/SEC Position on Shared Governance

De Vries moved to introduce the following resolution and Filling seconded.

De Vries explained that the rationale for this resolution is that a Sense of the Senate resolution was passed in 2001 to this affect and the faculty invited the administration to also join us in these standards on shared governance. That did not occur and we've decided to put forward this resolution due to continued conflicts on shared governance. SEC is putting this forward in the hopes to put this behind us.

Filling noted that former Chief Academic Officer Spence is referred to in this resolution and this is not a radical paper. It's quite constant with AUUP and other boards.

17/AS/11/SEC Position on Shared Governance

Resolved: That California State University, Stanislaus embrace the three principles of former Executive Vice-Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer Spence's initiative on shared governance; viz.,

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. and be it, further,

Resolved: That, the Academic Senate asserts the primacy of the Faculty's responsibility for generating, defining, and refining policies for the educational functions of the University.

Rationale: At a recent Academic Senate meeting we, the elected senators of the Academic Senate, realized that the Administration at CSU Stanislaus has not taken the opportunity to engage with us in crafting a unified vision for shared governance. We believe that it is important, as a show of trust and unity, that we move forward with a shared vision of our roles in the shared governance of CSU Stanislaus. We also believe that former Executive Vice-Chancellor Spence's framework must be the principle that guides and informs our campus-wide policy. We believe these provisions continue to provide a strong foundation for trust, the most important element of shared governance.

In academic senate resolution 21/AS/01/SEC, we approved these principles of shared governance as a sense of the senate, and invited the Administration to join us in adopting these principles as the campus model. So far, the Administration has been silent on this issue, and therefore we now ask the President to sign on to this resolution in the hope of fulfilling former EVC Spence's initiative to improve shared governance.

The EVC/CAO's initiative was likely in response to the growing unease among faculty system wide that the strength of the Faculty's voice in governance had declined. We believe this unease has continued to grow in the years since the EVC/CAO's initiative, both within the CSU system and on the Stanislaus campus in particular. The 2001 document *Shared Governance Reconsidered*, a joint project of the ASCSU and the Chancellor's Office, relates a faculty view that, contrary to the detailed views of the 1985 document, "administrators have taken the initiative in the area of academic policy and that faculty members have been relegated to a reactive or defensive mode," (5) adding that many faculty:

perceive that they are not respected by the administration and that they believe the administration does not treat them as an "equal partner" in governance of the institution. The survey indicated that faculty, in general, are skeptical not only of administrators' intentions and motives, but also of the notion that shared governance even exists. In short, it appears that some people believe the notions of "respect" and "trust" are so important to concepts of shared governance that their absence indicates that shared governance does not really exist—despite the presence of formal structures and processes. (4)

The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act (HEERA) articulates the Legislature's understanding that "joint decision making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of these institutions."

Precedent, practice, contractual responsibility, and the CSU Board of Trustee's (BOT) CSU Statement on Collegiality "assigns primary responsibility to the faculty for the educational functions of the institution in accordance with basic policy as determined by the Trustees," adding that "faculty recommendations are normally accepted, except in rare instances and for compelling reasons." The BOT also recognizes the "value of participation by the faculty in budgetary matters, particularly those directly affecting the areas for which for which the faculty has primary responsibility." We are asking that the Administration reaffirm this commitment as well.

Khodabandeh said that the students want it noted that they also believe in shared governance. Students are approaching the 51% mark on paying for this campus. Student's feel that shared governance is not shared with students. Shared responsibility was a term that had to be created by students and does not include shared governance. Right now we are in the predicament that students had to change to shared responsibility and we would like to be a part of the shared governance.

Shimek noted that the resolution states that so far administration has been silent. Does this pertain to recently or in the past? To say that we've been silent is an overstatement.

De Vries thinks that saying they've been silent is because there was a specific request for a response.

Shimek agrees and is in favor of that, but to put it in the resolution that the administration thus far has been silent is a mistake.

Filling offered some language that might address Shimek's concern. To replace "*So far, the Administration has been silent on this issue*" with So far, the Administration declined to affirm this resolution.

Provost Strong asked if resolution 21/AS/01/SEC was a Sense of the Senate. De Vries confirmed yes. The Provost asked if past President Hughes responded to it. Speaker Stone didn't think so.

Provost Strong would like to read the September 18, 1985 CSU Statement on Collegiality report and the other document before he comments on this motion.

Khodabandeh was hoping to get a response to his request to have students involved in shared governance. He thinks that the discussion won't go anywhere and no one is interested, based on the fact that no one will engage with him.

Strahm asked what Khodabandeh sees as shared responsibility?

Khodabandeh said that we have to create a whole new term. People on all side of the spectrum are even upset that students asked for shared governance. It is not a term that students can adopt and it doesn't reflect what we see as students and that is everyone's interpretation. Both students and faculty would like to see us more involved in governance and especially now when we are approaching the 50% mark. He thinks that we need to make the impact of opening shared governance to students.

Foreman recognizes that Khodabandeh feels that students are kind of left out of the conversation. It might be that students cannot participate in shared governance as it has been a system wide collaboration between CSU administration and faculty. So what would you like to see?

Khodabandeh said that he is late to the conversation because he was not born when these decisions were made. He would rather be late than not a part of the conversation. And that pie can always be re-divided. He feels that if students were slightly more involved in the process, especially as we are thinking about cutting programs and student services, he would like to see more students at the table. He knows that faculty and administration are keeping in mind the interests of the students, but he thinks that students need more representation and can just as effectively represent their own interests.

Provost Strong thinks that shared governance regarding students has nothing to do with tuition. For him shared governance is a collaborative approach to decision making which has been shown over years to be effective, not that it is not challenging, but it is the best approach. He thinks the issue with students wanting to be a part of shared governance is how they fit into operationalizing shared governance. We are making tough economic decisions, and he thinks that we need to think about ways to make good decisions for the whole University. We need to think about expanding the size of the pie rather than just focusing on dividing a fixed pie. He thinks that when we talk about pieces of the pie we do so without thinking of expanding the whole pie.

Espinoza thinks that students are already involved in the discussion. She thinks students should use their voice to participate, but so many students do not use their voice to the extent that Khodabandeh does. She also suggested that Khodabandeh think about what his specific suggestions would be as there may be middle

ground.

Strahm thinks what Khodabandeh is touching on is that there is a tension that she's noticed through these changes in the conceptions of how we view higher education. A lot of people are presenting education in a market model, where students are portrayed as customers or consumers rather than students. Within the market consumers have a say in what the product they intend to consume looks like, thus the increasing demands of students to have more of a say in the direction of higher education. Higher education, for hundreds of years, has been more of a feudal order, with the professoriate using their skill and knowledge to guide the institutions of higher education - deciding what students will learn based on disciplinary expertise. You can't have it both ways. You can't have higher education be a feudal order and at the same time have it be a market.

O'Brien noted that Khodabandeh asked about the Senate's silence on his comments. We will take this back to SEC and discuss it. He sees it as problematic to introduce "students" into the resolution but he thinks that Khodabandeh's concerns are valid.

Colnic wants to agree with our student leader in that we have a problem with a document that says shared governance and only includes two groups. We had to get people to recognize that coaches had a voice, so he can understand the frustration of the students.

b. 18/AS/11/SEC/GC Resolution Reaffirming the Graduate Council's Responsibility for Graduate Curriculum and Programs

Colnic moved the resolution seconded by Foreman. Colnic read the resolution as follows:

18/AS/11/SEC/GC Resolution Reaffirming the Graduate Council's Responsibility for Graduate Curriculum and Programs

Resolved: That the University and the Academic Senate hereby reiterates the primacy of the Graduate Council and the Senate in formulating and maintaining graduate academic programs, and be it further

Resolved: That the Graduate Council and the Academic Senate commit to finding appropriate means of coordinating between the areas of curriculum and budgets, through the mandated liaison with the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee, to maintain a strong graduate program at CSU Stanislaus, and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be distributed electronically to the faculty, staff, and students of CSU Stanislaus and delivered to the University Budget Advisory Committee.

Rationale:

The enabling legislation that created the California State University places primary responsibility for curriculum and academic programs with the faculty of each campus.

The constitution of the General Faculty of California State University, Stanislaus places primary responsibility for curriculum and academic programs with the Graduate Council, giving that committee the responsibility to "Formulate, review, and recommend to the Academic Senate graduate curricular policy." During the 2010-11 academic year, the co-chairs of the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) suggested on several occasions that the UBAC should take up questions of academic programs and curriculum in an effort to manage costs.

During the 2011-12 academic year, the UBAC has included “program prioritization” and course scheduling among the agenda items.

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation process suggests that there should be a systematic process for the integration of Academic Program Reviews (APR) into planning and budgeting processes.

DC:rlc GC approved 9/8/11

Foreman said that this is a companion to the motion he made a couple of weeks ago.

Tuedio had questions: What does “*the primacy of the Graduate Council and the Senate in formulating and maintaining graduate academic programs*” and what does “*the Graduate Council and the Academic Senate commit to finding appropriate means of coordinating between the areas of curriculum and budgets*” mean?

Colnic is suggesting that the Graduate Council plays a role in program review and the possibility of discontinuance. As far as budgets, he believes that the Graduate Council has a role in determining how graduate programs react.

Tuedio said that these are things that are typically in a college budget and are part of the department and college.

Colnic said that the Graduate Council is not questioning that. However, they believe that they should be involved in anything that impacts the duties of the Graduate Council.

Garcia asked if this has anything to do with the Graduate School.

Colnic said that this is not about that, although those issues are coming up. These issues are not embedded in this particular resolution.

Provost Strong noted in response to a question that the discontinuance policy allows for a number of different groups to initiate discontinuation of a program as follows:

1. A request for the review of an academic program for the purpose of determining whether program discontinuance or curtailment is warranted may be made
 - a. by a majority vote of the faculty of the program; or
 - b. by a majority vote of the Academic Senate; or
 - c. by a majority vote of the University Educational Policies Committee;or
 - d. by the academic administration; or
 - e. By a majority vote of the college committee constitutionally charged with academic program review. In addition, a request for review to discontinue an academic program may be as a result of a regular or ad hoc academic program review (EP & R 79-10: CSU System Executive Order of Program Discontinuance).
 - f. by a majority vote of the Graduate Council (if a graduate or post baccalaureate program).

As the policy reads, any of those bodies can bring forth a proposal to discontinue a program and it would be evaluated by a committee and be reviewed by the UEPC, Graduate Council, SEC and Academic Senate before going to the President. Any number of groups can propose discontinuance. He's concerned that this resolution presented by the Graduate Council might violate that current policy.

Colnic is not suggesting we violate policy. He is aware that other venues can bring forward discontinuance. The Graduate Council is constitutionally mandated to interact with FBAC.

Petrosky asked if the Graduate Council has more appointed members than UEPC.

Colnic said that there are a lot of appointed members and several ex-officio members.

Petrosky thinks that the administration cannot argue that they do not have a voice on Graduate Council.

M. Mayer asked if the discontinuance policy includes criteria by which to evaluate programs?

Tan said that FBAC looks at new program proposals, so if there are changes it should go through FBAC as well. FBAC works with UEPC and Graduate Council and our job is to look at the monetary aspects.

Provost Strong noted that there are criteria in the discontinuance policy. He thinks it should also involve FBAC so that they have the opportunity to review the monetary aspects of possible program discontinuation. De Vries noted that the policy on discontinuance says canceling a policy for budgetary purposes should be a last resort.

Garcia asked for clarification about the need to assert the primacy of the Graduate Council.

Colnic said that the Graduate Council feels that there are various entities and actors in the decentralized system who might not understand the role of the Graduate Council. There are several who feel their programs are now vulnerable so we felt the need to write this resolution to reaffirm what is already well established in the Constitution and faculty governance.

Tuedio said that the word primacy is an important word, but he wonders if it is important here. Programs go through several layers before reaching the Graduate Council, so he thinks that "primacy in formulating" is not what was meant. He thinks that if you are talking about prioritization then we need to talk about prioritization.

Provost Strong agrees with Tuedio. He thinks that graduate programs garner their support from programs and colleges and they receive their primary support from these programs. This resolution implies that the Graduate Council does that. He thinks there is overlap and some of that is reasonable and appropriate, but it could also cause some real difficulties in terms of making decisions when the wishes of a department or college are overlooked because of a level of solidarity among members of the Graduate Council. We need to think about this carefully before moving forward.

Colnic stated that he doesn't see primacy as necessarily being first. We are talking about decision making. Graduate Council plays the same role for graduate programs that UEPC plays for undergraduate programs. When it comes to deciding curriculum and signing off on programs and courses and major programmatic

changes Graduate Council has done it and done it well.

Nagel said that maybe the Graduate Council would consider altering the language in the resolved to say “*have primacy with regard to decision making*” rather than formulating and maintaining.

8. Action Item/Second Reading

a. 15/AS/11/SEC/UEPC/FBAC Resolution Reaffirming the University Educational Policy Committee’s Responsibility for Curriculum and Programs

Foreman noted that the major changes that occurred is that FBAC decided to sign on as co-signatures. A paragraph has been added to support that resolved in the rationale. The following is the revised resolution:

15/AS/11/SEC/UEPC/FBAC Resolution Reaffirming the University Educational Policies Committee’s Responsibility for Curriculum and Programs.

Resolved: *That the University hereby reiterates the primacy of the UEPC and the Senate in formulating and maintaining academic programs, and be it further*

Resolved: *That the University Educational Policies Committee (UEPC), the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC), and the Academic Senate with input from FBAC commit to finding appropriate means of coordinating between the areas of curriculum and budgets recognizing the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC) as essential to that coordination to maintain a strong academic program and build CSU Stanislaus into a strong institution.*

Rationale:

During the 2010-11 academic year, the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) suggested on several occasions that the University consider the prioritization of academic programs in an effort to manage costs.

The enabling legislation that created the California State University places primary responsibility for curriculum and academic programs with the faculty of each campus.

The constitution of the General Faculty of the California State University, Stanislaus places primary responsibility for curriculum and academic programs with the University Educational Policies Committee, giving that committee the responsibility to “Formulate, review, and recommend to the Academic Senate undergraduate curricular policy.”

Likewise, the duty of FBAC is to function as one of the University's campus budget advisory committees (see Chancellor's memorandum BA-87-14), and to advise the administration with respect to University budget issues. FBAC reviews and interprets budget requests and budget allocations to the General Faculty by reports to the Academic Senate.

Revised 9/22/11 by UEPC

Tan noted that we added FBAC to the resolution rather than coming up with a second FBAC resolution.

Gomula noted that since the wording of the first resolved is similar to the wording we just talked about on 18/AS/11/SEC/GC Resolution Reaffirming the Graduate Council’s Responsibility for Graduate Curriculum and Programs should it also be changed?

Foreman said that they were not raised in the first reading.

Tuedio said that they weren't, but he believes that there is not as much of a conflict here. In this committee, the responsibility of the deans, colleges and programs is sort of embedded in the committee.

Foreman reiterated that if you look at the rationale then a lot of the words are defined. Much of these are embedded in the constitution and we are reiterating constitutional wording.

Nagel suggested adding to "formulating" "academic programs" submitted as an amendment.

Filling seconded and suggested additional wording to the first resolved "*formulating academic policies and approving and maintaining academic programs.*" This was considered a friendly amendment and Nagel withdrew his amendment.

Strahm asked if the word "primacy" is a problem, as primacy is the state of being first and foremost.

Foreman noted that the reason for the word "primacy" is that the decisions on programs are first academic decisions and not budgetary decisions. We are talking about it being foremost rather than first.

Vang noted that it appears that we have two motions in front of us. These resolutions talk about reiteration of constitutional policies. Why are we looking at resolutions rather than constitutional amendments? He is not sure we have the entire whole story. Are these policy amendments or constitutional amendments?

Foreman said that this is a reiteration of current policy and our commitment to this set of policies. We're saying that this is the way of doing things despite possible distractions. These decisions are primarily related to academics and second to budgets, and it would be inappropriate to discard policies that are in place.

Vang asked if Foreman is saying that the policy is not clear enough. Are we trying to assert power over this?

Foreman thinks that we are talking about maintaining power where it is currently.

Tan said that there are different bodies on campus that make decisions. We had a process in the past on how decisions are made. Currently, we believe that the way we made decisions in the past is not being followed. There are people on campus who want to change the way we are making decisions, and we want to make sure decisions are being made in the way they have been in the past.

Vang wants to know what the issues are. He thinks we should be clear what these issues are.

Peterson thinks this reaffirmation ties into number 9 on our agenda. The reason we have these resolutions reaffirming things is not because of a particular thing, but that statements have been made. You may recall Provost Lujan talking about discontinuance being different from elimination, suggesting that in a budgetary shortfall you could bypass the policies we have. So part of what we are trying to do is ask if we still stand by our campus practices and procedures. We need to say that there are certain procedures you need to follow if you want to eliminate a program, and we are hearing rumors that there are people on campus who feel like we don't have to go through those procedures.

Sarraille noted that, from his point of view, one thing that makes it clear why we need this resolution is an

experience he had on UBAC (as chair of FBAC). On that committee there are 4 faculty and he thinks there are 16 or 17 members on UBAC. In the last few sessions he attended there were UBAC members who were not faculty suggesting that a motion be passed to call for the creation of a policy on and process of prioritization of academic programs.

Some of the faculty suggested that, if there was a desire to call for prioritization, it would be only fair to include all programs and operations on campus, not just academic programs, but there was no willingness of non-faculty to broaden the motion, but rather the desire to limit it to academic programs. It's only natural, when seeing such things happening on campus, that the AS would be motivated to create a motion like the one on the floor.

Moore noted that as a member of the recent UBAC, his understanding is that they discuss the issues and decide if they want to make a recommendation as a committee. His recollection differs greatly with what Sarraille recalls. His recollection is that there was in fact a discussion, and they discussed issues across the board to make recommendations that are meaningful to be considered or not.

Sarraille indicated that he was confident of the veracity of his comments, and asked, if Dean Moore felt something Sarraille said was untrue, that he specify what it was.

Vang thinks that if there are conflicts between these two committees then they should be resolved in the Senate. He thinks we should make a decision if we should amend the policy. He thinks that as a Senator representative for Teacher Education that this requires mediation and not a resolution from the Academic Senate.

Moore said that he is not suggesting Sarraille is lying. Those committee meetings are on video tape, and it is easy to see what happened. UBAC is not a committee to create policy. Perhaps they can make recommendations to review specific policies but not make policies.

Marcell asked about the current state of the amendment and if the amendment was accepted as friendly. Yes.

De Vries read the amended first resolved as follows:

Resolved: *That the University reiterates the primacy of the UEPC and the Senate in formulating academic policies and approving and maintaining academic programs, and be it further*

Filling agreed with Sarraille regarding his characterization of what was said in UBAC and that this statement is needed.

Foreman noted that one thing to consider is something Senator Bolton said last time, that sometimes decisions need to be made quickly. Those decisions are called executive decisions. This is a statement made by the Senate that we plan to follow this policy in the future. The President will be asked to sign it and we hope he does. If the President does not sign it he will be required to respond to it and his response will be a point of discussion.

Peterson said that UEPC and FBAC are faculty committees and UBAC is not a faculty committee. Traditionally we have thought that maintaining programs is something faculty do.

The resolution passed 37 for, 5 against, and 2 abstentions

b. 16/AS/11/SEC Resolution Recruitment of Permanent Deans (Sense of Senate)

Gerson in Biological sciences would like this resolution amended to say that any colleges not under consideration for reorganization be excluded from the resolution.

Nagel suggested additional wording to the first resolved “which are under consideration for reorganization”.

Vang would like to hear from the colleges that require deans.

Regalado would like to speak in support of the resolution. Some of the costs are coming from various private headhunting recruiting groups being paid for candidates. So a lot of money is conceivably being spent on the recruitment for positions that may not exist in the near future. The second is a policy matter. There have been discussions on the chair’s council in his college that some policies are being breached. There are no staff members in any of these committees, and that is a breach of protocol. It is a rogue interpretation of policy that was signed by Ham Shirvani in 2006 that reads as follows: *In establishing search committees, every effort should be made to ensure that these committees reflect the culturally diverse character of the campus and that faculty, staff, and students are included as is appropriate.*

Petrosky asked if this was a sense of the senate resolution. Speaker Stone replied yes, that it was a sense of the senate.

Provost Strong said that the policy on dean’s searches does not require staff and students to be included and the MPP Recruitment Selection and Appointment Policy has not been violated.

Regalado reiterated that the policy states that “every effort should be made to include staff and students on these search committees as appropriate.”

Provost Strong thinks that’s what “as appropriate” means.

Regalado asked if the Provost believes that having staff and students on these committees is inappropriate. Provost Strong responded no. Regalado continues to support the resolution.

Filling said that Trustee Monville was on campus and asked about this issue and SEC informed him about this, and his reaction was that this was a no brainer.

The vote was taken and results were 40 yes, 3 no and no abstentions. The amended resolution passed.

***16/AS/11/SEC Resolution Concerning Recruitment of College Permanent Deans
(Sense of the Senate)***

Resolved: *That the Academic Senate, CSU Stanislaus urge the President and Provost to halt recruitment of permanent academic deans in colleges which are under consideration for reorganization until such time as the ad hoc Academic Reorganization Committee has completed its work and any reorganization of the colleges has been implemented, and be it further*

Resolved: *That this resolution be distributed to President Shirvani, Provost Strong and the ad hoc*

Academic Reorganization Committee.

Rationale: *The University Budget Advisory Committee has heard repeated suggestions that the University consider reorganization of the colleges in pursuit of cost savings. An ad hoc task force was appointed to explore the matter. The committee issued its report in June 2011, concluding that there likely are cost savings to be achieved by reorganization and that multiple proposals for reorganization should be considered in a process conforming to the University's Academic Reorganization Policy. Clearly, any reorganization would be significantly more complicated to implement if all dean positions were filled. Further, it seems clear that there are ethical issues with recruiting and hiring a dean if we are in the process of consolidating the colleges and possibly making that dean redundant.*

Approved by the Academic Senate on September 27, 2011

9. Open Forum

a. Discussion of WASC Special Visit Report: <http://www.csustan.edu/wasc/specialvisit.html>

Nagel had a question and a comment. His question is about the confidential comment line on the WASC website. When he went to leave a comment it asked for identifying information.

AVP Kornuta said that there are different avenues to use and the confidential email to the WASC Team Visitors is not available to us yet. There are other avenues to communicate. There are links available to send questions to the Special Visit Research team and to send questions to the ALO. Those are confidential, but they are not anonymous. The email to the WASC members is confidential to the Team, but it is not available to us yet.

Nagel clarified that the current method involves trust of the committee.

AVP Kornuta shared that they are working on a Blackboard site as well. They are going to be setting up a Blackboard site which will include a discussion board that includes anonymity. That one will definitely be anonymous.

Filling asked if they can adjust the web design to separate the WASC Confidential Email link for comments from the Special Visit Research Team Members and ALO links. He feels that it's important that we try to minimize the chances of mis-sending communication.

Jasek-Rysdahl has concerns about the WASC report, specifically on page 8 where it talks about the review process. He was disappointed that faculty leadership were not given time to review and react to it at the same time the Special Visit Research Team and administration had a time to look at it. Specifically, he would have had issues with several things on pages 5–10. The fact that these are now in the report forces faculty into a position of responding to the report instead of the report being more accurate. He is concerned about how the responses people send the SVRT will be presented to the WASC Special Visit Team.

He thinks this group had a tough job and he commends them. Specifically they looked at the steps taken to restore trust, but feels that it would also be possible to develop a list of actions in the last year that moved trust backward on this campus. He wondered if other measures of trust in addition to individual perceptions were considered by the Research Team. His final comment is moving forward, how well did any actions work at restoring trust? Can the research help us identify what actions worked, why they worked, and what can be done to make them more effective? He thinks that WASC did the university a disservice. They did

not assign blame to anyone but then gave the administration the responsibility to solve the problem. It would have been better if they said you have a problem and you all need to work together to come up ways to fix it. WASC's framing of the issue determines the way the Research Team developed the research, and that results in a narrow analysis.

AVP Kornuta couldn't agree with Jasek-Rysdahl more. It would have been nice to open the review of the Special Visit Report to more people to review, but it wasn't possible to orchestrate that with the time that they had. They did the best they could knowing that they wanted to meet with the Speaker and the Provost after putting the report together. The comments that Jasek-Rysdahl has made will be gathered. We have a responsibility to populate an evidence room to give the WASC site team information on what has happened since the creation of the report, including minutes from this meeting. We will have an open forum in which we will use the comments provided by faculty and address these issues. The Educational Effectiveness WASC visiting team and the WASC Commission in their wisdom gave us their charge, and we are realizing a shared responsibility is better. This takes time and the dates given to us in 2010 to address and resolve those questions wasn't sufficient. She will ask the research team members to respond to these questions as well.

Garcia didn't want to take up a whole lot of time, because he is interested in people's observations. He pointed out that Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl's comment regarding WASC is right on target. We made this recommendation to both the Provost and Speaker that we don't think that WASC did us a favor. All the information we see thus far is that while the administration did 22 actions to address trust, those actions had very little chance of being successful because it needed faculty to be involved from the beginning. So we recommended that administration and faculty leadership need to sit down and figure out what has a chance at succeeding. A faculty dinner may be a nice thing, but in this context it does not have much chance of success. Garcia also commented on Dr. Jasek-Rysdahl's question about whether or not the study looked at factors that may have negatively impacted trust. Garcia explained that the survey tool used with Faculty leaders was robust. On page 31 of the WASC report it talks about additional actions and it addresses the level of participation. Garcia stated that the participants might have been tired by the time they got to this section of the survey, so there is not a good deal of additional information regarding other factors that impact trust.

O'Brien said that we might be able to put the WASC item on the next agenda as well. For those who haven't read it there were 6 people on the Special Visit Research Team as follows, AVP Halyna Kornuta (Co-chair), John Garcia (co-chair), Gina Leguria, Jim Tuedio, Harold Stanislaw, and Paul O'Brien. We did the best we could in the 2 months we had to do this. We were aware there would be critiques and we are all adults and can accept that. Administrators have listed many things we have done and faculty leaders have responded. It now behooves us to have a discussion on how to proceed. The WASC visit is November 7 and 8 and they are assuming we have read this and we need to be able to discuss it intelligently.

Provost Strong supports putting WASC on the agenda for the next meeting so we can discuss it further. He thanked the WASC Special Visit Research Team for their work and thinks the report is excellent. WASC has also expressed that they were impressed with the report. This is a good first step which far exceeded his expectations, and he thinks the committee did an outstanding job.

10. Adjournment
3:53pm