

<p>Academic Senate May 1, 2012</p> <p>Present: Baker, Bice, Bettencourt, Broadwater, Burroughs, Colnic, Deaner, Drake, Espinoza, Filling, Foreman, Garcia, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Held, Jackson, Salameh, Lindsay, Marshall, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Silverman, Strahm, Stone, Strong, Tan, Vang, Wallace, Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Mechelle Perea-Ryan for Judith Keswick, Kim Tan for David Lindsay, Dieter Renning for Barbara Manrique, Ann Strahm for Paul O'Brien</p> <p>Excused: Coach Representative, Mira Mayer, Dawn McCulley.</p> <p>Guest: Lauren Byerly, Reza Kamali, Kathy Norman, Annie Hor, Kevin Nemeth, Dennis Shimek, James Tuedio, Daryl Moore, Robert Marino, Halyna Kornuta, Marge Jaasma, Brian Duggan, Shauna Young, Betsy Eudey John Sarraille, and Megan Christianson.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>Second reading of 20/AS/11/UEPC CSU Stanislaus Policy for Suspension and Discontinuance of Academic Programs. Passed unanimously.</p> <p>8/AS/12/UEPC BS in Health Science Program (New resolution submitted by UEPC, previously discussed as 6/AS/12/FBAC BS in Health Science Program). Passed.</p> <p>Second Reading of 1/AS/12/FAC/FBAC CSU Stanislaus Endowed Faculty Policy. Passed.</p> <p>First and Second Reading of 7/AS/12/GC Opposition to Cuts of the State University Grants for Graduate Students (Sense of Senate) Waiver Requested. Passed.</p> <p>First & Second Reading of 9/AS/12/SEC Resolution in Support of the Ad Hoc College Reorganization Committee Phase 2. Passed.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: August 28, 2012 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p>
--	--

1. **Call to order**

2:02pm

2. **Approval of Agenda**

Approved Unanimously.

3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 17, 2012**

Approved Unanimously.

4. **Introductions**

Lauren Byerly, Reza Kamali, Kathy Norman, Annie Hor, Kevin Nemeth, Dennis Shimek, James Tuedio, Daryl Moore, Robert Marino, Halyna Kornuta, Marge Jaasma, Brian Duggan, Shauna Young, Betsy Eudey John Sarraille, and Megan Christianson.

5. **Announcements**

Megan Christianson came to talk about an opportunity for students to participate in peer health education. Applications are available on the Health Center website, and applications are being taken now. Over the summer they will be planning activities on what to focus on for next semester. Don't hesitate to contact her. She has brought business cards and is available at the

Health Center, and she can also be contacted through the Health Center website. Also, please note they are available over summer.

Speaker Stone introduced Dieter Renning who is the proxy for our retired faculty member today. Renning announced that on May 15th there will be the faculty recognition reception. His wife and he like to attend that event and they have for many years. They RSVP'd that they are going to participate and to their surprise they found out there is no free parking for the event.

Provost Strong will look into the issue of free parking for the May 15th Faculty Awards ceremony.

Kornuta noted that in the world of assessment and academic programming, her office is bringing us tools to make that part of our life easier. She distributed a flyer with a sample of the Academic Program Review website located at <http://www.csustan.edu/oaqa/ProgReview/>

Kornuta said that in the past year they had a large to-do list including a review of the academic reviews. For the past 18 months, they have been making program assessment more meaningful and manageable. They are connecting program reviews to the annual assessment report. Many features have changed including the Institutional Review office support. They have changed the website to include a checklist with the ability to transfer without having to recreate information. This has been reported to UEPC, and she thanks UEPC for their support. The quality assurance website highlights the changes, and she encourages us to go in and find the templates and use the tools available there.

Strahm noted that it has come to her attention that Service Learning and the FCETL are in danger of being cut right now due to the current budget situation. We do know through research that Service Learning is extremely important for students whose parents did not attend college, which is a lot of our population. Service Learning helps our students understand the value of service and may have an impact on our alumni donations.

Gerson shared that the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center contribute broadly to the mission of the California State University Stanislaus by supporting faculty development and faculty success in the roles of teachers and mentors, scholars, and members of the campus community. As we look for ways to improve our universities effectiveness and efficiency, those of us currently serving on the Faculty Development Committee ask members of our campus community to keep in mind the faculty centers substantial and cost-effective contributions to the intellectual vitality of this institution. We ask you to take an active stance in protecting the faculty center because it is a place where all faculty on campus, regardless of discipline, can come to find professional assistance to meet their professional goals. We look forward to seeing you at the 10th Anniversary Celebration on Monday, May 14th, from 4:30pm to 6:30pm. We will be celebrating the Faculty Center with a special guest, John Stuart Rogers himself. We are certain that each of you have found the center to be of importance in your professional development

You may have benefitted from the following:

New Faculty Orientation

Teaching workshops

And Instructional Institute Day

Technology workshops

Pedagogy development

Faculty lecture series

Book clubs

Teaching Mini-Grants

Webinars

Faculty Celebrations

Use of facilities for your department retreats and celebrations

If you have valued your time in the Faculty Center, please come to celebrate with us!

There are new ASI representatives in attendance today. Shanice Jackson is the newly elected ASI President and Mariam Salameh is the newly elected Vice President of ASI. Welcome.

Regalado announced that several History students, 4 grad and 1 undergrad participated in the regional history honor society, called conference. Of the three awards for best research paper [at the graduate level], they took two including best overall paper. In the past 5 years they have taken 9 of 16 awards, representing 60% of the total awards handed out in that time frame. Our M.S. graduate program is regarded as the best in the region and the papers originated from the seminars and independent studies projects. We sent notification to the President, Provost, and VP Kornuta, but unlike athletics whose athletes are justifiably and immediately praised, our students who have achieved academic awards received no kudos through the email list or on the website.

The Department of History feels that, at the very least, students scholastic achievement should be recognized on par with athletics. Regalado is left to wonder of the aforementioned administrators feel the same. So far, on this matter, it does not appear so.

Byerly noted that The College of the Arts and the Department of Music will be presenting the Faculty and Guest Artist Performing works by Mozart, Poulenc, and Grieg on Friday, October 7th, at 7:30 p.m., in the Snider Recital Hall. Please try to attend.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

Regalado had a question for SEC about the delay of the processing of the 4 unit courses. The History department has one course which has sat on the desk of AVP Kornuta since November of last year even though she has received requests from the department and college curriculum committees to reach a decision on the matter. Late last night his colleague, whose course is at issue, got a response with a list of queries from AVP Kornuta which his colleague was to provide a response by a 10am meeting this morning. Regalado wonders when it was that Kornuta expected his colleague to get some sleep. Kornuta's late night queries came 6 months after the

course was submitted. If this is the new practice from the AVP, Regalado considers Kornuta to be unprofessional. Regalado asked if SEC found any more information on this topic.

Foreman said that SEC sent a memo to department chairs to ask how widespread this might be. We knew of only two such cases at the time. We discovered that there were no others, so since it wasn't widespread we decided not to pursue it any further at that time.

a. Reports from GC, UEPC, and FBAC on the College Reorganization Committee Phase 2

Foreman noted that UEPC discussed the report briefly and had the benefit of the chair sitting on UEPC. It passed with little discussion, but with concern as to what would happen to those members of UEPC from those colleges when they return in the fall.

Tan said that FBAC discussed this and supports this. FBAC drafted the resolution before us today.

Colnic said that the Graduate Council discussed this at their most recent meeting. One GC representative was also on the committee. After a short discussion, they passed it unanimously. One area of concern was the potential impact on staff, but beyond that it passed unanimously.

7. Second Reading Items

a. 20/AS/11/UEPC CSU Stanislaus Policy for Suspension and Discontinuance of Academic Programs

Foreman noted that in section 3 there was a discussion last time that we should ask the Provost to coordinate with CoC on who would serve on the special program review committee, and the Provost agreed to this. The change is included in the resolution.

Strahm asked for a friendly amendment to section 5 in the policy to include FBAC consultation as follows:

5. Special Program Review Report and Recommendations

The Special Program Review Committee shall evaluate its findings in a written report with a recommendation for program suspension or discontinuation to the University Educational Policies Committee / Graduate Council, and the Academic Senate. University Educational Policies Committee/Graduate Council shall consult with the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee concerning the fiscal implications of the recommendation prior to forwarding their recommendation to the Academic Senate. The report and recommendation of the Special Review Committee as well as the recommendations of the University Educational Policies Committee / Graduate Council, and the Academic Senate, including any supporting statements, shall be forwarded to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and the affected program for their review. The Provost's recommendation is submitted to the President for a decision.

Tan concurs with this.

Regalado said that a concern in his department is that during the period of suspension what oversight might there be to prevent a concerted effort to defund the program? Would FBAC assure funding to help the program survive.

McGhee feels that the adjustments in section 3 and 5 address the concerns that he had raised in the last meeting, and he finds the document more workable and speaks in favor of this resolution.

Tan responded to Regalado's comment. If FBAC is included we are more likely to address such issues, but exclusion means that is less likely to be considered.

McGhee asked if something is put into suspension, what funding would be required aside from the funding required to teach-out the program.

Provost Strong said that obviously we would have to teach-out the program. Once the students were taught out then there wouldn't be any funding allocated to a program without courses. The advantage of suspension is that it stays on the books so it can be brought back without having to go through a curriculum process or require the Chancellor's approval in the case of a major.

Results of the vote: 43 yes, 0 no, 0 abstained. The resolution passed unanimously.

Speaker Stone thanked Bill Foreman and AVP Kornuta for their help with this. Applause.

b. 8/AS/12/UEPC BS in Health Science Program (New resolution submitted by UEPC, previously discussed as 6/AS/12/FBAC BS in Health Science Program)

Foreman moved the resolution, seconded by Strahm.

8/AS/12/UEPC BS in Health Science Program

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus approves the Bachelor of Sciences in Health Science as a self-support program, to be offered through University Extended Education, and be it further

Resolved: That the BS in Health Science shall have one concentration, "Health Leadership and Administration," and be it further

Resolved: That additional concentrations in this program to be offered through the state-support system must undergo a complete review process, including approval by the University Educational Policies Committee and the Academic Senate at a future date.

Rationale: The BS in Health Science, concentration in Health Leadership and Administration is a degree-completion program aimed at working professionals who need to complete a BS degree in order to advance their careers in the health care field. While another concentration, "Health Education and Advocacy," was brought forward, this would-be state-supported program is not appropriate at this time due to budget constraints and changes to university structure.

Faculty in the BS in Health Science program can move other concentrations forward once fiscal and structural concerns have been resolved, but any such concentration should receive a complete review through the entire approval process at that time.

Foreman noted that this approves the Health Science Program to be done exclusively through UEE. The other state-side concentration has been removed to return when funding allows. The resolution states that the second state-side concentration will have to go through full approval, including academic senate approval.

Perea-Ryan said that fiscally everyone agreed that this is the way to go at this time, and they hope that soon things will change and we can move forward in the future.

Results of the vote on the resolution: 36 yes, 4 no, 3 abstained. The resolution passes.

c. 1/AS/12/FAC/FBAC CSU, Stanislaus Endowed Faculty Policy

Tan noted that in the resolution the rationale was changed from the previous version. Where it mentioned the Foster Farms endowment that was removed. The policy itself, it went back and forth between FBAC, FAC, and also VP Dennis Shimek sat in some of the meetings. Many concerns were addressed. FBAC wanted a more general policy and not a restricted policy, one that applies to any level of an endowed faculty position. This is not just for full professors, but it could be used for an endowed chair etc. In the third paragraph, we added that the endowment should cover any cost above the highest 9 month salary. She thinks we also addressed the issue of tenure and specifically stated that tenure should be a decision of the department consistent with what we currently do. In the improved version there is a lot of consultation, so hopefully in the development of the endowed position there is a lot of consultation among different levels of faculty.

1/AS/12/FAC/FBAC California State University, Stanislaus Endowed Faculty Policy

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus adopts the attached California State University, Stanislaus Endowed Faculty Policy, and be it further

Resolved: That the California State University, Stanislaus Endowed Faculty Policy take effect upon approval by the President and be placed in the Faculty Handbook.

Rationale:

As of late, multiple donors have stepped forward and offered to fund endowed faculty positions. Such generosity is to be applauded. However, recent campus experiences have made clear the need for an endowed faculty campus policy to clarify responsibilities .

McGhee would like to reiterate that there was a lot of discussion. He had the luck or misfortune of being on both FBAC and FAC. There was a little bit of a different viewpoint between FAC and FBAC, but he feels like this is a good initial step. We may have to tweak this in the future, but it is a good start and very beneficial as a guide to both faculty and administration. He supports and recommends that we pass this.

Filling is unclear on how this might work. There is talk of faculty finding the right person, and in item C.1 they mention that the term could be renewable in 5 year increments but in item C.3 they talk about tenure. Where does the money come from if a person loses the endowment but remains tenured.

McGhee said that the discussion they had was that the endowment will fund endowment related activities and state-support money would fund the salary. We did not use the term “*permanent line*” because there may be legal implications. Basically, someone has to come up with the state-funding to pay for the state-classes they teach and if they step down then state-funding would have to pay them because they would be a state faculty member. The funding is general in nature, so Filling’s concern is that if the faculty member were to step down then the Provost would have to cover the cost. Provost Strong agreed that this is correct.

Results of the vote on the resolution: 35 yes, 3 no, 5 abstained. The resolution passes.

Speaker Stone thanked FAC, FBAC, Kelvin Jasek-Rysdahl and Provost Strong for their assistance on this policy. Applause.

8. **First Reading Item**

a. **7/AS/12/GC Opposition to Cuts of the State University Grants for Graduate Students (Sense of the Senate) Waiver Requested**

Colnic moved, seconded by Filling. This is a Sense of the Senate resolution and we would like to request a waiver.

7-AS-12-GC Resolution in Opposition to cuts of State University Grants for Graduate Students (Sense of the Senate) Waiver Requested

Be it Resolved: That the Faculty Senate of California State University, Stanislaus applaud the decision not to cut State University Grants for graduate students for 2012-3 and oppose any proposed discontinuation or suspension of the award of State University Grants to graduate students with financial need in the California State University System; and be it further

Resolved: That a copy of this resolution be distributed to the CSU Chancellor, the CSU Board of Trustees, CSU Presidents, the Chair of the Academic Senate of the CSU, the Chair of California State Student Association, and all CSU Campus Senate Chairs.

Rationale:

CSU Graduate Students, upon graduation, contribute significantly and substantially to the workforce of California.

http://www.calstate.edu/sas/fa_programs.shtml

Filling thinks that this is especially important because the Chancellor is going to reconsider the decision to remove funds this year, but also asked that they review these funds closely and come up with a report by September. This is important for our graduate students.

Results of the vote to move to second reading: 42 yes, 1 no. It is now a second reading item.

Colnic read the first resolved verbatim. The second resolved simply talks about who this will be distributed to and this is critical. A lot of our students depend on these grants and it would make a difference on who can and cannot attend this university. The Chancellor's office asked that the campuses look at not offering this during this coming year, and then changed his position when several campuses weighed in during our spring break. Colnic thinks it is important that we weigh in before this summer.

Baker asked what is the current status of these funds if originally they were going to cut the funds.

Colnic said that they are not going to do that now, but they are still considering it for the following year.

Baker has students who were told they would lose funds this year.

Filling said that on some campuses students did get letters saying their funding will be put on hold, and he thinks the availability of the funds has not been so widely distributed. Please advise your students of this.

Espinoza said that there are two different types of grants. There is the SUG and the subsidized loans. For graduate students the subsidized loans have been eliminated, but they can still get unsubsidized loans.

Results of the vote: 41 yes, 1 no, 1 abstained. The resolution passes.

b. 9-AS-12-SEC Resolution in Support of the Ad Hoc College Reorganization Committee Phase 2

Grobner moved the resolution, seconded by Strahm.

9-AS-12-SEC Resolution in Support of the Ad Hoc College Reorganization Committee Phase 2

Be it Resolved: That the Academic Senate of CSU, Stanislaus supports the recommendation of the Ad hoc College Reorganization Committee Phase 2 to reduce the number of colleges to four by eliminating COA and CHHS and merging the affected departments with the following three colleges as follows: Art, Music, and Theatre with CHSS; Nursing and Psychology/Child Development with CNS; and Social Work with COE.

Resolved: That the Academic Senate also supports the recommendation of the Ad hoc College Reorganization Committee Phase 2 to keep the former COA departments intact in a School within the new combined college.

Grobner noted that this has been through all the committees and they all approved it, and SEC supports the resolution.

Strahm said that it has been unanimously or almost unanimously passed through all the committees.

De Vries has one point of concern on the difficulty of tracking financial statements as the college structure changes. . He supports this but it has been very difficult to follow the financial change in the university thru the split from 3 to 6 colleges. As someone who followed some of the financial changes, it was very difficult to detangle how funds were split. He asks that people be aware as we merge together to not inadvertently cause more unintentional harm to programs or colleges.

Nagel would like to move this to a second reading, seconded by Petrosky.

Result of the vote to move to second reading: 41 yes, 1 no (one missing vote). We are now at a second reading.

Provost Strong pointed out that its normal practice when a Dean returns to normal status that it's common practice in the CSU for a Dean to have a semester off to retool for classes. He doesn't think that this was included in the analysis.

Salameh asked if this means the Dean gets a semester off.

Provost Strong said that he gets a semester of assigned time to prepare for classes or research.

Filling noted that since junior faculty get no assigned time to prepare, it seems reasonable that the Dean would get the summer to prepare.

Perea-Ryan asked if the colleges will get reorganized when they merge together?

Jaasma said that we used the term "merge" because the colleges would be merged into one new college.

Burroughs asked what happens when you have a college with a sitting Dean merging with a college with an interim Dean. How is that sort of decision going to be made?

Jaasma said that the Provost can speak to the deans, but the wording of the "Director of Arts" was removed from the proposal.

Provost Strong has no comment regarding the Deans.

Speaker Stone said that it sounds like those are administrative decisions and not faculty decisions.

Results of the vote on the resolution: 39 yes, 2 no, 2 abstained. The resolution passes.

Nagel asked what happens next? Will there be four colleges next semester?

Speaker Stone said that the Provost reviews the proposal and recommends to the President. The President will make the final decision.

Provost Strong said that his intention is to meet with all of the affected colleges and listen to any further input they have, and then he will make a recommendation to the President.

Sarraille asked if there is another step. If the President chooses to do the reorganization, does the Chancellor's office have to approve it?

Provost Strong doesn't think that the Chancellor's office has to approve this but he will double check to make sure.

9. Discussion Item

a. Award of RSCA funds

Speaker Stone noted that a memo from the Provost has been distributed and this topic came out of the TRPC.

Provost Strong said that this is the result of consultation over the last 3–4 weeks, and it seems like a reasonable compromise. If you look at number 6 it looks like there will be no reallocation of funds through the colleges until there is a policy, so he will ask that in the fall that the SEC create such a policy. Faculty will apply to the LAC and send a copy to the Dean who will write a letter of support. LAC will make recommendations to the Provost and the Provost will issue the awards. Time is short as there is a timeline on the back of the memo.

Baker appreciates this but it is late in the semester and this only allows 10 days. It would be nice if there was more time to submit a proposal.

Garcia appreciates number 6 on this list and he doesn't think that we should ignore that. He wishes that would have happened earlier. He thinks that this is part of the process to get to a kind of trust we all desire.

Gerson asked for some background about this. It seems as though we got money and now want to give it to faculty as quickly as possible.

Speaker Stone said that it's complicated. We have a LAC whose job is to distribute funds. There was an alternate proposal that the money would be distributed by the Deans, and members of the TRPC thought that if that were to happen it would require a policy. So we will use the procedure we have in place and develop a new procedure next year.

Gerson asked why the rush?

Provost Strong responded that he would like people to have funds available for the summer.

Grobner said that the RSCA grant fund is money from the Chancellor's office and these funds are from a different source, so we need to create a generic policy for distributing funds.

Nursing asked if LAC be able to meet?

LAC Chair, Michael Bice, has contacted the members of LAC and they said that they can get this accomplished.

10. Open Forum

McGhee has a concern about the direction that some things are going. His concern is that we are asking the faculty to do things, namely teach summer school which is self-support and winter term which is self-support. We do have more guidelines from the UEE side on how the EMBA funds will be distributed etc. His concern is that faculty who support these programs are being asked to wear themselves out as administration pushes more and more towards self-support. He doesn't think that faculty object to that, but they are also trying to generate other resources for our university. This cuts into research and time and time away from our families. He thinks we need to look at how those resources go back into our support of our institution. He doesn't want to see these resources go into staff functions and then see the academic side cut. He thinks we need to look at how those funds are going to be used if they are not going to be used for faculty lines. We need to have a discussion about if we are going to be able to do this work and also suffer for it.

Regalado noted that in March VP Shimek took great offense to his characterization that a MPP policy on power disparity also be provided. He would like to know if such a policy was created.

Shimek said that a policy was passed, distributed, and imposed. FAC was informed.

Provost Strong said that when it comes to special sessions programs they can be taught in load, and the funds can be used to reimburse the state-side budget. For example, a UEE EMBA course can be taught in-load and the state-side can be reimbursed. It is important that we build models based not on part time-rates but on full rates. That is one way that we can address the issue and use the revenue to build the faculty to be able to support both state-side and special session programs. We can't do it over the summer or winter, but we can do it in special session discipline programs.

Tan wants to follow up on McGhee's comment. She looked at some UEE numbers with respect to nursing which we just approved today. Based on the numbers that came in today, the funds we receive from students in the Health Science program is only \$0.13 for every dollar that goes to the college. So the question is where is the rest of the money going? She thinks that a significant portion is not going back to instruction. These are questions we need to answer.

De Vries followed up on McGhee's concern. One thing he still thinks about is when we put extra effort over the summer in an attempt to raise extra funds for the university and that money turned out not to be "green." We couldn't spend that money. We put in the effort to do what we could to

find that those efforts were misplaced. The Provost is saying that we can reimburse the stateside with a caveat that it's not possible for summer and winter session. We need to keep in mind when we put in these efforts what the outcome of the effort will be. Sometimes we don't receive the correct information on that and sometimes we are led astray.

Nemeth said that when that \$1 comes in for that special session there are many things to pay. There is travel, marketing, and faculty payroll. Those are all itemized by line. If there is a surplus, then that amount is split up according to the special session policy. That information is presented. The money that goes back to the college is a portion of the surplus, so he wants to make sure that is understood.

Provost Strong noted that they will be transparent where the UEE and summer money goes. They are trying to work out with Business & Finance a method of availability for money over the summer and he will share their progress, and if they have to use another approach he will share that. His intention would be to utilize any surplus UEE funds to reinvest those funds back into the units that are generating them. We have to fund new product development and new curriculum and do that in a transparent way. When it comes to dividing the pie there may be disagreements, but we will come to a consensus and it will be transparent. Having those reserves would be useful in the current budget climate.

Tan wants to reply to Nemeth, the Dean of UEE. The description she provided was based on the document Nemeth presented to her. She thinks that colleges need to be aware of what really comes in. When you analyze it is pennies on the dollar that goes to the colleges.

Provost Strong agrees. His intention would be to reward behavior that we desire. In order to address McGhee's concern, which is legitimate, we have to funnel money back to the programs that generate them. He thinks that we need to support our other divisions, for example advising. He wants to use the funds to make the university better. He cannot think of a better way to support those individuals who are doing the heavy lifting to support those programs. He thinks that we ought to have line items and then we need to talk about individual issues and be specific in our conversations.

Colnic asked the Provost if he is talking about reducing a professor's state-side load and adding it to UEE. Is the Provost talking only of special programs or summer and winter programs?

Provost Strong is 99% sure that it would not be acceptable to teach part of your load in the summer and he thinks that is true of the winter intersession. When it comes to discipline-based programs there is nothing wrong with reimbursing the state budget for units that are taught in the UEE program.

Nemeth noted one final point. The bottom line is that in the case of the example in Health Sciences is that this is a more expensive program to offer. So the bottom line on that one might be \$0.13 on the dollar, but other programs in Criminal Justice it might be higher, like \$0.18 on the dollar. When we develop programs with the Deans we sit down with the budget in hand and go through it item by item.

Tan noted her college has been teaching self-support programs for a while, so they do have some UEE money.

McGhee is very supportive of us doing this extra work, but he is concerned that this not get bottle necked. When we did UEE summer work we were told that those funds could not be used, and now we are looking at a \$3million cut to Academic Affairs. To use a metaphor, what good is getting the water turned on when all the trees have died.

Tan thinks that when it comes to budget cuts we always get scenarios about what our cuts will be. When we discuss these, she would like to see the amount of the contribution from UEE in helping us to reduce the budget cuts as that will be the evidence that UEE is helping us. What is the amount currently in UEE.

Nemeth projected they UEE has about \$1.6million that could help.

McGhee would like to recommend that we all give Speaker Koni Stone a big hand. Applause

Filling said that in the spirit of showing thanks, AVP Kornuta will not be here next year. He would like to thank her for all her work. Applause

Filling asked what the Provost's plans are for AVP Kornuta's position.

Provost Strong said that we will leave it vacant for a year, but he would be open to input.

Eudey asked how would the Provost redistribute those responsibilities?

Strong has not decided this yet.

Kornuta would like to thank Filling and everyone for the opportunity to serve at this critical time. Thank you. Applause

11. Adjournment

3:48pm