R. Abbott, O. Aina, D. Lee, B. Yorker

ABSENT

K. Baaske, C. Haras, J. Perez-Carballo

EXCUSED ABSENCE

Chair Hunt convened the meeting at 1:34 p.m.

1. 1.1 The Chair's Announcements:

ANNOUNCEMENTS

    1.1.1 I am pleased to report that the ASI Board of directors has appointed Sandra Largaespada as an Undergraduate Academic Senator and Christopher Bowen as a Graduate Academic Senator.

    1.1.2 Following is a joint response from Ashish Vaidya, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Peter Quan, Vice President for Information Technology Services, to the question raised by Senator Abbott at the Senate meeting on March 1st.

Question:
I would like to know what steps are taken to ensure that anonymous assessments and anonymous votes actually are anonymous.

Response:
Regarding anonymous assessments, Institutional Research is officially designated to conduct all campus surveys. ITS provides the software application but all surveys are constructed and conducted by Institutional Research following strictly established survey guidelines. All survey results are secured by Institutional Research and remain confidential and anonymous.

The anonymity of online voting is predicated on the concept of segregation of duties. Academic Affairs conducts Academic Senate voting using a software application developed many years ago by the College of Natural and Social Sciences. Academic Affairs ITCs are responsible for distributing the ballots via e-mail. Each ballot contains a link to a unique voting address. This is the only step during which the name and unique identifier (the link) are connected. The identifier is comprised of a complex string of alpha/numeric code and does not contain any portion of the user's name. Once the ballot is cast, the application posts a message on the unique identifier link telling anyone subsequently using the link that another vote cannot be cast, thereby preventing any single individual from casting multiple ballots or an unauthorized person from voting. At the close of elections, a program is run that tabulates the votes, which were posted to a database that contains only the unique identifiers and the vote(s). The individual tabulating votes has no access to the originating emails. Voting results are secured by Academic Affairs.

  1.2 Vice Chair's Announcements

The following faculty members have accepted appointment by the Nominations Committee to serve on the Student Grievance Committee for one-year terms ending Summer Quarter, 2012: Tina Salmassi (Biological Sciences), Joan Fingon (Curriculum and Instruction), and Anthony Cox (Television, Film, and Media Studies).

2. 2.1 Senator Aniol announced his intent to raise the following question of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS

I have two questions about the sabbatical approvals for 2011-2012. For this period the University Faculty Policy Committee received 50 applications. FPC ranked 15 applications as highly recommended and 22 as recommended. Only the 15 applications in the highly recommended category were approved.

INTENT TO RAISE QUESTIONS *(Continued)*	Question 1: What is the purpose for the recommended category since only those in the highly recommended category were approved?
	My second question is about the recent trend in sabbatical approvals. For the 2010-2011 year 48 applications were submitted and 31 were approved. For the 2009-2010 year 35 applications were submitted and 27 were approved. For the 2008-2009 year 56 applications were submitted and 29 were approved.
	Question 2: Why is the number of sabbaticals approved for the 2011-2012 year significantly lower than the numbers in these previous years?
	2.2 Senator Moss announced his intent to raise the following question of the Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer:
	What steps has the University taken in the last year to further reduce the overall carbon footprint from 2010 levels, and how is this measured?
	2.3 Senator Carrington announced her intent to raise the following question of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:
	I want to know why there is not a transparency as to who was awarded a sabbatical and who was not. Clearly the list of who is eligible is public record but when they are awarded the results were not public. Why is there not a transparency? Is this not a public record?
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES	3. 3.1 It was m/s/ (Huld) to approve the minutes of the meeting of April 12, 2011 (ASM 10-18).
	3.2 Senator Dumitrescu suggested an editorial amendment to her announcement in item 1.3 of the minutes.
	3.3 The editorial amendment was accepted and the Chair ruled the minutes were approved.
APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA	4. It was m/s/p (Ledesma) to approve the agenda.
STATE OF THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY ADDRESS *Presented by Alice Kawakami, University Librarian*	5. University Librarian Alice Kawakami presented a report on the University Library and a brief question and answer period followed.
PROPOSED POLICY MODIFICATION: MODES OF DELIVERY, <u>FACULTY HANDBOOK</u>, CHAPTER IV (10-26) *Second-Reading* *Forwarded to the President*	6. 6.1 The Chair reminded the body that the following motion was on the floor: to amend line 27 of document 26 by deleting <u>80%</u> and inserting **90%**, and line 36 by deleting <u>20%</u> and inserting **10%**.
	6.2 Debate ensued.
	6.3 The motion failed.
	6.4 The recommendation was APPROVED as amended (10-26). Copies of the document are available in the Senate Office.
ADJOURNMENT	7. It was m/s/p (Ulanoff) to adjourn at 2:29 p.m.