

<p>Academic Senate May 14, 2013</p> <p>Present: Bice, Colnic, Crayton, C. Davis, Deaner, Espinoza, Eudey, Floyd, Garcia, Gerson, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Guichard, Hartman, Jasek-Rysdahl, Johnson, Littlewood, Manrique, Martin, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, O'Brien, Park, Peterson, Petrosky, Poole, Regalado, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Silverman, Nhu-Y Stessman, Strong, and Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: John Garcia for Valerie Leyva, Mitch McGhee for Steve Filling, Mitch McGhee for Panos Petratos and Jennifer Helzer for Steve Arounsack.</p> <p>Excused: Kathleen Hidalgo, Chris Lore, Shanice Jackson, Chris Vang and Eric Broadwater.</p> <p>Guests: Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Reza Kamali, Linda Nowak, Annie Hor Marge Jaasma, John Sarraillie, Brian Duggan, Jim Tuedio and Harold Stanislaw.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>First reading of 31/AS/13/GC-Resolution University-Wide Assessment of Graduate Education. The resolution did not pass and was referred to GC to review next year.</p> <p>First and second reading of 30/AS/13/SEC Resolution on a Policy Regarding Flexibility in Assignment of Workload to Full-Time Faculty. The resolution passed.</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: August 27, 2013 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room Minutes submitted by: Cathlin Davis, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. Call to order

2:03 pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved a slightly revised version of the agenda.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of April 16, 2013.

Approved.

4. Introductions

Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Oddmund Myhre, Reza Kamali, Linda Nowak, Annie Hor Marge Jaasma, John Sarraillie, Brian Duggan, Jim Tuedio and Harold Stanislaw.

5. Announcements

a. Provost Strong to introduce Ms. Shirley Pok, new Vice President for Advancement

I would like to introduce Shirley Pok as the new VP of University Advancement. She started on May 9th and we are extremely pleased to have someone of her caliber to join us for this role.

Shirley Pok thanked the Senate for inviting her to come. She stated that it is truly a pleasure for her to be back on this campus and that faculty have been warm and welcoming. She came from a Higher ED setting and look forward to being able to contribute to that setting. She looks forward to working with this body and others across campus.

The clerk reminded the body to wait to be acknowledged to speak.

Paul Park distributed a flyer on an upcoming workshop titled: Discovering and Utilizing resources for Affordable Learning. This workshop is sponsored by the University Library and FDC. A stipend will be awarded to participants who complete their commitment and present at the final workshop. The workshops will be held as follows:

June 3, Exploring OER at CSU Stanislaus

June 5, Utilizing Resources

August/September TBD: Final Presentation

Email Maryann Hight at mhight@csustan.edu or call 664-53 if you have questions.

Regalado shared that the History Department is pleased to announce that a graduate student took first place category at the CSU Student Research this past weekend. This is the first 1st place award for our school in this competition. This speaks to the good work that is coming from our graduate program.

Karen Hartman from Communication Studies announced that she will be filling the faculty in residence position this year. If anyone is interested in breaking down walls between faculty and students, feel free to contact her.

Eudey reminded us about workshop: Enhancing online and hybrid teaching with QOLT. Glen Pillsbury will be giving us an opportunity to learn about best practices in devising hybrid courses and engaging activities in areas you decide are valuable in your particular course. A small stipend will be awarded to participants - exact value is dependent upon total number of participants. In return, participants will be asked to present one of their courses at a campus-based show-and-tell of online teaching and learning best practices that will take place in early 2014, and will be encouraged to participate in the CSU-wide QOLT competition in spring 2014.

Scheduled dates for the workshop are as follows:

Tuesday, May 28, 9:00 am - 12:00 pm

Wednesday, May 29, 9:00 am - 12:00 pm

Thursday, May 30, 9:00 am - 11:00 am

All sessions will meet in FDC 103

To be eligible for the stipend, faculty participants must be contracted to teach at CSU Stanislaus during the 2013-14 academic year, and must actively participate in all three workshops. Please contact Glenn (gpillsbury@csustan.edu) or Betsy (beudey@csustan.edu) if you have questions about the workshop.

Eudey also reminded us that our fall starts out differently with the general faculty meeting being held on Monday, August 19th which means that Tuesday, August 20th will be the new faculty orientation. Departments are asked to not schedule other activities that day if they have new faculty hires.

6. First Reading Item

**a. 2:05pm time certain for Harold Stanislaw -- 31/AS/13/GC- Resolution
University-Wide Assessment of Graduate Education**

Stanislaw said that the Graduate Council adopted this policy to assess graduate education beyond the program level. They will look at common outcomes that will be delivered by all programs, the needs of programs in general, and assess quality. They phrased it in the context of what WASC is going to require in terms of accreditation, not just for programs but for the University in general. This is an institution wide assessment approach. The common outcomes must be defined in some way. One possibility is to utilize what was laid out at Grad Council and apply this at the UG level, providing a snapshot of what is happening. His main role is to answer questions you may have.

The resolution was moved by Martin and seconded by Johnson.

**California State University, Stanislaus
Graduate Council**

31/AS/13/GC – Resolution University-Wide Assessment of Graduate Education

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus approve the attached University-Wide Assessment of Graduate Education Policy, and be it further

Resolved: That the University-Wide Assessment of Graduate Education Policy take effect upon approval by the President.

Rationale: The university-wide assessment of graduate education helps assure continued delivery of high quality graduate education, and can provide a powerful argument to continue support of graduate programs. University-wide assessment data also play a vital role in supporting data-driven arguments to attain or maintain critical resources for curricular delivery.

Governance responsibility for the development, implementation, and periodic review of the effectiveness of the *Plan for the University-Wide Assessment of Graduate Education* is vested with the Graduate Council.

CM:rl Graduate Council Approved 5/2/13

Revised by SEC on 5/7/13

Martin noted that this resolution is the result of a yearlong work and collaboration between the Graduate Council and the workgroup supported by CEGE. The Graduate Council would be responsible for the university wide assessment plan, the purpose of which is to align the program goals and graduate education goals as the GC moves forward with strategic planning for Graduate Education.

Regalado had some queries on the policy. It seems to him that items #6 and #7 seem to be directed at quantitative data rather than qualitative. If that is at all addressed in this assessment, how often is a program to be assessed?

6. The Office of Institutional Research will provide the Subcommittee with data required to conduct university-wide assessment of graduate education, including enrollment data, degree completion data, trend data, and other data as deemed necessary by the Subcommittee. These data will be provided on an annual basis, or more frequently as appropriate.

7. The Subcommittee will develop a methodology for compiling the assessment data provided to it by the individual graduate programs and the Office of Institutional Research into universitywide assessment data. The Subcommittee will maintain an archive of these data, enabling longitudinal evaluations of trends to be conducted. Access to the raw assessment data compiled for these purposes will be limited to Subcommittee and Graduate Council members only.

Stanislaw said that this piggybacks on the APR process. Program goals are assessed on a rotating basis and that information is forwarded to the committee that is gathering information. There is room within that process to use qualitative information for individual programs. The IR piece is basically laid out in the document to describe what the expectations are, spelling out a commitment for that office. The program data are not spelled out in this document.

Regalado noted that by saying that there is room, it might also apply that there is not room.

Stanislaw said that in 2002 common learning goals for all graduate programs were adopted. However, assessment is meant to be a living policy, so qualitative information can be added if we see value in that.

Regalado asked how many times programs are being assessed.

Stanislaw said that this is an annual gathering of information that is combined with the IR and this is not adding to that. This is ongoing and it is part of the APR process, using the intervals at which it takes place.

Nagel is a little confused by this. The policy document attached seems to depend on documents and methodologies that will be developed. Other than that, it just says that data will be collected. He asked if this might be a little out of place and it might be a little premature to be looking at this. It is cited in the rationale as being the document that will govern the process of the assessment as follows but the document doesn't seem to exist.

Governance responsibility for the development, implementation, and periodic review of the effectiveness of the Plan for the University-Wide Assessment of Graduate Education is vested with the Graduate Council.

Stanislaw said that the document does exist but it is very long. This lays out what that document will implement. That document will describe what the system is, and will track modifications. Paragraph 9 will capture whatever changes that are implemented as follows:

9. The Subcommittee will develop and maintain a document (Plan for the University-Wide Assessment of Graduate Education) that respects the University's Principles for the Assessment of Student Learning and summarizes the procedure for conducting university-wide assessment of graduate education. The document will incorporate examples of assessment procedures and tools (such as rubrics, portfolios, etc.), and track faculty governance policy decisions and actions relating to graduate assessment.

This says that we agree to engage on assessment at this level. The needs and questions that arise will be engaged at this level. There is a document that has been under development for a few years. We do have a number of groups that have looked at it and we need to implement it and start seeing how it plays out.

Garcia noted that his colleagues in Social Work are in full support of this, but they have one question: Has there been any discussion in GC about resources to support assessment, as that has been the Achilles heel to all of this.

Yes, per Stanislaw there is a concern. He doesn't think we'll have to address assessment as an institution yet. We're piggybacking onto existing assessment activities. Once we can combine the data from the programs that will need relatively few resources. There won't be too much required to make this work. The real question is how assessment will be supported at the program level.

Thompson has two questions. On the plan for the university wide assessment, is that a policy document?

Stanislaw said that's the big document he referenced.

Thompson asked when it will be finally approved. The final question is that this says it's a policy to establish that committee which will also require amending the constitution. We can't establish the committee by approving the policy. He also asked what the intended timeline was for putting this in place.

The subcommittee of GC would not require a change in the general faculty constitution. GC can create a subcommittee on their own.

Thompson noted that this would be a new working subcommittee of GC.

Johnson motioned to move the resolution to a second reading ,as this is our last meeting of the year and the resolution would have to start all over again next year; seconded by Martin. No discussion so it went to a vote.

Result of the vote on moving to a second reading, 21 yes, 17 no's and the motion failed.

The resolution is still at the first reading.

Colnic noted that in terms of what GC envisioned, the college coordinators would form the base of the subcommittee. It would require a constitutional change specifying that the committee exists and names would be submitted to CoC. This needs further refinement over the summer. He will be on the committee next year and wants to know what else people want to see next year.

Eudey said that it's unclear to her whether item #4 creates a condition that would then have a constitutional vote because we don't create the subcommittee without the activity. If we passed this, then that would lead to the constitutional change. The Senate approves constitutional changes and then it goes to the general faculty for a vote. If we approve this and it will lead to a constitutional vote.

Colnic noted that we need a clearer expectation for that committee. GC knew where they wanted to go but he's not sure that this document has that level of clarity.

Nagel would like to see more information on what it is we're assessing for and what the aim is for assessment. We're often assessing to assess. He means this partly facetiously and maybe we need to assess assessment on campus. That's what he's concerned about. WASC says we have to do something, and it's not clear what or why other than to have done it. It's supposed to do something but it's not clear why it's being done.

Stanislaw said that it's not strictly a WASC requirement. We started this process in 2002 and it's only become official WASC policy last year. The greater goal is try to answer why we offer graduate programs. It's expensive and we need to show why we are bothering. This speaks to what we're promising the tax payers and students -- what can we say to students about their degree when they leave this institution. We can talk about mission statements and we need a systematic way to assess that. For example, when WASC came in, some programs said they hoped WASC wouldn't assess us because we've been cut back. This is the perfect way to show the effect of cuts. When things get taken away we should see a hit in the assessment. Otherwise you didn't need those resources. This is the assurance to say why we need certain resources. It comes down to educational quality and telling people what they can expect in exchange for the investment.

Speaker Grobner noted that we can direct further comments to GC. This will be considered by next year's Senate.

b. 30/AS/13/SEC Resolution on a Policy Regarding Flexibility in Assignment of Workload to Full-Time Faculty

The resolution was moved by Jasek-Rysdahl and seconded by McGhee.

Version: 2013/03/24

30/AS/13/SEC -- RESOLUTION ON A POLICY REGARDING FLEXIBILITY

IN ASSIGNMENT OF WORKLOAD TO FULL-TIME FACULTY

Be it Resolved: That CSU Stanislaus adopt the attached Policy on Assignment of Workload to Full-Time Faculty; and be it further

Resolved: that the policy be effective immediately after gaining approval by the Academic Senate and the President; and be it further

Resolved: that, upon approval by the President, the policy be incorporated as soon as possible into the Faculty Policies section of the Faculty Handbook (any and all printed and/or online versions), and that the policy be positioned there together in close proximity with all other faculty policies or Collective Bargaining Agreement excerpts contained in the Faculty Policies section of the Faculty Handbook that relate to full-time faculty workload.

Rationale: The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) of September 18, 2012, governing terms and conditions of employment for faculty, does not define any number of weighted-teaching-units (WTUs), or any similar units or equivalents, to be a minimum workload for either tenure-line or temporary full-time faculty. It is well-established, through provisions of the CBA and arbitration results, that full-time faculty shall not be required to accept a workload of more than 30 WTUs per academic year, nor shall tenure-line faculty be required to accept a teaching load of more than 24 WTUs. (Previous CBAs assigned a 6-WTU equivalence of non-instructional instructionally-related responsibilities to tenure-line faculty.)

Programs, departments, and colleges can meet their reasonable full-time-equivalent-student (FTES) targets and appropriate educational objectives by adjusting a variety of parameters, including the WTU counts of faculty teaching assignments, the numbers of sections scheduled, and the class sizes allowable. Faculty in the departments and programs are generally very familiar with their workings, and usually well-qualified to select optimal values for the parameters.

ATTACHMENT

Version: 2013/03/24

30/AS/13/SEC -- Policy Regarding Flexibility in Assignment of Workload to Full-Time Faculty

The assignment of workloads to full-time tenure-track faculty and full-time lecturer faculty shall be characterized by a principle of flexibility, in that programs, departments, and colleges shall be permitted to meet their reasonable full-time-equivalent-student (FTES) targets and appropriate educational objectives through such means as the assignment of teaching loads,

numbers of sections, and class sizes, without imposition of minimum numbers of weighted-teaching-units (WTUs), or similar units.

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that this has been here as a discussion item in the past. FBAC looked at it and didn't have any objections to it. It is important for faculty and helpful for dept. chairs.

McGhee said that this has been brought forward to change the mindset that we've experienced for a long time. Faculty appointment letters state a given amount of wtus to be taught. This is being brought forward to help people understand what the contract says. More flexibility needs to be built in to meet the goals of teaching the students. Using FTES as a guide would help to accomplish the mission of the University. What we've been used to forever is not how things work anymore.

Sarraille noted that what this resolution would do is put a clear, concise statement in the faculty handbook as a policy that we can refer to and it states some basic truths about what the ground rules are. It will be in the faculty handbook where everyone can refer to it and it will be extremely useful when they're trying to resolve these questions.

Petrosky moved that we waive the rules and move to a second reading, given that we have had this before, it's been circulated on Facnet, and this is our last meeting.

McGhee noted that this issue has gone through a unique situation. There's been shared governance involved in this and it's bounced back and forth with administration and the faculty. He noted that senate will review the Provost's memo later. This has been an interactive process that has pushed it back to this time.

Eudey agrees. We've had many opportunities to see portions of this and it's not controversial, it's just clarifying. If we pass this now it may give some programs an opportunity to make adjustments to spring 2014 schedule if not fall 2013. It can give us a chance to incorporate it into new faculty orientation.

Results of the vote to move to a second reading was 33 yes, 6 no. The resolution moved to a second reading.

O'Brien supports this resolution. He thinks that all of this is so murky and cloudy. We lived for years under the memo from Provost Dauwalder until he left. Faculty just have to hope a person stays or leaves depending on their view.

Eudey thinks this is a really nice example of collaboration between administration, faculty and CFA. It's important to have a resolution, but it is also equally important that we have administrative support. Everything isn't always smooth and easy but she likes that we've done this collaboratively.

McGhee said that it's a good benchmark to use. The Provost has been more specific in how things work and this allows us to continue the interaction between this body and the

administration as we move forward. This type of policy is not something where we can dot every i. these two documents together can be complimentary and make an effective policy.

Provost Strong noted that it requires decisions on faculty assignments and he is concerned with the contract interpretation. He has concerns about the resolution.

Colnic asked if there is anything specific in this resolution that the Provost finds problematic. The Provost sees it as an interpretation of the collective bargaining contract and that's what he's concerned about

Sarraille said that we circulated a document that came from Long Beach's response to the Hoover commission. The Chancellor's office made some statements about workload for full time employees. This is something that already has been worked out between CFA and the administration and the interpretation has already been made. This repeats that which has been agreed upon, including its interpretation of the collective bargaining agreement.

Thompson noted that it sounds like this is a no sweat resolution and that all the comments about the interaction and agreement are not an issue. He asked if we know the intention of the President. Thompson thinks we have other interpretations presented to us in the contract, which have been wrong yet enforced on our campus.

Tuedio noted that in the policy there's a statement that has enough ambiguity unless it's qualified. It's pretty clear from section of the collective bargaining agreement that it is the President's prerogative, which is passed on to the provost and the deans. It's an administrative prerogative in the final analysis to confirm these assignments.

Sarraille said that practically anything can be misread. He doesn't see the ambiguity. It's the word permitted that is used. It's obvious to him that nothing in this policy can reverse what's in the contract, where it states the assignment of workload is approved by the administration. It's pretty far-fetched to read into this the suggestion that this means faculty will be permitted to assign their own workloads to themselves. Maybe that's the sort of thing some people are worried about. If it comes to that, all someone has to do is open the contract and show it to them and settle the argument.

Colnic noted that regarding Tuedio's concern, the CBA mandates collaboration between these three units in assignment of workload.

Tuedio said that depending on circumstance Sarraille may be right that it's consistent with the CBA.

Provost Strong would like to go back to the earlier stages of the discussion around this issue. Originally, this policy was referred to FAC. He expressed some concerns about the resolution and FAC asked him to write a clarifying memo, which was the genesis of this memo. In his opinion, his memo is the better way to deal with these issues. The resolution was also referred to FBAC and we discussed both the resolution and the memo in FBAC and SEC.

Littlewood backed up what the Provost just said. He doesn't disagree with anything in this resolution but it's not timely. We've spent a lot of time arguing that shared governance is important and we've had shared governance with this issue. He thinks that we shouldn't go down this route at the moment and we should write policy that enacts what's been agreed on.

McGhee sees a potential precedent being set if we have to get administration's approval on issues before we set policy and if the administration has to agree with any resolution. To him, shared governance is discussions on both sides but not always an agreement. The give and take of this process has taken two months, and this is not just something that has been put forward. If we have to get to a final agreement on both sides it might be a bad precedent to set.

Littlewood didn't say that shared governance has to get administrations agreement, but it should have a chance to come to agreement.

Sarraille expressed confusion at these statements. He thinks that what we're doing is shared governance. We have a resolution and we're proposing a policy. If passed it goes to the President for approval. That's the process for shared governance.

Nagel asked Sarraille the number of faculty signatories to the letter to the President.

Sarraille noted that 85 faculty signed on to letter asking for a memo from Interim President Sheley with the content of this policy.

Thompson seconded what Sarraille just said. Since the no-confidence vote on President Shirvani, when have we had so many faculty sign on to something? That indicates a strong desire of faculty for this kind of statement. We can try to stall it but we're trying to state a principle in policy that will not overthrow the CBA. We've been misled about the minimum workload for faculty in the past.

Littlewood noted that perhaps in reference to 85 signatures that there are a number of faculty who would not have signed if they had known about the conversations between the Provost and FAC.

Garcia sees this as the nitpicking of words. He's trying to get a sense of where the difference is between the policy and the memo. The second line speaks to what he thinks is a concern raised by Dean Tuedio and it says the same thing as the policy.

Thompson asked Littlewood if he knows the number of those who would not have signed.

Littlewood knows of four faculty members who would not have signed it.

Tuedio said that the second sentence of the Provost's memo speaks to the possibility of open discussion, etc. in working through considerations that a good analysis would factor in. We have a lot of things to think about in terms of faculty workload that don't have to do with workload.

There is complexity there. He reminded us that the collective bargaining agreement places administration as the decision maker. One speaks to collaboration, the second point puts limits on what is permitted. While we are going to have flexibility it will be ultimately determined by administration that the policy the resolution calls for is clear and concise. Sarraille asks that the policy be put in the faculty handbook with other items on assignment of workload. You will find article 20 of CBA is there. The result of this resolution would be to put this policy next to that article. The net effect is fine, as all the rules will be there for all of us to see.

Colnic moved to extend discussion. Passed.

Colnic noted that the genesis for this speaks to Thompson's question. This came to us from Interim President Sheley's open forum where a statement was made on practice at a former institution with flexibility given to the deans. Based on that statement, he thinks the President will be favorable to this.

Regalado noted that the rationale on the very last paragraph says it all.

Programs, departments, and colleges can meet their reasonable full-time-equivalent-student (FTES) targets and appropriate educational objectives by adjusting a variety of parameters, including the WTU counts of faculty teaching assignments, the numbers of sections scheduled, and the class sizes allowable. Faculty in the departments and programs are generally very familiar with their workings, and usually well-qualified to select optimal values for the parameters.

We're responsible to meet the FTES and we know what to do. Is there anybody who will disagree with that? As faculty we will deal with administration. This speaks to us having a greater voice in determining our own workload. We can best discuss those complexities within our own programs and we should be part of that discussion.

Result of the vote to pass this resolution, 26 yes, 11 no, 1 abstention. The resolution passes and will be sent to the President.

7. Committee Reports/Questions

No questions.

8. Information Item

a. Dennis Shimek, VP of HR/FA, will meet with FAC to discuss any items related to the IDEA evaluations process

Littlewood said that earlier this semester we passed a resolution on student evaluation of classes which will be sent to the President. We also have to recognize that there will be unforeseen questions and FAC has invited Dennis Shimek to meet with FAC to ask questions about the process when necessary next year.

**b. Faculty Instructional Assignments memo from Provost James T. Strong
(Distributed separately)**

Littlewood noted that this is still a draft and inquired when it will become official.

Provost Strong said that there is no set time and he will reflect on today's discussions. McGhee thanked the Provost for providing us with new guidelines on how to be more efficient and productive. Hopefully, we will be able to provide a better product for our students

Regalado said that his colleagues have asked him to query on a few points. On page 2. item 20.3.b. as follows:

- b. In the assignment of workload, consideration shall be given at least to the following factors: graduate instruction, activity classes, laboratory courses, supervision, distance learning, sports, and directed study. Consideration for adjustments in workload shall be given to at least the following: preparation for substantive changes in instructional methods, research, student teacher supervision, thesis supervision, supervision of fieldwork, and service on a University committee.*

The History Department faculty are wondering if relative factors would also include Individual Studies and course preparation.

The Provost responded that yes, they both would be relevant factors.

Tuedio noted that just to make that point clear that the paragraph makes a reference to the agreement, things like research, preparation, and the provisions are all there.

9. Discussion Item

a. FBAC Report Regarding Low Enrolled Course Spreadsheet

Jasek-Rysdahl noted that last fall the Provost provided UEPC with a spreadsheet on low enrolled courses. SEC asked FBAC to look at it and FBAC had discussions on how it was created and where it came from. Throughout our discussions the clear reason for the creation of it was to lower the number of courses. The flexibility it implied does not exist as it uses 24 as a minimum and 24 becomes, even though it's not in the contract, something used to drive decision making. Not all low enrolled courses are the same, and this was a report that FBAC prepared and forwarded to UEPC to review next year.

Nagel said that the phrase that's used is low enrolled. The term is an evaluative term, not an objective one. Perhaps a more unwieldy expression might be more neutral such as "courses identified by administration as low enrolled". He asked how FBAC drew the conclusion that the goal was to cut costs, and why was there a need to identify courses of 10 or fewer students.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that 10 is the number used to create the spreadsheet. Why FBAC would draw that conclusion was because that's what they were told by the Provost.

Littlewood compared this to the Provost's memo, and referenced the sentence "*including avoidance of unnecessary low enrolled courses.*" There are a number of low enrolled courses that we need for students to graduate.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that was never brought up in the FBAC discussion. It was a broad sweep looking at numbers. FBAC says not all low enrolled courses are the same. The methodology for creating the spreadsheet did not look at any of those things.

Salameh has a concern about low enrolled courses because of requirements. For students to be able to fulfill requirements, it's beneficial to keep those courses. These courses may help students graduate on time.

Provost Strong said that this started out as an analysis to UEPC to see if they thought there was any policy remedies that could be utilized to help improve the number of low enrolled courses. Low enrolled courses that are needed would be kept. This was a cost analysis so we could be aware of the dollar amount that could be associated with courses with less than 10 enrolled. We face tremendous pressure from the legislature to do more with less. Nobody is suggesting that we may not have needed courses that happen to have low enrollments. Scheduling the number of courses that we do, the complexity of our curriculum makes managing this difficult. If there are ways to be more efficient then we could have more resources to serve students in other ways. The idea was to take a look at the situation and have a conversation about it and see where it goes.

Jasek-Rysdahl agrees that this is a discussion, but it seems to him that's it one sided. It's about cost, not quality. Anyone can increase efficiency with courses of 200 students but that avoids the other side of the issue.

Salameh asked who makes the decision to cancel these courses.

Jasek-Rysdahl said that as a department chair, he has been asked to defend the low enrolled courses or get rid of these courses. Usually, the call is from the dean.

Thompson appreciates the Provost's comments. He's glad that after 20 years we now have a number. He's asked before what is a low enrolled course number. He wonders if 10 is an increase or decrease in the number.

Regalado responded to Salameh about who cuts the courses. He noted that the department heads will do anything they can to keep courses. We'll do what is best for our students. It's a negotiation between the department and the dean. This speaks to departments having a say in workload.

Provost Strong said that it is relative to cancelling low enrolled courses. Dept. chairs cancel courses and we have conversations with deans, and deans have conversations with chairs. We ask questions relative to the necessity of the course. We don't demand that courses be cancelled, but we certainly ask questions. We're a resource constrained environment, and these courses are

at the top of the agenda. Right now the Governor's office and the legislature are talking about implementing performance-based funding for higher education. Higher Ed has changed and there's a lot of pressure for performance based measures. In Virginia they are requiring institutions to report on the starting salaries for students after graduation. It's being considered by congress that the Department of Education do the same thing on a federal level. The world we're in now is different.

Regalado asked if we have an obligation to the students. He suggested we should note "pending resources" with every one of our courses, and students should have a backup plan in case a class doesn't go.

b. UBAC recommendation

Jasek-Rysdahl would encourage the President to make sure that this is operating at the beginning of the fall 2013 term, and not delay it. Maybe we should have an evaluation at two years, instead of five years.

Speaker Grobner noted that Interim President Sheley and the co-chairs came to SEC. President Sheley addressed SEC concerns.

Provost Strong supports this document.

Speaker Grobner noted that the SEC agrees that this document reflects consensus or discussion with SEC members.

Eudey clarified that Interim President Sheley came to us for feedback, but we didn't as a group come to a consensus. He took our individual feedback and reflected on it.

Thompson noted that one of the most important points is that it's not just about the allocated budgets, but it's also about the actual expenditures. He's happy to see this noted in this document.

Colnic said that it seems quite an improvement over previous iterations of UBAC. If we're going to look at efficiency it's not just about cost, it's about what we're getting for the cost and how we are succeeding and how resources are being used.

10. Open Forum

Regalado referred back to the winter intersession discussion in the April 16th Senate minutes. The Provost and VP Giambelluca did not get into the area of cost savings. Regalado thought that the charge was to assess cost savings, and note if there was a surplus and where the surplus was spent. These were the areas he wanted to see addressed.

11. Adjournment

a. 3:43pm