

Senate Minutes
September 18, 2003
3:00 - 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Report from the Chair. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 4/24; 5/8; 5/22; 9/4 approved. Report from President, Provost, Associate Students, Chair-Elect and Statewide Senator. Christine Renaudin approved for three year term as Academic Council on International Programs Representative for SSU. Resolution Opposing Prop 54 first reading waived, motion passed. From S&F: By-laws change to SSP rep for APC approved. Constitutional Amendment: Lecturer Eligibility for Voting and Service tabled.

Present: Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Phil McGough, Susan McKillop, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Victor Garlin, Birch Moonwoman, Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, Mary Dingle, Raye Lynn Thomas, Derek Girman, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Steve Winter, Meri Storino, Myrna Goodman, Peter Phillips, Robert McNamara, Sandra Shand, Bruce Peterson, Ruben Armíñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Jason Spencer, Ephraim Freed, Greg Tichava, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Karin Enstam

Absent: Elizabeth Martinez, Steve Cuellar, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Robert Coleman-Senghor

Proxies: Les Brooks for Victor Garlin, Anne Greenblatt for Jan Beauly

Guests: Rose Bruce, Katie Pierce, Judith Hunt

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

C. Nelson asked the body to join in a moment of silence out of respect for the Hutchins students that were involved in a car accident on Friday. One of the those students, Lisa Kamby, did pass away as a result of the accident. Three other students, Renee Rodriguez, Erin Silver and Crystal Jennings did survive. Best wishes to them and their families.

A moment of silence was observed by the body.

C. Nelson reported that the new recording system is working much better. If everyone could speak at the volume of Edie Mendez that would be ideal. Regarding the minutes for the last meeting, Provost Ochoa's report is available on the Senate website to preserve the color. She reported back on the Senate "inaudibles" issue and stated that Laurel has contacted people from the last three meetings of Spring '03, from now on you have a week to get back to Laurel if "unintelligible" is seen in the minutes. She remarked concerning the possible extensive discussions/debate that might emerge this Senate session, she wanted to note Robert's Rules of order on debate. No one can be on the speaker's list again until everyone has had a chance to speak. No person is supposed to speak more than twice on one issue and regardless of what is going on, no one person is supposed to speak for more than ten minutes. She stated she plans to enforce these rules should it become necessary.

Correspondences: None

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda – an item added from Chair-Elect regarding the ACIP representative. *Approved*

Approval of Minutes (4/24; 5/8; 5/22 – see packet of 9/4); 9/4 – B. Peterson moved to approve, L. Brooks second. *All minutes approved.*

REPORTS

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

R. Armiñana stated that since the Provost is going to talk about this year's budget, he would talk about next year's budget. In this year's budget, there was a Budget Trailer Act which is law, different from the Supplement Budget Language which is intent. The Budget Trailer Act basically says that for next year's budget there will be no price increase inflation adjustment, no compensation and no enrollment growth. That is in the law. There are some people who would argue that you cannot bind one legislature by the next legislature, so this is only what this legislature did. Based on that the Department of Finance sent a request to the different state agencies about instructions to prepare a budget. The instructions want us to assume at least a 7.9 billion dollar fiscal gap. Before we begin next year there is a recognized 8 billion dollar gap. He predicted that it will much larger than 7.9, probably 12. There will be no funding for current year deficiencies. We were cut \$304 million and if the partnership is added we really are under funded by half a million. No discretionary funding for new initiatives. If you want to add something, you have to eliminate something of equal value. And they ask for a 20% reduction plan. He did not think we would be able to do a 20% budget reduction. But if we assume we had to do that, what would that mean? It would mean a reduction of 482.6 million dollars, that is the equivalent of losing 82,306 FTES or 11,000 students which would mean, if we had a reduction of 20%, a quarter of the present students would have to be eliminated. Or fees could be increased by 89.4%. Or we could lose 6700 faculty and 9300 staff and administrative positions. And approximately 5400 course sections. He didn't think this would happen, but wanted to give the Senators a feel for what it could mean. Whoever is Governor in January will present a budget. Last year Gray Davis presented a very honest budget. He was wrong by 3.8 billion dollars. He reminded the body that the state spent several months arguing over the numbers, wasting time. That's the worst case scenario being painted at this time. Yesterday we received a commitment for the Green Music Center of \$3,000,000 from Mr. Evert Person. So that gets us about a million and a half to the right figure.

R. Luttmann asked the President to comment on hiring tenure-track faculty next year if any vacancies occur. R. Armiñana responded at this moment he didn't have assurance one way or the other that it would happen. If the numbers he cited previously occur, then he didn't see replacements being able to happen, but he said he would like to see replacements. S. McKillop asked if there was any relationship between the timing of the department of finance letter and the hearings that are looking at taking the UC and the CSU as much out of the budget as possible. R. Armiñana responded that, no, the hearings were another matter altogether. Both the CSU and the UC have a schedule in terms of budget preparation. Both systems have to present a budget to the department of finance by October or November. In September, both systems present a statement of budget priorities, for us, next year we will

have increased mandatory costs of 55 million dollars, no matter what happens, we will have to absorb 55 million dollars mostly in compensation for faculty, health benefits, some energy costs and insurance costs, to a large extent worker's compensation costs. Even if we were not to lose or gain a dollar next year, we have \$55 million to cut. Then by October both systems have to submit a budget, then it is submitted to Department of Finance in November. E. Stanny asked that the President mentioned a 20% reduction the governor asked agencies to consider and she asked what the \$12 billion dollars translated into in terms of percentage. R. Armiñana responded that it is based on a budget of about \$73 billion dollars, therefore it would be about 16%. This year's budget for the state is \$72.8 billion, and this assumes exactly the same budget next year. S. Wilson asked about the President's plans for following the Supplemental Budget Language in implementing these budget cuts to protect instruction. R. Armiñana responded that this is a system issue that we will adhere as best as possible to the intent of that language.

Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs - (E. Ochoa) T. C. 3:15

E. Ochoa presented a report on the budget that was prepared by Vice President Schlereth who was unable to be present at the meeting. (*The information he refers to is available in pdf format on the Senate website – <http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate/>.*) This is the final budget that was adopted by the State of California. It has handled the 38 billion dollar gap with a combination of budget cuts and borrowing, higher education fees have risen to cover a portion of the general fund loss for us. The state still has an 8 – 12 billion dollar shortfall that it has not addressed for '04-'05. For us, there will be no enrollment growth for '04-'05 and no compensation increases. This is part of the law. The new budget does not address new costs incurred by the CSU as a result of bargained salary increases, increased employee benefits and any possible utility increases. There are 369.1 million dollars in budget reductions to the CSU. In the itemization you can see some of the cuts are unallocated and others are targeted for different activities. There have been increased cuts since the May revise and there are revenues that help offset those reductions in terms of enrollment growth and fee increases, so the net for the system \$225 million. He noted the Supplemental Budget language which encourages the CSU to give priority to funding core classroom and instructional needs, student services and libraries while recognizing that academic support and maintenance help maintain the quality of the institution. It also asks for reporting on major indicators. He then presented what this means for SSU and noted the cuts to each area. Some of the targeted functions are distributed over several different divisions, so the information shows the distribution over the divisions. As you can see Academic Affairs does take a big hit, but we are the biggest division. Then there is the growth money which is distributed among the divisions according to the marginal cost formula which is FTES linked. Specific to our campus there was a commitment here made in cuts to instruction to ensure classes would be available for all our students at reasonable class sizes. When Academic Affairs was asked what it would take to do that the answer was 1.3 million, so 1.3 million was earmarked from university money to help offset those cuts to Academic Affairs. And ASI made a smaller subsidy to Student Affairs. All the proceeding represents the pure cuts to SSU. Then he described the mandatory new costs – mandatory compensation increases for faculty and for the trades, and benefit increases for all employees. We did have previously anticipated utility increases, but after some discussion we decided we didn't need to do that because it looked like prices were pretty stable. For Academic Affairs that represents a reduction in increased costs of slightly over \$200,000, so that was a welcome decision. He then showed how the mandatory costs hit the various divisions. (*This detail is available via the pdf documents on the Senate website.*)

R. Luttmann questioned the Student Health Center cut as he thought that was paid for by student fees. E. Ochoa responded that he didn't have that information and referred the question to L. Furukawa-Schlereth or Rand Link. K. Pierce offered that the Student Health Center is not totally supported by student fees. The student fees will continue to go there. What is mentioned on this sheet is from the general fund.

The Chair asked the body if they wished to extend beyond the time for this report. The body said yes.

E. Ochoa continued to show the affect of the budget reductions on each division. P. Phillips observed that the budget for Administration and Finance doesn't have an OE category if you look at it in the annual budget. Their OE expenses are paid by fees charged to the Academic side and other units in the university. He questioned how they could have an operating expense reduction when they don't have it in their budget. K. Pierce stated she was certain the division of Administration and Finance does have operating expenses aside from the materials and services for which Academic Affairs and other areas of the university are being charged back. P. Phillips responded that if you look at the budget under Administration and Finance, OE is zero all the way through A&F's budget. At the back of overall university budget, there is a budget, but it's from fees paid by other divisions of the university. K. Pierce stated she may stand corrected. E. Ochoa stated that to get the final word, we need to talk to the Vice President of Administration and Finance. B. Moonwoman asked the President in what ways do you anticipate proactively reallocating funds, finding outside sources or other sources of funding, and reducing administrative costs in order to follow the intent of the Supplemental Language report. R. Armiñana responded that he didn't know yet. R. Karlsrud said he understood the 1.3 million was now being distributed across Academic Affairs to the Schools and that in the Spring we understood that those dollars would be used to make sure that sections were preserved to the best of our ability and the lecturers were retained to the best of our ability. Is that how the money is going to be spent in the various Schools? Are they only going to be allowed to spend it on sections and lecturers? E. Ochoa responded that his understanding of the intent of the patch was to ensure student access and maintaining the quality of academic programs and instruction. Since the time that the patch was committed to, we had two more rounds of budget cuts. We also had a reduction in the growth rate that the targets for this year were set at. For both of those reasons it would not make sense to lock in the full 1.3 million to mounting class sections, because you don't have to serve as many students and we're facing significant additional cuts. The Schools are going to be given the flexibility to decided how to distribute the remaining funds to minimize the adverse impact on academic programs. R. Karlsrud stated that what he said means that Deans do not have to spend the money on saving lecturer's jobs in the Spring. E. Ochoa responded yes, and stated there is a question of an intermediate objective and a final objective. He sees saving lecturer's job as an intermediate objective, the final objective is maintaining the quality of our academic programs. Now since we are faced with more cuts and a lower target, we have to ask how can we get the most bang for the buck here with the 1.3 million and minimize the impact on the quality of our programs. To a large extend that means mounting more classes than we would have without the patch, but not necessarily 100%. R. McNamara stated that looking at the different divisions, it was itemized where the deductions were going to come from in the other divisions, but in Academic Affairs it wasn't there. Many of us here are waiting for the detail on that and what the consequences are going to be. E. Ochoa said he could give another complete report on that. C. Nelson asked the body if they wanted such a report at

this time. The body affirmed. E. Ochoa asked for some time to find the correct files. C. Nelson recognized J. Spencer for his report.

President of the Associated Students - (J. Spencer)

J. Spencer reported that on the Statewide level there has been talking about major reductions next year and someone is going to have to foot the bill to maintain the quality of education we have now. From a student perspective, he heard a troubling interpretation from the statewide representative this weekend that Academic Senators are concerned about who foots the bill. It's not going to be the legislature. It's going to most likely be the students. On this campus, what I would like to hear is some sort of commitment from this body that we will look at where we can trim things before we look at that 89% fee increase that the Board of Trustees talked about. He asked the body to think about what students will be pushed out of the system if we talk about doubling fees at this point. On a campus wide issue, we are really working towards co-curricular education. Around Proposition 54 Dean Leeder and T.K. Clark have agreed to debate the issues around 54. We ask that you remind your students of the importance of attending the co-curricular events as well as the fun things Associated Students is putting on. We also are sponsoring a resolution opposing Proposition 54, that will be discussed at the Student Senate on Monday. As you start to get to know your students, please encourage your stand out students that there are opportunities for them on campus committees, to get involved. R. Luttmann asked if the Associated Students has any official comment on or reaction to the article in the Star this week on the Beaujolais Building and unhappiness. J. Spencer responded they are gathering more information to make sure that it's not just the opinion of a few students. We have a few associated students officers that live in that building and the sentiment seems to be that it's great that it's open, but there are some aspects of it that are not quite what they thought they would be. The price tag they are paying is pretty stiff. There's no official comment yet. But dissent seems to be growing.

Return to Provost Ochoa's report

N. Byrne stated that his understanding was that the 1.3 million dollars would have saved the jobs of lecturer's at the enrollment level prior to any growth whatsoever. He thought that the growth being 4% would not warrant a conclusion that there was no longer a need for as many lecturers as we had. E. Ochoa said that if that's the case he would limit his observation to two additional (*unintelligible*). E. Ochoa asked for tolerance of limited minute accuracy of the spreadsheet he was showing. He described the spreadsheet. (available in .pdf on the Senate website – <http://www.sonoma.edu>) He noted that the reduction to ESAS would have devastated that area and the decision was made to give \$400,000 to ESAS. That cost will be spread among the Schools. The amount of money that the Provost's office would have contributed to ESAS, \$200,000 would have meant no sabbaticals. It was decided to keep the \$200,000 and retain funding sabbaticals centrally and instead spread nearly the full cost of the \$400,000 support to ESAS throughout the Schools. The reason for doing it this way is that sabbaticals impact Schools in an uneven way, depending on people that happen to be eligible and people that happen to be selected. So the practice had been to fund them centrally to lessen the differential impact on Schools. That seemed to be good practice, so we thought it would be better to do it that way and spread out the costs in a more proportional fashion. Also, the 1.3 million patch really consisted of two halves, the \$650,000 was covered by the university reserves for last year, but the second half came from rollover money from within the division. So there has been a detailed discussion given that

the rollover money is distributed among the Schools in a way that is different from the way you would have to allocated it to do the patch. Of the rollover money that was there, which was about double, what portion of it was really committed and what portion was truly available for reallocation. We've also had to actually cut back enrollment more in the Spring because some Schools over enrolled in the Fall in order to hit the target for the year. And it is important to hit the target for the year because under the current budget environment, we would be penalized for exceeding our targets. We would literally lose money. The Chancellor's office is adamant that we do not continue to do more with less to the point of degrading the quality of our academic programs with no end in sight. Because of that there will be some tweaking of the numbers as we adjust the enrollment figures for the Schools.

R. Luttmann asked about the targeted reductions from the Governor's budget concerning ESAS. He wondered if the transfer of the \$400,000 to ESAS from Academic Affairs is contrary to legislative intent. E. Ochoa stated he was not involved in the detailed discussions that went into making that decision. However, after the review he made in looking at effecting these kinds of cuts, he saw it would have involved very significant layoffs of permanent employees. It would mean wholesale eliminating of entire categories of services to our students and so it didn't look like something he wanted to revisit this year for sure. S. Shand stated she thought the intent of the legislature was the percentage which they applied across all the CSUs. In fact SSU, compared to many other campuses had already reengineered ESAS, so we were already operating with a third of the employees than about 8 years ago. We had already taken such a hit and that can be looked at in keeping with the spirit of it. WASC was looking at our lack of diversity and in that unit we were looking at EOP which is one of the major recruiters of low income and diverse students on this campus. P. McGough asked has anyone made an estimate of what the impact of these cuts will be on the instructional program in the Spring? E. Ochoa responded that now that the Dean's have a sense of what kind of cuts they are going to have to cope with, they are now building the schedule for the Spring, so we will have a better sense of this in a few weeks. P. Phillips stated that his Council of Department Chairs has meet and it looks like there are very few areas to cut, just a little student assistant money. It's going to come out of the classroom, there's no way around it. What we don't understand completely is the \$400,000 and will all due respect to Sandra, what the real trade off was. We don't know what that \$400,000 is protecting. In the consultative process, it would be good for us to know that. M. Dreisbach stated that in regards to the final objective of maintaining the quality of our academic programs, when we're making cuts I hope that we look at programs and not just people. She said she knew that we wanted to preserve tenure line faculty, but there are many programs on campus that are very dependent on lecturers and if we just cut lecturers, we are cutting programs as well. J. Spencer noted that last year before the 1.3 million and it looked like the lecturers would be cut, there was talk about administrative bloat. This institution has changed a lot in the past few years, all the associated vice presidents, and MPP positions that have been slid in with really not that many more students. From a student perspective it seems we are right where we were last year and as the discussion ensues he wanted the student perspective to be that, if people are going to go, the conversation needs not to stem not just around programs and not just the bigger numbers, but how is this going to affect the classroom. Whether it is an associate vice president or whether it is someone in the hierarchy that has grown in the last few years, as those individuals are deleted, is that going to help the students more so than cutting back classes and bringing less students onto campus and I think so. If people are going to go, we need to get the most bang for our buck and not take it out of the classroom. R. Karlsrud stated he was worried that individual Deans are spending their part of the 1.3 million on things other

than classes. Nothing worries him more though than next year. Why aren't we taking those dollars that we're not going to use on sections and lecturers and roll them to next year. It seemed to him the need is far greater next year. E. Ochoa responded that is it his intent and expectation and what he will be looking for from the Deans that in delegating the decision how to allocate these diminished resources that they engage in a collegial, consultative process so that in fact the Schools as organizations have the flexibility to be the best judges of how to cope with this situation. Now that could be rolling money over next year but that has its drawbacks too. C. Nelson welcomed Ephraim Freed who will be confirmed to sit on the Senate soon to ask the Provost a question. E. Freed he stated he thought it would be very helpful to have AS, the Academic Senate, various parts of the campus community work together to really educate the students as to the changes they will be seeing next semester and next year. He said he thought a lot of student know something is going down, but most folks don't understand the scope of what could be happening.

BUSINESS

Academic Council on International Programs Representative

M. Dreisbach stated that Elizabeth Martinez had one year left to serve as our SSU representative on ACIP. She resigned for that last year and Christine Renaudin was selected to be her replacement, but subsequently we learned from ACIP that they do not accept one year replacements. In the case of a resignation, a new three year term starts. Christine Renaudin has been selected for that three year term and is willing and M. Dreisbach asked the Senate to approve her appointment to ACIP for this three year term. Structure and Functions will be looking at selecting or electing ACIP representatives in the future. Right now Laurel is collecting information for us on how other campuses do this. **E. Mendez moved to approve. S. Brannen second.** B. Peterson asked what ACIP stood for. M. Dreisbach responded that it stands for Academic Council on International Programs.

Vote – motion passed on voice vote.

C. Nelson stated Christine Renaudin has been confirmed by the Senate for a three year appointment for ACIP as Sonoma State's representative.

Resolution Opposing Prop 54 – First Reading – attachment – R. Luttmann

R. Luttmann introduced the resolution. He advised that the body proceed on this even though the recall election date is currently in doubt. He proposed to waive the rule requiring two readings. San Francisco State University, the Statewide Senate, the Board of Trustees, California Faculty Association, California Teachers have all passed resolutions opposing Proposition 54. The Associated Students are considering a similar resolution. It was forty years ago that Martin Luther King had a dream about a color blind society and I think that's a dream we all share, but you can't just wish it so. If government is color blind, racial injustices will happen and we just won't know about it. We have concerns as an institution about this. Our hands were tied somewhat three years ago by the passage of 209 in regard to specifically recruiting from racial categories, we remain concerned, as you know, about the inadequate amount of diversity on the campus and we approved a statement last December supporting diversity. Under this proposition, we wouldn't be legally able to understand the treatment of minority groups. Should we be even taking a position on such an issue? He said that the Senate's constitution says we can deal with

matters that affect the institution, in the faculty's opinion, and it is not unusual for this body to take a position on a matter of current political interest. **He moved to waive the rules requiring two readings. Many seconds.**

R. Whitkus stated he looked at the by-laws for the duties as a School representative and his duty is to bring to the constituents in his School matters that are brought up in the Senate to receive feedback from them to bring back to the Senate. He believes that is what the first and second reading is all about. On an issue such as this whenever we waive first readings we are bypassing our duties as representative to our Schools. He also argued that even if it did come to a second reading, it would be before the election. He opposed waiving the first reading on this matter.

Vote to waive the first reading – Yes = 25, No = 5, approved.

S. Wilson moved to approve the resolution. P. Phillip second.

R. Whitkus stated that when this came up he thought about it, and as Senator Luttmann has said, we have looked at political matters in the past, but it did not sit well with him and he gave his reasons. The Senate represents the voice of the faculty in shared governance of the university. We as a body have a right to speak as one voice for all of our colleagues on such matters. The resolution we are looking at is a political issue and one that cannot be thought of as reflecting a matter of shared governance on this campus. Therefore voting on this matter will represent only the views of the members in this room, not the people we represent. If the resolution passes, we will usurp the right of those we represent to speak on this issue which will weaken this body as we are not truly representing our colleagues' views. He urged a vote against the resolution and offered an alternative. To make a stronger statement the resolution should be provided as a petition for faculty, staff and students to sign, which would carry much greater weight in making the point of this resolution since it would be the voice of many individuals and not just the Senate. S. McKillop stated that this issue has to do with access. Once the student is in the university, they can ask all kinds of questions. We have to report to the federal government. This is primarily about access to the CSU. R. McNamara responded to R. Whitkus that his argument was very well put and had some merit, but asked him to consider the thought that it is not unusual for a representative body to make a decision when there is some immediacy at hand without going back to their constituencies and asking for an opinion. It happens in most legislative bodies all the time. That's why you are elected as representative. You are then held accountable when you are up for re-election again or if your constituents let you know they are unhappy with that.

Vote on resolution Opposing Proposition 54 – voice vote, passed, one nay.

From S&F: By-laws change to SSP rep for APC - attachment – Second Reading – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach explained the proposed by-law change to have the Student Services Professional elected to the Academic Planning Committee instead of appointed. B. Peterson offered a friendly amendment that the distinction should be made concerning those SSP who are eligible and who are not. He proposed that after the italicized Student Services Professionals change add Level II, III, IV. M. Dreisbach didn't think that it was necessary to add that as faculty are defined in the Constitution and didn't think it needed to be specified.

again here. It would be redundant. B. Peterson said if that was the case he withdrew his amendment.

Vote on By-laws change to SSP rep for APC – voice vote, passed.

Return to Reports

Chair-Elect of the Senate - (M. Dreisbach)

M. Dreisbach reported on the constitutional amendments vote. All three amendments did pass with 55% of eligible faculty voting. She passed out a handout showing percentages of faculty voting by status and by School. She summarized the handout. She also handed out a list of appointments that Structure and Functions had made and read the items to the body. M. Dreisbach announced staggering of the three year terms for the Lecturers now that we have three year terms for our lecturers. It was agreed last Spring that we would stagger the years depending on the number of votes received in the election. The three year term is for Steve Wilson, two year term is for Birch Moonwomon and one year term for Marilyn Dudley-Flores. She announced that nominations are now sought for faculty to sit on the search committee for the Director of Admissions and Recruitment, an important position and an important search committee. We have a medium list of faculty members who have been nominated. The deadline is September 29th. The Senate is free to make nominations of faculty members to sit on this committee. Structure and Functions will be reviewing the brief statements of interest from the nominees about why they want to sit on the committee and what they would bring to it in order to make a decision.

Statewide Senators - (P. McGough)

P. McGough made a brief comment that at the Statewide Senate Proposition 53 came up. This proposition would eventually, if the budget were such that it could, increase the constitutionally mandated part of the budget from 86% to 89%. Currently, the UC, the CSU and the prisons and some other state budget items are funded from only 14% of the budget because propositions have required that 86% of the budget be constitutionally allocated. This might eventually bring that up to 89% in which case we would be funded out of 11%.

APC, EPC, FSAC, SAC

No reports

R. McNamara asked the SAC representative what the procedures were for finding a chair. K. Enstam responded that they will not have a chair this semester. The first day we meet we were told that we did not have a chair and none of us were able to get out of our classes. We've decided to rotate and have made a schedule. R. McNamara asked if they expected to have a chair next semester. K. Enstam responded that the committee elected Brigitte Lahme from Math for chair next semester. J. Spencer stated he believed the Chair of the SAC usually sits on the Fee Advisory committee. M. Dreisbach stated they are working on that now and she is in contact with the incoming Chair.

Reports completed, returned to Business

Constitutional Amendment: Lecturer Eligibility for Voting and Service – attachments – Second Reading – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach stated this is a second reading on a constitutional amendment specifying that lecturers would be eligible to vote and serve on the Academic Senate with 6 WTU's a semester as opposed to the current half-time which is 7.5 WTU's. There were some questions that arose last week that she responded to. One question was how many additional lecturers would become eligible and based on the constitutional amendment of this semester 31 additional lecturers would have been eligible to vote and serve. There was a question about whether or not the lecturer would lose their seat, if he or she became ineligible because of falling below the 6 WTU's and would that be a permanent loss. Structure and Functions is dealing with this issue now and it has not been resolved. Also included in this week's packet is information from our sister CSU campuses regarding lecturer eligibility and voting. She summarized the data. S. McKillop stated that one of her concerns is where you have lots of part-time and they are one person, one vote, you might one day have more part-timers voting than permanent faculty. She talked with San Francisco and they give a position, you have so many part-timers and add them up and you've got that many positions. The part-timer votes on the part time that they hold. Now that might allow you to go down to less than 6 units. She worries about the possibility that sometime a campus could be run by part-timers. She suggested opening it up to more than 6 units, but be proportional to the position they hold. M. Dreisbach responded that the data changes a lot and wondered how easily it could be done. S. McKillop stated that San Francisco and San Jose have figured it out, so it's not un-doable. **M. Dreisbach moved to table this constitutional amendment proposal.** The reason she stated is that a number of committees are looking at different pieces of lecturer voting and eligibility and also how we are paying out that one unit. She argued it would be better to step back, get it all together, get a whole picture and then move forward again. She did not want to table indefinitely. S. Wilson asked how long it would be tabled. M. Dreisbach said dates didn't need to be set for tabling and it could come up again this year. Personally, she wants to bring it back as soon as the committees have addressed it. **Motion to table second by S. Brannen.** S. Wilson stated he would like to see it discussed fully and would like to see it come back and resolved.

Vote on motion to table = voice vote, passed.

Adjournment 5:00

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom