

**General Senate Meeting
4 January 2012**

1. Call to order at 10:07 a.m.
2. President's State of the Academy Address

President commends the faculty for calling a meeting to discuss the roles and responsibilities of faculty.

New Personnel: Our new VP Finance will join us in mid February. Financial Aid has grown from \$2 – 7 million, so we're glad to have this new director. Industry folks have continued to be generous in giving to scholarships, despite hard times. Debbie Hebert has been made Dean of Students; we believe we couldn't find a better Dean of Students. We have also hired a new Director of Facilities, from Monterey Bay, with experience with former military facilities, including a legal settlement with the marina there.

We recently received another significant grant from MARAD related to ballast water. Chief Engineer Bill Davidson will be working on this.

The \$100 million state budget trigger has been determined to be a permanent cut. Our share of that cut is zero, based on a "base budget" argument. We are not sufficiently over that base budget number and the Chancellor's Office agrees that we shouldn't be cut \$724,000.

Our enrollment target is 1150 next year. This year we have 1025 resident fte. The Provost is working on where we can increase from there and in what majors? Some majors are at capacity. For example we may be able to increase ME students, except for their cruise requirement.

On the move to one cruise Summer 2012: We've looked at one cruise for three years. We know there will be some surprises that will need to be worked out after first one-cruise summer. We may go back to two cruises.

An environmental study has been done to allow for growth and/or a second campus. The results are not public yet as we are waiting for the CO to look at it. Report suggests 17 possible majors, a couple of which we may be able to add very soon. We are looking at growth to 5000. Majors in Electronics Engineering Technology, Mechatronics, Logistics/Port Management are some of the top contenders.

There are two CSU trustees, led by the Lt. Governor saying this is a watershed moment for higher education, saying the Master Plan by Clark Kerr will no longer work due to different demographics in the state. They are looking at consolidation. We have been visited by someone asking if some of our management could be handled by someone at another campus. The Chancellor does not support this.

Sonoma State looked at merging with us 15 years ago and said no way. There may be some small savings but is it worth jeopardizing the identity of institution, especially regarding alumni and industry. Hopefully this conversation won't go far.

We are considering a move to share server space with SJSU. We are already using SJSU dispatcher.

Facilities: The new athletic field is still being created; there was a gravel-related delay. The new Dining Hall will open in 2013. We received funding for the aquatic center, which has been designed. We are working on matching our facilities master plan to the academic master plan and WASC recommendations.

Question: is our environmental scan/plan to grow a response to the above "threat" of consolidation? President: we started looking at expansion 4 years ago, based on a "what if" mode of thinking. Consolidation was only first mentioned very recently.

Question: is there a plan to replace VP for Development? President: The CEO and this position need a very good personality/philosophy mesh; the President will likely recommend his successor make this replacement. The President is expected to raise 10% of state allocation. Our momentum in this area is growing; we have gotten some substantial money on ballast water and security projects because of good work being done on campus.

Question: how will search process on new President go? President doesn't believe the sitting president should have any part of search. An Interim President was appointed at Fullerton, likely one will be appointed at Northridge; these are the #2 and #1 CSU campuses in size. We'll all know more at the end of this month.

3. Visiting Scholars

Lloyd Kitazono introduced four visiting scholars from VIMARU: Dr. Bao, the Vice Dean of Faculty of Maritime Business, Ms. Ha, a Lecturer of macroeconomics and microeconomics, Mr. Son, a Lecturer of maritime insurance, and Mr. Hieu, a Lecturer in the Foreign Trade Department.

4. Discussion of faculty engagement in the Senate

Chair: How are we going to engage faculty more in Senate business or is it necessary that all faculty be engaged? We need to be a cohesive, strong faculty, especially with a new president coming in.

Individual comments from faculty:

- Attendance at Senate meetings depends on tenor of the meeting; who runs the programs?

- Disengagement is wrong; it is the moral imperative of faculty to husband the academic programs; academic vision has to come from faculty.
- Idea of Senate is relatively new to CMA; we have to do a better job of educating new faculty, esp. for people coming from industry.
- CMA is very unique; for any of us to unplug is wrong. But people feel cynical about the limits of our power.
- Disengagement isn't wrong, but those who choose to engage could speak for them.
- Last minute notice regarding Senate meetings is a factor in faculty disengagement; executive committee meeting minutes need to be shared.
- CFA should have representation in a representative senate.
- Clear goals and definitions of academic senate would help new faculty members.
- In the past, the focus of the Senate was policy creation. We believed that if we created tight policies, we would have a positive impact on academic programs.
- We should grow some teeth.
- Disengagement is due to work overload and cutting units in particular programs. "I tuned out as a time management strategy" and response to sense of powerlessness. Saw the retreat as waste of his time.
- "I've been to six retreats, many of which asked, where are we going to go as a school; but there's no accounting at the end of the retreat."
- Suggestion that we read the preamble re: purpose of senate at the beginning of every year.
- A representative Senate may be a way to be stronger. On some campuses, the president of the academic senate is second most powerful position. Not here.
- Senate can be collegial and strong. Leave fighting to the union.
- Senate has to bring ideas; right now we're always reacting to other ideas.
- Furlough year seen as the year things unraveled. Workload was ridiculous, combined with no raises. It's the carrot of tenure or contract renewal that keeps people from speaking out too much, which contributes to cynicism and disengagement.

- How do we act ethically when dealing with unethical people?
- There has been bullying of faculty by certain members of the Administration.
- Why are we asking what we should do differently? Administration should be adjusting their approach.
- The answer is not to tell the more powerful party to stop bullying, if we want to use that word. The answer is to become stronger ourselves. A more unified and rapidly responding Senate would be a more powerful Senate.
- Concern expressed about the use of the word “bullying.”
- We don’t have any ability to enforce our will.
- Is it an issue of marketing, with new faculty?
- Faculty voices should be heard thru the Executive Committee.
- Suggestion that faculty should not be so fearful of speaking out.
- We need a Senate office to file documents.
- The Curriculum Committee should have more voice/strength than they do now.
- There are other areas that are not curriculum-based where autocratic decisions are being made that have a fundamental impact on the curriculum. Example: Cruise Coordination Committee.

Senate Chair agreed that the agenda for Senate meetings would be announced well in advance, with sufficient description to inform faculty. Senate Executive Committee also needs to make sure that faculty representation is present on committees with administration. The Executive Committee is going to work on putting together a proposal for a more effective Senate.

Comment: Consider defining quorum based on FTE, not total number of faculty.

5. Whiteboard Notes

Board 1: Is disengagement wrong?

No

Senate is ineffective
No voice, vote, or veto

We're not all permanent/full-time faculty
We're busy
We're disenfranchised

Yes

It's ethically/morally wrong
It makes us vulnerable

Board 2: What is the purpose of the academic Senate?

Keepers of unique academic "culture"/identity
Clearly and quickly transferring information between its constituents
Ensuring accountability / closing loops
Actively putting forth ideas

Agendas
Minutes
Meeting times
Rights/roles/responsibility

Board 3: Should we reorganize as a representative senate?

Only if truly representative, including:
Lecturers
CFA

More release time for chair/members
Admin support / space
Should administrators be invited to participate in Senate meetings?

Meeting adjourned at 12:10pm.
Minutes respectfully submitted by Michele Van Hoeck