

**Minutes
Academic Senate Meeting
October 3, 2002**

Abstract

Report from Chair. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes amended and approved. Update on Provost Search Committee. School Calendar for 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 approved. First Reading of Resolution: Audit of Greenhouse Gas Emissions. First Reading Constitutional Amendment regarding Article III, Section 2.2. Constitutional Amendment and By-Laws Change regarding Staff Requirements received short discussion. Resolution on Search for Provost approved.

Present: Jan Beaulyn, Wanda Boda, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Ephraim Freed, Victor Garlin, Derek Girman, Bob Karlsrud, Heidi LaMoreaux, Rick Luttmann, Phil McGough, Eric McGuckin, Susan McKillop, Robert McNamara, Edith Mendez, Scott Miller, Jen Minnich, Birch Moonwomon, GerryAnn Olson, Peter Phillips, Jeffrey Reeder, Elizabeth Stanny, Liz Thach, Raye Lynn Thomas, Karen Thomson, Sunil Tiwari, Tim Wandling, Art Warmoth, Helmut Wautischer, Richard Whitkus, Steve Winter

Proxies: Jim Pedgrift (*Steve Wilson*)

Absent: Ruben Armiñana, Steve Cuellar, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Bernie Goldstein, John Kornfeld, Marcus Payne, III

Guests: Elaine Sundberg, Jacqueline Boman

Meeting begin at 3:10pm

Report of the Chair of the Senate – (Noel Byrne)

Wanted to bring the to the attention of the Senate an important issue and has asked Scott Miller to present.

Report of the Chair of the Senate – (Noel Byrne) - continued

S. Miller: After a discussion with a friend, Larry Robertson (who is with the City of Sebastopol), he suggested that SSU hold a Teach In regarding the War with Iraq. Procedurally this can be accomplished like the Forum of 9/11, which was held in conjunction with the Provost and the Associated Students.

Action Item: Jen Minnich, Ephraim Freed and Noel Byrne will meet to discuss plans to take this plan forward. It was also suggested that Deb Hammond would also like to be involved.

P. Phillips: If the Forum were to be held on a Friday or Saturday, then Dennis Kemich (spelling?) (Demo/Senator) may also be willing to attend.

No Correspondence

Approval of the Agenda

P. Phillips has asked to propose a Resolution Regarding Search for Provost be added to today's agenda.

Point of Order – Motion to Approved

R. Coleman-Senghor: What is this regarding?

P. McGough: Questioned why wasn't this brought to the Senate's attention 48 hours ago.

R. Coleman-Senghor: We can get around this rule by taking a 2/3 vote to approve.

V. Garlin: **Motion seconded.**

P. McGough: Though he would probably support the motion (to add the Resolution to the agenda), he still wanted 48 hours notice and did not feel there was not enough time to discuss.

V. Garlin: Felt that this needed a second reading process.

A. Warmoth: Wanted to see the Resolution before voting on it.

R. Luttmann: General rule is to get things to the Senate floor via the Executive Committee. Strongly urges that Resolutions go to the Executive Committee.

P. Phillips: Stated that he proceeded in this manner because it was a timely urgent event.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Motion to Approved was unanimously and it will be No. 6 on the agenda.

Approval of the September 19, 2002 Minutes:

Page 1: Add Liz Thach to the attendance list.

Page 4:

N. Kaufman: Legally, 15% of the homes have to be affordable housing. The developer is building a variety of types of housing, with mixed size lots in a block area. This is called new urbanism.

Correction:

H. Wautischer: These homes would not be of service to SSU since salaries of teachers would not allow them to qualify.

Page 7:

S. Wilson read a communication he had written. (see attached)

Correction:

S. Wilson read a communication he had written regarding inconsistencies about the last day of the academic calendar.

Attachment should have had a proper title, name of author and date of submission.

Page 8:

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

Budget Update. On September 2nd, the Assembly passed the budget that the Senate approved, except for the \$750 million that the Governor will reduce at

Correction:

Budget Update. On September 2nd, the Assembly passed the budget that the Senate approved, **except** for the \$750 million that the Governor will reduce at

Minutes Approved with corrections.

BUSINESS

Update on Provost Search Committee

R. Luttmann: Blue Paper Policy

There are 14 nominees for 4 positions on the Provost Search Committee. This Senate meeting is the last opportunity to add nominees to the voting ballot.

Ballot will be hand distributed on Friday, October 4, 2002. E-voting will not be available at this time since proper procedures have not been formulated.

Normally R. Luttmann would assist the Senate Secretary in the counting of the ballots but since he is a nominee, Noel Byrne and Carol will do the counting on Monday, October 14, 2002.

List of Nominees:

Tom Anderson, Emiliano Ayala, Melinda Barnard, Ellen Carlton, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Randall Dodgen, Paul Draper, Paula Hammett, John Kramer,

List of Nominees: - continued

Rick Luttmann, Linda Nowak, Steve Orlick, Nathan Rank, Elaine Wellin and Brian Jersky for URTP.

N. Byrne asked for final nominations from the floor. None received.

Nominations closed.

Approval of School Calendar for 2005/2006 and 2006/2007

H. Wautischer: Regarding the issues of the last day of the school semester. He felt that this needed to be discussed further.

S. Miller: Need clarification about what actually needed to happen. Possibly a resolution?

V. Garlin: Felt that the FSAC should review the School Calendar first. There is a statewide policy but nothing written. It has been left to campuses to interpret. SSU should exercise discretion. We should not question unemployment claims by lecturers. We also need to know why SSU is getting involved with the claims. The Senate needs a report. Also suggested that we make a resolution.

Motion that Campus Policy of Contesting Unemployment Claims by Lectures be send to FSAC seconded by S. Winter.

R. Luttmann: Stated that we can go ahead and initiate a resolution but in the meantime approve the School Calendar.

P. Phillips: What is in question in the lecturers portion. We should put in their starting and ending dates. FSAC should review and get back to the Senate with a recommendation by the end of the semester. We need to study the factual foundations.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Noted that this item is not on the agenda.

Motion – Underlying policy be send to FSAC for a report.
Motion approved.

Motion to approval calendar as it stands, passed.

Resolution: Audit of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

D. Friedel was not able to attend this meeting. In her place is Zeno Swijtink.

For the last year, plans have been in place to begin a city / county audit of gas emissions. The process will begin this spring with four workshops. What is needed is support and encouragement from the Senate and Administration to create this resolution.

V. Garlin: Noted that Z. Swijtink is a lecturer and does not get paid for this work. Thanked Z. Swijtink for bringing this to our attention. V. Garlin asked that this resolution be approved.

R. Coleman-Senghor: This resolution still needs editing since it will be a public document.

R. Coleman-Senghor suggested the following changes:
(from) As well as any (and others who might be interested in participating in the project)

imperative (encourage)

He also questioned why we needed the last resolve clause.

Z. Swijtink: Some of the data needed may not be made available by the administration and that might affect the report.

S. Miller: Noted that Administration prefers **that SSU be spelt out**.

W. Boda: Questioned whether or not there was a financial obligation.

Z. Swijtink: Software is needed that there is no money for at the present time. Approximate amount need: \$1,000.

J. Reeder: Questioned why there might be resistance from Administration.

Z. Swijtink: None know at this time, but he wants to be prepared.

Once the changes have been completed, this item will be on the next Senate Agenda (as a second reading) - (They will also need to meet with the next Executive Committee.)

Constitutional Amendment regarding Article III, Section 2.2

R. Luttmann summarized his attached memo.

Problem: What does the term “in-session” mean? The Executive Committee has asked the Structures and Functions committee to clarify.

There have arisen some emergencies that called for the Executive Committee to act without the Senate due to time constraints. Case in point was the printing of last springs catalog. It would not have been printed on time if the Executive Committee had not stepped in since waiting for the Senate meeting would have been too late.

Difficult to nail down in black and white what constitutes an emergency.

Since this is part of the constitution, we can either vote to change this OR we would also create a by-law (as was suggested by P. McGough)

R. Coleman-Senghor: Really wants to know what the Executive Committee is doing. By-Laws are supplements and will not change the constitution. If this is truly important, let us bring to the faculty for a vote.

T. Wandling: Is there dissention on the Executive Committee? Would the Executive Committee have to make a unanimous decision?

V. Garlin: Is there really a case? Is this problem coming up time and time again? Has there been abuse of power? Doesn't think there is. The interpretation of "in-session" has been made into a problem that doesn't exist.

R. Luttmann: True. But we do not know when this will come up. Someone every time on the Executive Committee will object - and ask to wait for the Senate. Summer is not unclear - it is the other times.

E. Mendez: During those unclear periods, can the Executive Committee inform the Senate via email or SenateTalk? - then the Senate can discuss.

B. Karlsrud: The constitution was created during a difficult time and it is clear - we should not change and agrees with R. Coleman-Senghor.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Brought up an important point. His interpretation is the beginning and end of the semester. We should keep the rule as it is and use email when problems arise.

T. Wandling: The question of what is timely will always be debated.

P. McGough: Likes the change. This would encourage administration to at least go to the Executive Committee if there is a problem that needs a fast decision.

R. Luttmann: Still feels that there is too much ambiguity. Executive Committee wants to know what the Senate thinks. He encouraged discussion on SenateTalk.

V. Garling: Administration keeps saying that the reason why they don't always seek consultation from the Senate is to do the fact that the Senate is too slow.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Insession should begin and end on certain dates.

R. Luttmann: Will report on this issue at the next Senate Meeting.

Constitutional Amendment and By-Laws Change regarding Staff Requirements.

Executive Committee is questioning one year term. The benefits of having a one year term will create more diversity on the team. Also, a longer term may be very overwhelming to some staff members, in addition they would also have to receive permission from their supervisors to participate. Wording would be easy to change by a vote by this body.
No further discussion.

Resolution on Search for Provost

P. Phillips: Questioning why we need the assistance of a search firm to locate a Provost. One reason stated would be to weed out "bad applicants". This would not be fair because a good applicant might be disqualified on the terms of "gossip".

R. Whitkus: Agreed with P. Phillips, but does not want to limit the resources we can use to find the best provost.

E. Mendez: Resolve the SSU us inhouse search firms.

J. Reeder: Agreed, but thinks we should add a little bit more because a Provost is more important (higher profile).

P. Philips: Agreed to drop the last line of the Resolution.

~~The provost search should not exceed the average cost of recruiting a new faculty member.~~

E. Mendez: Asked that we waive the first reading.

Vote: 17 yes, 6 opposed and 4 abstained.

Motion passed.

R. Coleman-Senghor:

Important to use inhouse resources so we have more control. Let's start inhouse and then go out. We don't need confrontation.

R. McNamara: Supports the spirit. Real time and resources will come from the faculty.

C. Karlsrud: Many of the headhunters that may be used will be the same ones used by the Chancellor. The \$3,500 amount in the 3rd line should be taken out.

Motion to call the Question with Clarifications. The nays have it.

Motion to continue to 5:15pm - no objection.

S. McKillop: Suggests dropping the third line.

G. Olson: Has the agreement to use a headhunter been agreed upon?

N. Byrne: An agreement has been approved, but the search has not started.

A. Warmoth: Encourage administration to exercise financial prudence with the use of headhunters.

The wording of the Resolution on the Search of Provost was change to read as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE SEARCH OF PROVOST

Whereas Sonoma State University may be facing a serious budget cut after the November election, and

Whereas Sonoma State University is currently recruiting 40 faculty members for 2003-2004, and

Whereas the average recruitment expense for even a senior faculty member at Sonoma State University is modest, and

Whereas Sonoma State University faculty and staff have the expertise to conduct a successful and fiscally responsible provost search. We recommend to the President and the Provost Search Committee to not outsource the provost recruitment.

Motion approved.

N. Byrne will submit to the President.

No other Reports given. Please see Senate Talk for new reports.

Meeting adjourned at 5:15pm

Respectfully submitted by Carol Tamagni