



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

Academic Senate
Del Norte Hall 1500
April 8th, 2014
2:30pm-4:30pm
Meeting Minutes

Attendance

Virgil Adams, Mary Adler, Simone Aloisio, Sean Anderson, Catherine Bae, Julia Balén, Frank Barajas, A.J. Bieszczad, Merilyn Buchanan, Karen Carey, Sean Carswell, Stephen Clark, Matt Cook, Manuel Correia, Beatrice de Oca, Nancy Deans, Caroline Doll, Dennis Downey, Jesse Elliott, Therese Eyer mann, Marie Francois, Jorge Garcia, Jeanne Grier, Ivona Grzegorzcyk, John Griffin, Georgina Guzmán, Beth Hartung, Debi Hoffman, Tiina Itkonen, Jacob Jenkins, Karen Jensen, Antonio Jiménez-Jiménez, Kathryn Leonard, Jim Meriwether, Jason Miller, Brad Monsma, Paul Murphy, Lindsey O'Connor, Claudio Paiva, Monica Pereira, Luda Popenhagen, Christina Salazar, Sofia Samatar, Sara Sanders, Tom Schmidhauser, Peter Smith, Elizabeth Sowers, Steve Stratton, Kaia Tollefson, Cindy Wyels.

I. Welcome

Meeting called to order at 2:38pm

II. Approval of the Agenda

Agenda passed without objection.

III. Approval of the Minutes of March 18th, 2014

Minutes passed without objection.

IV. Report from Statewide Senators

S. Aloisio reported that Statewide Senate met just before Spring Break. Discussion focused on majors over 120-units. CI programs are all under 120 or have exceptions. S. Aloisio reported much contention regarding waiver process. Resolutions passed included support for lecturer eligibility for emeritus faculty; ethnic studies, and shared governance; and against community colleges offering Bachelor's degrees. S. Aloisio also added that the Chancellor's office is currently studying ethnic studies programs; you may direct questions about that study to José Alamillo. If you have questions about other ASCSU matters, talk to Simone.

V. Report from CFA President (Griffin)

On 4/22 at the usual Senate time slot, CFA will be showing film *Inequality for All*. J. Griffin updated everyone that he recently spoke before Trustees in support of actions to bring about a quick resolution to Collective Bargaining Agreement contract negotiations that are in progress. This weekend at Westin Bonaventure is the CFA Assembly with delegates for all 23 campuses. Direct your questions to John.



VI) Report from the Senate Chair

Chair Grier announced events to kick off International Week on next Monday, April 14 – including Daniel Lee as the recipient for the Faculty Award for Excellence in International Engagement. Event will be from 4-5pm in the Founders Courtyard, with music afterwards.

Chair read an update from Dan Wakelee regarding an e-catalog system. The campus is working to implement an “e-catalog” system (the vendor is Acalog). However, after initiating this project it was discovered that there were major obstacles to full implementation and the project was put on hold until this coming summer. At this time the catalog data is not being shared between PeopleSoft and Acalog. As a result, catalog information is currently being manually updated in both systems. We are now working with T&C to restart the implementation of this integration over the summer.

--Dan Wakelee

Chair gave an update on a possible Special Committee for On-line Learning Issues at CSU Channel Islands and read their charge aloud: The taskforce for on-line and blended learning issues is charged with identifying policy issues pertaining to on-line and blended learning and propose recommended policies for senate consideration. Chair will work with the Provost to compose the committee based on the suggestions of senate exec and the definition of special composition committee from the Senate by-laws defines special committee composition.

The call for Nominations for Senate Standing and Advisory Committees will be coming out this week. Nominations to be made on the Academic Senate Community Blackboard. The Committee on Committees shored up a few things from our by-laws and with input from Senate Exec -- SCC is confirmed to be a special or ad hoc committee and will have one year terms for membership. As a note, chair added that this Committee is not in the senate bylaws as a formal committee and was created by SR 06-06.

Chair announced some “late” announcements for our Senate newsletter about relevant changes to some policies on campus. Let the Chair know if you have any suggestions on a place for relevant announcements. S. Aloisio suggested such announcements should go in next newsletter if not time-sensitive. Chair also updated everyone that the first strategic Town Hall was yesterday. There will be another on April 29th. There is no Strategic Plan document at this point; message will be going out to entire campus with an attached presentation of Strategic Plan components. Survey will also be attached in order to give input.

VII) Intent to Raise Questions

- Old Questions

1) Q. Is it possible to have some amenities in the town center, such as a mini post office?

--Nitika Parmar



--or a gas station?(amendment by M. Francois!)

A. We are working with Coast Copy Center, located in the Town Center, as this would be a logical location for post office type services. They are in the information gathering and development stage for the provision of a mail and package mailing outlet within their existing operation. They are working with the USPO, FedEx and UPS. No specific timeline can be offered at this time. Information on services and timeline will be forwarded as available.

I know this next question was light hearted, but University Glen Corporation has no plans to provide a gas station on the CSU Channel Islands campus. Limited campus demographics and significant regulatory issues are not conducive to offering this service.

Erik Blaine, AVP of Administrative Services

2) Q. Where are we in the Computer Refresh Program?

-- Kathryn Leonard

A. There is no longer a centralized computer refresh program. The money that was previously used for that purpose was distributed on a proportional basis to each Division, effective this budget year. Each Division is responsible for allocating funds to maintain their stock of computers.

--Michael Berman, VP Technology and Communication

The computer refresh funds were supplemented by new and additional general funds dollars to increase O&M needs. That distribution about doubled the funds available -- for O&M and divisional computer refresh.

--Ysabel Trinidad, VP of Finance and Administration

Within Academic Affairs funding was distributed to each AVP for faculty and staff computer refresh. It is my understanding that each area placed orders and that new machines should be delivered at any time. Faculty should contact their AVP offices for details about the status of specific orders. When new machines are delivered, old machines being refreshed must be returned for disposal or potential reuse elsewhere on campus.

--Dan Wakelee, Associate Provost

B) New Questions

1) Whose responsibility is it to manage an inventory of our computer assets?

--Christina Salazar

2) After reading two articles in *The Economist* recently regarding putting a real/quantifiable value on degrees obtained and whether they are worth the investment and debt -- is there an organized effort on campus looking at this data and to addressing these issues? A.J. Bieszczad



3) For International courses happening in summer, students have to pay a number of campus fees for technology and other related on-campus resources and services. Since those students are not here on campus to benefit from these resources, could the Student Fee Committee waive that fee for international courses? A. Jiménez-Jiménez

4) Regarding waste generated on campus. How much waste does our campus produce, including food that is thrown away? And are there ways that we can reduce that?

Jesse Elliott

5) Do we have parking to accommodate our amount of new students in the Fall? N. Deans
Amendments: Do we have faculty to accommodate our amount of new students in the Fall? And classrooms? (from floor, speakers not identified)

6) We recruit new faculty expressing values around team teaching and interdisciplinarity, but there is a lack of support for their efforts once they are here. Regarding team teaching in Fall 2014, is there a policy or plan in place for our institution and administrators to support this?

F. Barajas

VII) Continuing Business Items

- SP 13-10 Policy on Withdrawal (from SAPP)

S. Carswell introduced this policy and clarified that many comments received had to do with a term withdrawal policy. Sean clarified that this policy is either for individual courses or some courses but not whole term withdrawal, adding that hopefully next year SAPP will consider a policy on term withdrawal.

Vote taken to approve policy.

Approve 34

Oppose 0

Abstain 3

Policy passed.

VIII) New Business Items

- Student Opinion of Teaching Survey (FAC)

Motion to discuss by B. de Oca, motion was seconded by D. Hoffman. B. de Oca introduced policy and noted a reduced number of questions, and simplified wording based on feedback. C. Paiva welcomed FAC's efforts in revising the SRT form and the inclusion of expected grade in the questionnaire (as a way to control for great evaluations coming from easy grades).

L. O'Connor mentioned that scale seems to be weighted unevenly – no neutral option. Also response option #2 under "Student Engagement in the Course" has gaps between scale in hour



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

increments. I. Grzegorzczuk pointed out “inside of class” / “outside of class” wording also on this question, and noted that there are different modes of instruction outside of the classroom including field trips, service learning, asynchronous courses, etc. #2 under student engagement. J. Elliott suggested that #6 under the same section “Student Engagement” could be modified and remove “examples and illustrations” wording in order to simply read “the instructor helped me understand the course content”.

A.J. Bieszczad argued against a policy containing questions, noting that questions should be separated from policy, adding also that students should be asked about whether course met learning outcomes as listed in syllabus.

K. Leonard spoke strongly in favor of having a simplified instrument that addresses main questions of a) What aspects of the course helped and b) what would you change? Adding that students would be more likely to answer two meaningful questions rather than an excess number of quantitative questions. C. Paiva supported the suggestion of using 2 very simple questions such as: a) how do you rate the class; b) how do you rate the instructor? Discussion of how this data is used. S. Anderson gave history of survey and noted that questions at end are most important. Faculty should have flexibility to get more useful anonymous feedback / have other questions.

B. Monsma commented on numbers 5 & 6 of the addendum regarding faculty being given the opportunity to respond and asked if there is a way for this data to be attached to the mechanism rather than be separated from survey results. B. Monsma also noted that he would like all faculty to fill out contextual information to provide greater context and explanation, and to offset the greater weight and lesser reliability of these instruments.

Discussion of shortening evaluation and narrative format, and of importance of last two questions of survey. B. Monsma commented that he would welcome narrative feedback as a chair, if accompanied by a reflection, noting that this facilitates dialogue. Discussion regarding Addendum number 7. J. Balén suggests narrative format unless campuses are legally required to do quantitative data, noting that course outcomes could be an opportunity for numerical feedback. I. Grzegorzczuk suggests adding “students- how do you evaluate yourself in this course?”

S. Aloisio suggested letting departments add own questions at the end. Discussion about having questions about how challenging the course is or to what extent the student liked instructor or course material. It was suggested that feedback be opened up to a wider audience such as via brown bags. B. De Oca spoke about requirements, outcomes, chairs’ need for instruments to get a snapshot of instructors and how they are doing in the classroom, and noted the chair’s willingness to revisit these ideas. Send additional suggestions to Faculty Affairs.

- Policy on Mode of Instruction (FAC)



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

Motion to discuss by T. Itkonen, motion seconded by A. Jiménez-Jiménez. B. de Oca described process that an instructor should go through if they think a class should be taught online. Policy addresses both instructor-initiated requests and requests that do not originate from faculty instructing a course. M. Cook said that Provost will create a special committee on online learning. Chair said that FAC wanted to move ahead with this policy even as the task force is still in the planning stages. J. Meriwether spoke on behalf of the majority opinion of Senate Exec who believed it was in best interest for the policy to go forward. M. Pereira spoke for FAC of need to have policy in place until task force results are generated. A.J. Bieszczad spoke about international students needing to be more than part-time. If they take courses wholly online, they have potential problems with their visas. Discussion of whether policy addresses whole programs online. G. Wood mentions that policy applies specifically to switching of a course. J. Elliott asked how courses are listed in catalog and it was clarified that online courses are listed by section.

K. Leonard asked about part B in light of about recent whole programs moving online. Chair Grier clarified that the Santa Barbara was moved online. Discussion of what might possibly happen when a whole program moves online and a department person disagrees. M. Adler asked if courses are approved to be online, does that mean courses are approved in perpetuity notwithstanding instructor; and does each faculty member who wants to change course needs permission? Mention of lecturer faculty having right to vote in program bylaws. D. Downey asked if programs switched without faculty collective approval will be “grandfathered in”. K. Jensen mentioned about student input and suggested that certain courses cannot be taught online. Suggests adding a number “with input of students”.

J. Elliott suggested that under part A for faculty-initiated requests, a simple majority may not be enough and suggests that 2/3 vote may be more appropriate. I. Grzegorzcyk and M. Francois talked about shared/cross-listed courses. What happens when one program goes online, and the other program does not want to? M. Pereira thanked everyone for their comments and asked that everyone give their questions by email.

Chair noted that following three policies on RSP were developed in a collaborative fashion and will go through both Senate and President’s Policy and Planning Council (PPPC). Policy has also gone through Provost’s Council. Discussion on composition of RSP Advisory Council. Policies are necessary to meet federal and CSU compliance.

- Policy on PI Financial Conflict of Interest (RSP)

Motion to discuss by M. Francois, motion seconded by G. Wood. J. Miller introduced policy. Policy addresses requirements of NIH/NSF “recipients of aid must have own FCI policies/processes in place” and CSU requirement for Form 700U. Send any comments to J. Miller.

- Policy on RSP Records Retention (RSP)



Motion to discuss by M. Cook, motion was seconded by S. Anderson. Directions for retention and destruction of records.

- Policy on Subrecipient Monitoring (RSP)

Motion to discuss by M. Francois, motion was seconded by K. Leonard. Policy describes financial and programmatic monitoring and brings CI into compliance with broader national requirements. It was noted that this requirement places significant burden on faculty and staff. M. Francois suggested wording of “Director” to include institutional grants. J. Miller countered that PI definition is quite broad deeper into the policy. Please forward comments to J. Miller and the Committee.

- 2017-2018 Academic Calendar (Faculty Affairs)

Motion to discuss by I. Grzegorzcyk, motion seconded by J. Balén. Chair introduced this policy. B. Hartung mentioned restrictions for creating academic calendar and noted that there will be no hanging Mondays this year. K. Jensen suggests two five-week sessions rather than a 5/6 schedule in summer. J. Meriwether asked to find solutions prior to implementation. S. Clark asked about possibly adding a Fall graduation. I. Grzegorzcyk asked if it were possible to coordinate with local school districts. It was determined that local school districts have widely varying calendars.

IX. Reports from Standing Committees

- Faculty Affairs Committee

B. De Oca noted that the Committee is busy reviewing and editing policies.

- Fiscal Policies Committee

- G. Wood gave an update of how the \$8.15 million in supplemental funds from the Chancellor’s office were allocated. Of that amount, \$600 thousand was used for four tenure track positions, and \$1.8 million was used to hire lecturers, leading to a total of \$2.4 million, or 29.5%. [PDF of Fiscal Policies Recommendations](#) . Also gave link to [requests for fiscal year 2015](#). Noted that in the budget requests for Fall 2015, 17 TT hires were requested for a total of \$2.55 million out of the total campus requests of \$11.3m, or 23%. Remarked that is about consistent with the campus’s past level of funding per student. (Note: The Fiscal Policies memo to the Provost dated March 17, 2014 are included as an appendix at the end of these minutes).

- Student Academic Policies and Procedures

C. Wyels reported that the Committee is currently working on with business.

- Curriculum Committee

M. Cook announced that the Committee is continuing to look at programs and course modifications, noting that anything submitted now will not be available in Fall. The Committee



is excited about possibility of real-time course modifications/ new software. The course modifications deadline for next year will be Oct 15.

M. Francois asked about Curriculum meetings- are still ongoing. Yes, Curriculum is still meeting.

- General Education

D. Hoffman announcement that GE Committee has been working on course modifications and is meeting again officially on this upcoming Monday.

- Committee on Committees

Chair gave announcement on behalf of the C on C's. An email call will be going out for nominations for Senate Executive Officers and Senate Standing and Advisory Committees.

- Committee on Centers and Institutes

Chair Grier reported on behalf of the Committee that Senate Exec has reviewed their report.

- Professional Leave Committee

No report.

- Minigrant Review Committee

J. Miller reported that the Chancellor's Office will be able to give funding for RSCA funds. Our campus is getting \$34,000 additional dollars. The Committee will use reviews of recent unfunded minigrants and choose the next few projects.

- Administrator Evaluation Committee

J. Meriwether thanked everyone for their responses and noted that the Committee is in the midst of writing their report.

X. Reports from Other Committees and Centers on Campus

- Instructionally Related Activities Committee

S. Aloisio spoke about IRA guidelines change that has to with recurring students on UNIV 392 International Trips. The Committee has been working closely with the Center for International Affairs in order to prevent students from unfairly receiving the benefit of these student fees more than once by going on more than one IRA-funded International Trip. Clarified that it is one trip per student career, and that it only applies to IRA-funded trips (i.e. does not include Study Abroad). I. Grzegorzcyk asked about recurring students for CERN. M. Francois asked about provision for needing students to go on trip when no one else is in line.

- Center for International Affairs



A. Jiménez-Jiménez gave an announcement about International week. There will be a reception on Monday for students going for a year to study abroad, along with information sessions and workshops for students. Schedule has been sent out. Please spread the word to your students.

- Center for Community Engagement

D. Downey announced on behalf of the Center that 4/15 is the deadline for applying for a number of awards for service and community engagement. Please send your questions to D. Downey.

X. Announcements

- M. Cook announced that next week, April 14-18 is National Student Research Week
- J. Miller announced that there will be a survey going out regarding how many students (both graduate and undergraduate) faculty have mentored. Feedback will be given to Chancellor's Office.
- I. Grzegorzcyk announced the Business and Technology Partnership Leadership dinner on 4/17 at the Crowne Plaza. Please email Cathy Sanchez for details. Karen Jensen will be honored as Faculty Leader of the year. Scholarship committee has also decided on upcoming student recipients in science, math, business, and nursing.
- Center for Multicultural Engagement
J. Balén announced the Day of Silence coming up 4/17. Asked for faculty understanding; students should be informing you if they are participating. There will be a Breaking The Silence event at 3pm that day. There will also be a screening of Very Young Girls at 5pm that day as part of the CinÉngage screening. Also, opportunities for SAFE training are coming up- reference the ISLAS website.
- University Chorus
J. Balén announced upcoming fundraiser event, "Elizabethan Spring". Please see Julia for invitations.
- M. Francois announced that the UNIV program is still in need of University Experience Associates. The application process ends Friday. Please inform students about employment/ personal development process. HR requires two letters. For more information, please get in touch with Marie. The program is looking to diversify their team.
- D. Hoffman announced the Library faculty party and snark awards on 4/30. M. Francois mentioned that is same day as student leadership awards.



ACADEMIC SENATE

C H A N N E L
I S L A N D S

- S. Anderson announced that a survey was sent out on how faculty and staff use graphing programs, commenting that over 160 people responded from all over the nation. S. Anderson also announced the poster session for Japan, India and New Orleans UNIV 391/392 trips on Earth Day 4/20 from 4:30pm-6pm.
- K. Tollefson announced the Annual Conference on Social Justice for Education on 4/19. Also gave updates on “Children of CI” organization. They have been meeting and are making great progress toward affordable childcare for students.
- J. Elliott announced a classical music concert “Songs of Innocence, Experience, and Reflection” on 4/23 in Malibu 120 from 7-8:45pm.
- J. Griffin is in the midst of gauging interest for a possible summer group outing to a Hollywood Bowl concert. Please contact John if interested.

XI. Adjourn
4:13pm



Date: March 17, 2014

To: Gayle Hutchinson, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Faculty Senate Fiscal Policies Committee: Manuel Correia, Amy Denton, Scott Frisch
Priscilla Liang, Sean Kelly, Janet Pinkley, Greg Wood

Subject: Recommendations for Budget Priorities 2014-2015

Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with our input for the Academic Affairs budget. We have outlined our recommendations below. However, before we begin our specific recommendations, we would like to offer a comment on this year's budget process. In a word, we found it disappointing. We strongly recommend that next year and in the years to come a standard budget calendar be adopted that maximizes the opportunities for faculty input throughout each stage of the cycle. We believe that the process used this year marginalized the ability of faculty to weigh in on our budgetary priorities. This is especially troubling in a year when considerable new revenues were allocated to the campus from the CSU Chancellor's Office. We believe that artificial deadlines created a climate of exclusion, and that our input in the process was an afterthought.

In addition, we do not believe that the process regarding the flow of information this year was conducive to faculty engagement. We frankly do not understand why we were not allowed to see the requests submitted to the Provost's Office by the Associate Vice Presidents (AVPs) in Academic Affairs. If we are to have a transparent budget process, we need to have access to as much information as possible. Limiting our access only serves to increase suspicion and decrease trust. We believe that going forward all AVPs should be advised that this committee will have access to their budget requests. This will not only serve the goal of openness, but may in fact serve to dampen down unreasonable requests. That is a key purpose of transparency in the budget process. Administrators will typically not forward spending requests that have not been vetted and well-constructed for fear that they will be questioned.

A final general observation concerns the lack of supporting data that accompanied requests, particularly requests for new staff and administrative positions. It seems that while faculty need to justify our very existence through a constant stream of assessment and program evaluation, there are very little data provided in the budget requests about the need for new spending outside of direct instruction, especially the need for new permanent staff positions.

Recommendations

Tenure Track Faculty Hiring

We are very disappointed that none of the new funds from the Chancellor's Office are committed to hiring new faculty. More than 75% of courses are taught by lecturer faculty, a figure that has risen consistently. Between 2007 and 2013 the percentage of tenure track faculty as a percentage of FTE has dropped from 42% to 37.5%. While we are hiring approximately 16 new faculty for 2014-2015

(all from money budgeted last year), to simply keep up with student growth next year we would need to hire 25 new faculty, much less redress the unsustainable withering of tenure track faculty as a presence on campus. We are concerned that this is a University of Phoenix-like strategy aimed at maintaining a skeleton crew of tenure track faculty while depending on adjunct faculty to carry the bulk of the teaching load. Faculty morale is eroding after ten years of heavy teaching loads, and an increasingly heavy (for lack of new faculty) service load.

We are appreciative of the faculty hiring plan that was presented by the Provost to the Academic Senate and forwarded to this committee. However, we believe that the plan as it currently stands is insufficient to meet the needs of the university. The plan aims for mediocrity and it is likely, based on past experience and habitual statewide budget crises that even the modest goals of the plan will not be attained. The hiring plan aims for a 1 to 1 ratio of tenure track faculty to lecturer faculty. This will keep Channel Islands well below the system average. In reality this simply perpetuates a system where the majority of classes are still taught by lecturer faculty, as the teaching load for a full time lecturer is 15 WTUs per semester while the load for a tenure track faculty member is 12 WTUs. In addition, the plan contains unrealistic assumptions concerning the growth in reassigned time, and likewise imposes larger class sizes which will be difficult to attain given the lack of large classrooms on the campus. **We recommend that a task force be formed to improve the plan in ways that make it more student-centered and consistent with the mission of the university.**

Specific Questions and Concerns Regarding Numbered Requests

The budget draft that was provided to committee members in preparation of our February 27 meeting requests a total of \$5,332,164 and hiring nearly 24 Full Time Equivalent Employees. Among the employees are four new staff members for International Programs, a new articulation assistant, new budget staff, new recruitment assistant, two new employees in enrollment management, and two new employees for the Centers. The budget demonstrates very little additional support for academic programs that will bear the burden of supporting 600 new Full Time Equivalent Students (beyond an increase to the lecturer pool and a \$30,000 increase in the operating budget for Arts and Sciences). Many of the issues and questions raised below stem from a lack of data supporting need in the budget request as well as the limited time (one hour) that we had to raise questions during the meeting when this budget request was presented to the committee.

International Programs

The committee has many questions about the timing and feasibility such a dramatic growth in international programs in a single year. While the increase is being sold as quickly self-sustaining and eventually profit generating, we are skeptical about Channel Islands' ability to attract and particularly house international students in the short run. What impact will this have on our ability to serve students in our service area?

As a committee we have witnessed past attempts to grow programs with the promise that they will pay for themselves that have not panned out. The Institute for Global Economic Research (IGER) is one example of a supposedly self-sustaining endeavor that is a drain on general fund expenditures. The committee finds it especially troubling that Academic Affairs is willing to allocate funds for five people in international programs while at the same time only devoting funds for a single tenure track faculty line in international politics over the first eleven years of our existence.

Faculty Affairs

We question the need of a new assistant to help with faculty recruitment. The committee strongly supports moving to a new decentralized hiring process that would divide the work of scheduling campus visits between programs, and eliminate much of the time consuming coordination necessary to arrange interdisciplinary campus visits. Even if the current process is retained, it seems that some of the workload could be spread around to program areas rather than adding additional permanent staff for an activity that involves intensive activity over a matter of weeks rather than throughout the year.

TL Innovation

The committee would also like additional information concerning the teaching and learning innovation initiative. Specifically, what assessment has been done on the pilot projects to date, why has the particular blended format been adopted, how has student learning been improved by the project and how much funding has the university devoted to the project to date? There is considerable concern among the committee members about the proposed rapid growth – two new staff positions – of this initiative in a single year without performance data.

Academic Advising

The committee would also like to see assessment data regarding the advising office. The current model of advising used by CI is very labor intensive and relies on an increasing number of professional advisors to keep pace with enrollment growth. The faculty role in lower division advising is quite limited. Perhaps it is time to rethink the model used on campus. The CSU spent considerable sums implementing the PeopleSoft (now Oracle) system of advising information that provides students with information regarding their progress to degree. This should reduce the need for hands on advising. The use of information technology should in theory reduce the need for additional staff in this area, yet we are requesting two additional positions this cycle.

Enrollment Management

The justification for more employees in Enrollment Management continues to be an external report. We would like to know why that report has motivated so much focus and spending in that area, while other reports – external program reviews and WASC and accreditation reports of academic programs in particular, which highlight the need to hire more tenure track faculty -- have not been met with a similar response. Again, why is there a crushing need for more and more staff, while at the same time tenure track faculty needs are neglected? We still do not have a single tenure track faculty line in Accounting, yet we can hire two well paid professionals to augment our already augmented Enrollment Management staff.

Research and Sponsored Programs

We would also like data on the need for an additional highly paid employee in Research and Sponsored program. How does this office compare to offices in the other small CSU campuses? What is the role of this person?

School of Education

Why is the university spending money on rent for the Early Childhood Studies program in Goleta? More information on this line item would help the committee make sense of this request.

Staff Professional Development

Staff Professional development appears twice in the Academic Affairs budget – in \$50,000 requested by the Provost, and \$20,000 in Research and Sponsored Programs. What specifically are these funds requested for? The committee has strong concerns, especially in light of a lack of uniform allocation for faculty travel and support.

Faculty Development

The committee is unclear about the current status of faculty development. It appears that special initiatives, for example, the HSI Grants and the TL Innovation program have taken the place of formal faculty development. Is this the case? Is there a way to assess the reach and success of current faculty development spending?

WASC/Continuous Improvement

The committee is concerned about the centralization of assessment and continuous improvement funding, with little spending at the program level. Academic Programs are required to conduct annual assessments and periodic program reviews and other external reports, yet no funding is provided. The Continuous Improvement AVP coordinates activities, but there is little that can be done to institutionalize Continuous Improvement without financial support at the program level.

Santa Rosa Island

While the committee is generally supportive of the research station on Santa Rosa Island and the opportunities that will be available for both instruction and faculty research, we are concerned with the lack of detail provided with the request. How will the \$50,000 be spent, and how will that help the university meet the needs of our students?