**For**

First Reading of 17/AS/14/UEPC GE Goals and Objectives. Will return as a second reading item.

Second reading of 15/AS/14/FAC Endorsement of RPT Survey Report Recommendations. Passed without dissent.

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

February 10, 2015

2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Isabel Pierce, Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

October 1, 2013

2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

Mark Thompson, Clerk

Academic Senate

January 27, 2015

**Present:** Brodie, Burroughs, Carroll, Crayton, Espinoza, Filling, Foreman, Gerson, Ghuman, Guichard, Huang, Johnson, Pengtao Li, Littlewood, Manrique, Miller-Antonio, Mulder, Nagel, Olivant, Park, Peterson, Powell, Price, Provost Strong, Roe, Silverman, Strong, Strahm, Taylor, and Wood.

**Excused**: Advanced Studies, Lee Bettencourt, Chad Stessman, Staci Gem-Scheiwiller, Kenneth Hoover, Greg Morris and Mark Thompson.

**Proxies:** Petrosky for Tzu-Man-Huang, Ron Rodriguez for Paul Parks, William Foreman for Andrew Dorsey and Ann Strahm for Paul O’Brien.

**Guests:** The following guests were welcomed: John Sarraille, David Colnic, Jennifer Cooper, Dennis Shimek, David Lindsay, Erin Littlepage, Susan Marshall, Marge Jaasma, John Tillman, Oddmund Myhre, and James Tuedio.

Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary

1. **Call to order**

2:04pm

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Speaker Carroll announced that Betsy Eudey resigned from the Clerk and Statewide Academic Senate positions, and the Committee on Committees will be trying to fill these positions for spring term.

1. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of December 2, 2014** (distributed electronically)

Approved.

1. **Introductions**

Speaker Carroll welcomed the following guests: John Sarraille, David Colnic, Jennifer Cooper, Dennis Shimek, David Lindsay, Erin Littlepage, Susan Marshall, Marge Jaasma, John Tillman, Oddmund Myhre, and James Tuedio.

1. **Announcements**

Speaker Carroll called attention to proposed Baccalaureate programs at 17 community colleges. He sent out an email to the general faculty identifying schools and programs for feedback on the issue. The memo from SWAS Chair Steven Filling and Vice-Chancellor Ephraim Smith specified a Feb 12th deadline for feedback. This memo should be shared with department chairs, departmental and college wide curriculum and resources committees. The chief concern is to avoid duplication of programs already existing in the CSU. You may contact Speaker Carroll or Steven Filling if you have questions.

Provost Strong provided an update on enrollments and distributed the following memo that will be shared with faculty today.

The following is an update on the status of enrollment and registration for spring semester 2015. The current situation, as of the first day of classes, January 27, is that annualized FTES enrollment is at 103.8 percent of the annualized 2014-15 target. The upper limit of annualized FTES enrollment (as instructed by the Chancellor’s Office) is 103.5 percent of the target (7,077 FTES). The prediction is that the University will not exceed the upper limit and that enrollment will shrink slightly over the add/drop period. It is important that the University take all reasonable actions to meet the instructions from the Chancellor’s Office and not exceed 103.5 percent of the target. Campuses no longer have to return funds to the Chancellor’s Office if they exceed the upper limit, but they are expected to reduce the excess enrollment by one percent the following year. Because enrollment growth for 2015-16 is only 1 percent, and continuing students will absorb most if not all of that growth, it is important that the University not exceed the upper limit this year. At this point, we are planning a normal add/drop period. However, new course sections will not be added to the schedule except in situations that are highly justified on other criteria.

The following are actions we ask faculty and department chairs to support to avoid exceeding the upper limit of FTES enrollment (7,077 FTES plus 3.5 percent = 7,325 FTES).

1. Only the most meritorious requests by students to exceed 18 credit units will be granted. Please deny requests unless they are highly justified. The Registrar has also been given these instructions.
2. Please be judicious in allowing students to add a section that is already enrolled at the upper course limit recorded in PeopleSoft/CMS.
3. Please dis-enroll students who do not attend the first day of class or contact the instructor within 24 hours and students who have not completed the course prerequisites unless there are special circumstances. To “IW” a student, send an email with the student’s name and the course information to Lisa Bernardo (lbernardo@csustan.edu).
4. Please recall the following policy: “At the end of the fourth week of instruction (by the census date) there shall be a campus-wide enrollment update; any student who has never attended a particular course shall be dropped administratively from the course by the instructor” (p. 23, 2013-2014 University Catalog). Please administratively withdraw such students following the procedure outlined above.

The primary reason enrollment continues to be high for 2014-15 is because of continuing student enrollment. The growth of this sector compared to last year is 3 percent of the 7,077 target. For 2014-15, new freshmen and transfer FTES levels are flat compared to 2013-14. Student credit load, as measured by FTES/headcount, was also flat for 2014-15 compared to 2013-14. The strong enrollments in 2013-14 are moving through the “pipeline” and increasing demand, and other sectors are holding steady. The challenge for next year is coping with the fact that the level of enrollment growth provided the CSU is only 1 percent after 2.9 percent in 2014-15 and 2.4 percent in 2013-14. Additionally, the upper limit for exceeding the target as a percentage has been reduced from 5 percent in 2013-14 to 3.5 percent in 2014-15 and 2015-16. This reduction in the upper limit provides less flexibility for the University to exceed target. The University receives only tuition fees for FTES that exceed the target. As mentioned above, FTES that exceed the upper limit must be managed down by at least 1 percent the following year. Strong continuing student demand puts the forecast for 2015-16 at 104.0 percent of the target, exceeding the upper limit by half a percent. The University has some time to cope with this challenge for 2015-16, and a variety of tactics are being considered. The mission is to serve students and the region. The University is in a position of managing difficult trade-offs, and I appreciate your help coping with these constraints. Thank you for all the good work you do to support students and the University, and I wish you the very best semester. If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Salameh thanked the Provost for sharing this information in advance. Last year the registration information was given to students at the last minute.

Nagel noted that the calculation from 103.8 to 103.5 reduction and it comes to 21 or 22 FTES. Yes per Tillman, it’s a small number.

Strahm asked if the fall graduations factor into that. Yes, they take that into consideration.

Speaker Carroll noted that the Chancellor’s office is changing the way they penalize campuses for excess targets and asked why the change?

The Provost’s understanding is that Chancellor White was uncomfortable with campuses giving money back due to enrollment pressure. The tradeoff is that we don’t want to give the impression that we can educate more students without more funds. Some of our fixed costs can’t be addressed as an example, maintaining buildings and other support services.

Sarraille: You also can’t hire enough faculty to maintain a reasonable ratio to faculty and students. Espinoza noted that the numbers are actually enrolled students.

Tillman: Our history of going from the first day of instruction to census date is that our enrollment tends to increase, so even small reductions in FTES become very important.

Provost Strong noted that when we go over the target we don’t get any subsidies from the state and rely solely on the tuition paid by the students. This is not enough to hire the amount of faculty we need and to operate effectively.

Gerson announced that Chris Roe is the faculty fellow who will give a workshop on Common Core. She also mentioned the following fiction and nonfiction book club meetings. There are books available at the FDC if you’re interested.

Fiction

* [Snow Child](http://www.amazon.com/Snow-Child-Novel-Eowyn-Ivey/dp/0316175668/ref%3Dsr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1422235139&sr=8-1&keywords=snow+child) (Feb 10)
* [The 100-Year-Old Man who climbed out the window and disappeared](http://www.amazon.com/100-Year-Old-Man-Climbed-Window-Disappeared/dp/1401324649/ref%3Dsr_1_fkmr0_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1422235175&sr=8-1-fkmr0&keywords=%E2%80%A2%09The+100-Year-Old+Man+who+climbed+out+the+window+and+disappeared) (March 10)
* [Running the Rift](http://www.amazon.com/Running-Rift-Novel-Naomi-Benaron/dp/B00B2SFX3S/ref%3Dsr_1_fkmr0_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1422235196&sr=8-1-fkmr0&keywords=%E2%80%A2%09Running+the+Rift) (April 21)

Non-fiction

* [In Stitches](http://www.amazon.com/Stitches-Dr-Anthony-Youn/dp/1451649762/ref%3Dsr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1422235224&sr=8-1&keywords=In+Stitches) (Feb 24)
* [Inside of a Dog](http://www.amazon.com/Inside-Dog-What-Dogs-Smell/dp/1416583432/ref%3Dsr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1422235247&sr=8-1&keywords=Inside+of+a+Dog): What Dogs See, Smell, and Know (March 24)
* [Soul Repair](http://www.amazon.com/Soul-Repair-Recovering-Moral-Injury/dp/0807029122/ref%3Dsr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1422235296&sr=8-1&keywords=Soul+Repair) (April 14)
* [The Black Russian](http://www.amazon.com/Black-Russian-Vladimir-Alexandrov/dp/0802122299/ref%3Dsr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1422235334&sr=8-1&keywords=The+Black+Russian) (May 5)

If interested in participating, please request a copy of the book from Ms. Emy Barsley or by calling x3216. Hope to see you there!

Pappageorge winner Dr. Choong-Min Kan from the Department of Biological Sciences will be presenting the “Microbes and My Life” seminar on Wednesday, February 18th, from 3-4pm, in FDC 114.

Dr. Arnold Schmidt from the Department of English will be sharing his sabbatical work in a seminar entitled "Sabbatical Research in Rome & London: Pizza & Pasties, Poetry & Pirates" on Monday, February 23rd, in FDC 114.

Regalado noted the upcoming presentation by Sara Fields to discuss Title IX. The talk will be on Feb. 23rd and admission and parking is free. He thanked Dennis Shimek as well as Dean Tuedio for their generous support and helpful suggestions. The History department is very happy to bring this presentation to our campus and it will be successful due to your help.

Tuedio mentioned 3 prominent speakers coming to campus this spring. On Feb. 19th CAHSS and CEKSW are hosting An Evening with Bobby Seale in MainStage Theatre at 7pm. Bobby Seale was a seminal leader in the formation of the Black Panther Party and remains a significant community activist in Oakland with his R.E.A.C.H! Foundation. In addition to his talk that evening, Bobby Seale will meet with students earlier in the afternoon of the 19th and with faculty on Friday morning (Feb 20). We are preceding this special event with a Black History panel presentation on Feb. 18. This panel discussion, sponsored by the History Department and our Campus Diversity Committee, will feature Professor Sean Malloy, a founding member of the UC Merced faculty.

CAHSS is also hosting Ericka Huggins, another prominent human rights activist, poet, professor and former Black Panther leader and political prisoner, as a visiting scholar during Women’s History Month. She will present a public talk in MainStage Theatre at 7pm on the evening of March 17th; she will also meet with students earlier in the day and again on March 18.

On April 1, the Cesar Chavez celebration keynote speaker will be Paul Chavez, youngest son of Cesar Chavez and President of the Chavez Foundation. His talk in Main Dining will be preceded by a special screening of a 2014 Sundance documentary film entitled Cesar’s Last Fast, at 4pm in MainStage Theatre (with a follow-up Q&A session with Paul Chavez)..

Dean Rodriguez noted that the CSU system has decided to suspend subscriptions to electronic journals delivered by Wiley-Blackwell due to a proposed 12% increase in subscription costs.   Wiley declined counter-proposals by the Chancellor’s Office for smaller price increases.  The Electronic Access to Information Resources (EAR) Committee comprised of library faculty involved in collection development from the 23 CSU campuses recommended to “walk away” from the Wiley offer.  The Council of Library Directors (COLD) endorsed this recommendation.  Dean Rodriguez reports that CSU Stanislaus University Library will be able to function in a nearly normal manner in the foreseeable future by relying upon Ebsco databases, Interlibrary Loan expedited services and subscribing to a small number key titles.

1. **Committee Reports/Questions**

None.

1. **Consent Item**
	1. Faculty Representative on the ASI Board of Directors

Speaker Carroll noted that there was a misunderstanding of ASI Bylaws so this item is being removed from the agenda as the Committee on Committees will handle the this appointment.

1. **Information Item**
	1. Update on the Nominees for 2015-17 Faculty Trustee

Speaker Carroll: As you recall at an earlier Senate meeting we were asking for nominations and we put together a packet for Dr. David Colnic and sent it to the Chancellor’s office. Carroll thanked the senators for voting during the break over email. All votes were positive in support of Dr. Colnic’s nomination and he received more than the required votes. He hopes that Governor Brown smiles on Colnic’s application.

Colnic thanked everyone for the support of his application and he appreciated in particular that Speaker Carroll helped put together what he thought was a strong packet. However, they did create a short list and he did not make the short list, but never the less he thanks everyone for the support. Applause.

1. **First Reading Items**
	1. 17/AS/14/UEPC GE Goals and Outcomes

Speaker Carroll limited discussion to 30 minutes. Strahm is hoping that the senators will have good ideas and be supportive to get this resolution passed. Strahm read the following resolution aloud:

**California State University Stanislaus**

**17/AS/14/UEPC – Resolution to Adopt General Education Goals and Outcomes**

**Be it Resolved:** That CSU Stanislaus adopt the attached General Education Goals and Outcomes.

**Rationale:**  Executive Order 1065 requires that the CSU Stanislaus General Education Goals and Outcomes align with the essential learning outcomes developed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities as part of their Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative. The accompanying goals are the result of a thoughtful, multi-year, collaborative effort between the GE Ad Hoc Committee, General Education Subcommittee of the University Educational Policy Committee (UEPC), the Faculty Coordinator of General Education, the Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, the Faculty Coordinator of the Assessment of Student Learning, and UEPC. The resultant goals represent the skills and competencies, knowledge, and abilities that CSU Stanislaus commits to developing in its students.

We recognize that the Goals and Outcomes of any educational program are continuously being evaluated and revised. The determination of Goals and Outcomes for General Education is one part of an iterative process designed to assure that students are acquiring the knowledge, skills, and abilities we believe to be critical to a broad liberal education. As individual courses are mapped to the GE goals and outcomes, assessment strategies are developed, and evidence of student learning analyzed, we may desire to modify our Goals and Outcomes to better reflect our academic programs. Every five years the GE Subcommittee will also revisit these Goals and Outcomes as we respond to changes in our world and society.

*California State University, Stanislaus*

*General Education Program*

**Goals and Outcomes**

Goal 1: Develop the intellectual skills and competencies necessary to participate effectively in society and the world.

 Students attaining the first learning goal will be able to:

1. Demonstrate effective oral communication.
2. Demonstrate effective written communication.
3. Demonstrate the ability to think critically and creatively.
4. Apply quantitative reasoning concepts and skills to solve problems.
5. Find, understand, examine critically, and use information from various sources.
6. Comprehend and use appropriate technological tools effectively.

Goal 2: Develop broad knowledge of biological and physical sciences, humanities and creative arts, and social sciences.

 Students attaining the second learning goal will be able to:

1. Explain and apply basic scientific methods.
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the living and non-living physical world.
3. Recognize the structures and institutions that frame human interactions.
4. Identify and articulate the nature of cultural, intellectual, or artistic ideas and works.
5. Demonstrate effective creative expression and understanding through artistic means.
6. Identify life-skills and behaviors needed to flourish as a mature person.

Goal 3: Develop abilities to integrate knowledge, make informed ethical decisions, and accept civic responsibility.

 Students attaining the third learning goal will be able to:

1. Integrate and combine the knowledge and abilities developed in several fields to analyze and critically evaluate specific problems, issues, or topics.
2. Illustrate the ability to self-reflect and assess relevant ethical values.
3. Identify and analyze problems within local, regional, national, and/or global contexts.
4. Demonstrate enhanced awareness of multicultural, community, and/or technological perspectives.

When proposing a General Education Course, choose the goal that is most central to your course and identify a minimum of two (2) corresponding learning outcomes that can be achieved in your course.

Moved by Speaker Carroll seconded by Nagel. The floor is open for discussion

Nagel noted that in goal 2, there is concern that the outcomes listed under that goal seem to misfire when it comes to identifying what philosophy courses do. It’s not clear how the philosophy class can do these the way they are written. The word nature, in particular is the problem. Perhaps “appreciate” would be better. If you propose a GE course to the GE Subcommittee, will they be using this to assess what is a GE course? It may be unclear to the Philosophy dept. how to address Goal 2.

Salameh asked how these goals will be measured.

Susan Marshall noted that these are the goals that were articulated in 2013 when Caroline Mercier was the GE director. They went thru UEPC and they felt that we needed more discussion on campus and halted the Senate reading of the goals. The GE Ad Hoc Task Force was created to hold these discussions. They have been meeting with the departments and are aware of some of the concerns. It is impossible to put forth an assessment plan without having the GE goals in place. That’s why we don’t have an assessment plan on campus because we don’t have the goals. Common sense tells us that there will be an exam or perhaps a paper that instructors put forth illustrative of what students have learned/achieved in your class. Our ad hoc committee is only making recommendations for the GE Goals.

Nagel's question about Goal 2 item d could possibly be addressed by adding the word appreciation.

Speaker Carroll asked what the implications are if this doesn’t get passed.

Strahm’s understanding is that we were given the charge to do this several years ago with a time line and that next year we reach the time limit. At that point we will be out of compliance. We continue to be out of compliance with the Chancellor’s Office and are well beyond that time frame. Then WASC will get concerned and she doesn’t know what the actual ramifications will be.

Marshall is not sure what the ramifications will be but this has been going on since 2008/09. It comes from EO 1065 that we need to integrate the courses and GE should not be taught as isolated fragments and should be integrated. This is not reflected in the GE goals we have now. The revision is not that the classes will change but the idea that they will be connected to each other.

Strahm thinks there was a 7 yr. timeline to accomplish this on our campus. Marshall knows that the other CSU's are in compliance with this.

Speaker Carroll noted that the bottom line is that essentially UEPC is putting bringing it forward for an up or down vote. This is coming back in two weeks for a second reading.

Salameh is confused about assessment vs. goals. Marshall is saying the opposite that there can’t be an assessment plan without approving the actual goals by the Senate. Once their ratified by the Senate they can move forward. Their ad hoc committee is discussing disbanding this spring and wanted to make their recommendations were completed before the end of this year. If these are not acceptable to the Senate than perhaps this body can help with word smiting. Speaker Carroll noted that we can make suggestions but word smiting is not in our purview.

Regalado wonders if we’re not opening up Pandora’s Box with Goal 3 using the word ethical decisions, how can that be determined. Goal 3: Develop abilities to integrate knowledge, make informed ethical decisions, and accept civic responsibility. Whose ethical values are to be assessed? He suggests dropping these words and just state make informed decisions on goal 3 and not mention informed ethical decisions.

Strahm: Anytime you have contested values you will have the issue Regalado is raising. She also knows that college is one of those places where in every discipline we are encouraged to assess our values and assess those in relation to the new ideas we are encounter. If those values and ethics are weak they won’t survive the assessment. There are no sacred cows. Through the process of learning we can evaluate our values and those that stand up to that scrutiny we can hang onto and discard the ones that we don’t feel are important. In the world we live in there are people being slaughtered for their ideas because someone else doesn't like them. She assumes that most of us reevaluate everything in our lives when we find new ideas. We need to make some kind of stand and maintain the idea of what college is about. "

Regalado thinks it opens up Pandora’s Box and we may be facing how ethical is determined?

Marshall: It’s the student’s ability to integrate knowledge and make informed ethical decisions and accept civic responsibility. This doesn’t mean it’s the faculty. Regalado noted that it’s about critical thinking.

Sarraille wants to clarify what’s going on with respect to the language. He’s encouraged to offer specific changes to language although the Senate is not allowed to make changes here. It sounds like Susan Marshall is looking for feedback and encouraging people to send her the language.

Marshall: The ad hoc committee didn’t have the authority to change anything on the document, so needs to return to UEPC as the advisory committee shouldn’t do that. Strahm suggested that you send your suggestions directly to her to be discussed at UEPC.

Colnic noted that the GE Subcommittee is meeting Tuesday of next week and will consider this discussion.

Steve Wood has two concerns. If there is not more precise language how do we as faculty go about assessing these outcomes? He understands the goals are needed to prepare an assessment. He thinks both items need to be worked on at the same time.

Ghuman thanked the ad hoc committee for their work. It’s hard to get something that encompasses all programs as far as his understanding of this, but he doesn’t think every course will be able to hit all of these. This should allow for some latitude. Can you add language that encourages instructors to hit 80% of the goals? It’s already noted in the document. The idea is to get a much as you can from the GE program.

Strahm noted that when proposing a GE course you can choose the goal closest to your course and identify two at the minimum. Maybe including something like this would be helpful to folks. Maybe this would contract a certain number of courses if you don’t want to open up everything but make sure that the depts. that want to have a robust play with the GE goals have that opportunity.

Tuedio thinks these goals have come a long way and are moving in the right direction. Maybe this is where they will land. He shares Nagel’s concern about Goal 2 objective D and thinks it’s important to keep the word “articulate” and that appreciation is important. Differentiated from other decision making. Civic responsibility also has a level of complexity, but we need to remain committed. While these are goals serving outside constituents, the last sentence is important to us because it is going to be used by a committee that will be assessing GE. It’s important to make students to be aware of how to make that decision. We will have to work with our students to make that meaningful to our students. We need to be committed to it. Also, when talking about technological tools, maybe use the words “technological resources”.

Strahm is tracking changes when we look at Goal 2 D instead of using mention of nature we can articulate it as appreciation. We want students to be able to develop an appreciation of the nature of cultural, intellectual or artistic ideas and works.

Tuedio appreciates that sensitivity, but was approached by outside groups to discuss related issues in a meaningful way. These are serving outside of us. The way this will be used will be by a committee that will be reviewing courses for GE.

Marshall appreciates all the comments and if someone is interested in hearing what other departments are saying on the goals they were equally divided in faculty members that thought they were too specific and those that thought it wasn’t specific enough. We want a big tent and to make sure that GE is broad and wide. She believes that the word appreciation was used in the past and removed.

Provost Strong thinks that ethical thinking and decision making are very important. He agrees with Tuedio that the community expects leadership in ethics and values to society. We should be encouraging students to engage in civic responsibility and it’s also important to the state and communities. Goal 2 is well placed.

Foreman has a concern regarding the paucity of things directly related to the humanities. Why must we only choose two from one goal, rather than choose more than one of the goals? Why can’t we choose two goals and one outcome from each? It was originally approved by UEPC and removed. Now we are saying that you have to do them all.

Strahm: Is there a kind of taboo on choosing multiple goals for one class? No. Maybe UEPC can add in or choose at least one learning outcome from 2 or more goals.

Wood: If you proceed with this, is this only relevant to new course proposals or to existing course proposals?

Jaasma said that the recertification will happen with the program review. Now it goes to GE Subcommittee.

Guichard asked about the rationale that states that this will be reviewed every 5 yrs. She is assuming that if this changes every five years, they have the potential to have to go through recertification.

Regalado is not against the notion or principles that we have ethical decisions but is concerned that we live in community with power brokers that don’t share our values, and our administrators have to deal with these folks from time to time. We have to be prepared to defend these positions. There are people that put us under their microscope and he is concerned that we don’t open ourselves to these positions. He agrees in principle but is concerned with some pushback from the community.

Tuedio was approached by the Modesto Rotary and they’re interested in the topic of ethics and not in a criticism of the university because they are expecting us to do this and are looking to us for this.

Peterson really likes Foreman’s suggestion. In the past the complaint was that they were expected to do all the outcomes and do them well. By breaking them down she sees that some can come up all the time but are not the overall main goal. She can only say that they can probably explain those methods. She rather see it stated: Indicate which goals can be achieved in your course.

Strahm asked for clarification, when proposing GE Goals, choose a minimum of 2 and indicate which outcome can be achieved in your course.

Peterson: You can have goals that are not easy to assess but it doesn’t mean you should give them up as a goal.

Provost Strong agrees with Tuedio that the community expects us to teach community building and ethical decision making and thinking. When the University does not do that they are usually criticized. He thinks it’s very important. We have a values section in our Mission which addresses values specifically. Maybe helpful to the committee for the last sentence to include: choose the goal (s) which would open up to having multiple goals.

Sarraille pointed out that revamping GE is something that’s been done system wide and the result on many campuses has been that the process is to have fewer courses and bigger sections and simplify to standardize. Therefore you should consider the goals and criteria for recertifying your course as a serious thing. If you have courses in your dept. that you want to preserve look ahead and try to assure that you can make the cut when that happens.

Speaker Carroll noted that this resolution will return to UEPC for discussion and return to the Senate as a second reading item.

1. **Second Reading Item**
	1. **17 /AS/14/FAC Endorsement of RPT Survey Report Recommendations**

Burroughs noted that per the last Senate discussion, it was suggested to specifically name the 3 recommendations which have been added, and the FAC also added the word “following” in the 4th Resolved. Those are the changes that were made based on the previous discussion.

We are voting on moving this forward to the President and it is not a sense of the senate resolution. We want to acknowledge this as a statement by the Senate.

The resolution passed without dissent.

1. **Open Forum**

Strahm thanked everyone for the suggestions and asked that any more revisions be sent to her sooner rather than later. Their first meeting is this Thursday.

1. **Adjournment**

3:40pm