

Academic Senate Minutes

December 14, 2006

3:00 – 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Approval of agenda. English MA revision approved. Information item - Sick and Tired: a case study of faculty workload and health by Birch Moonwomon. Provost Report. Special Report: Fees in Trust. Sabbatical policy amended and postponed to next meeting. EPC recommendation re: post-grad and unclassified grad student admission first reading. Endorsement of Statewide Senate Resolution on Cornerstones approved. Endorsement of Statewide Resolution on ACR 73 tabled.

Present: Elaine McDonald, Tim Wandling, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Sam Brannen, Carolyn Epple, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Robert Train, Thaine Stearns, Liz Thach, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Rick Luttmann, Steve Orlick, Glenn Brassington, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Scott Miller, Sandra Shand, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Rachel Sagapolu, Lane Olson, Art Warmoth, Mary Halavais, Carlos Ayala

Absent: Michael Pinkston, Steve Cuellar, Virginia Lea, Cora Neal, Sandra Feldman, Jarrod Russell, Eric Halstrom, Doug Jordan

Guests: Ian Hannah, Elaine Leeder, Rose Bruce, Elaine Sundberg, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Katie Pierce, Barbara Butler, James Robertson, Bill Babula, Margaret Purser, Katharyn Crabbe

Proxies: Lillian Lee for Marguerite St. Germain, Victor Garlin for Steve Cuellar and Michelle Moosbrugger for Wanda Boda

Approval of Agenda – item added: Discussion of impaction issues missing from the agenda; Resolution from EPC regarding admitting post-bac and unclassified grad studies. The parliamentarian raised objection to the inclusion of the EPC resolution as it had not been seen by the Executive Committee. **The items were split. Discussion of impaction issues - Approved. EPC resolution – Approved.**

Consent item: Revision to English MA – *Approved.*

Information Item: Sick and Tired: a case study of faculty workload and health by Birch Moonwomon. B. Moonwomon passed out an additional sheet of paper to the body (15 copies).

President's Report – R. Armiñana

Passed.

Provost Report – E. Ochoa

E. Ochoa reported that the University Strategic Planning committee has developed strategic goals and objectives in smaller working groups. These have now been brought back to the whole committee and they are continuing to modify them. They are on target to release the first draft in the early to mid spring semester to the campus community for comment. They also shared with the WASC committee what they had done so far. The WASC committee had a positive response. The Executive Committee has worked with the administration to select a date for a university wide conversation on the CSU Strategic Planning. It will be a first take on the domains and the issues of importance grouped under the domains. The date selected was February 22 and was selected to coincide with the Senate meeting to have maximum input from Senators. The date has been communicated to the Chancellor's office so they can plan for visitors from the CSU Strategic Planning group, one of whom will be a Trustee, to observe our campus process. The Provost reported that summer space scheduling will now be coordinated by Academic Affairs instead of Extended Education. He said more communication will be needed from all users of space and the timelines for allocation of space will have to be longer. They are putting together a work group to examine this. He also reported that the independent Educational Doctorate is running into problems with WASC in terms of faculty research and curriculum. The benchmarks seem to be University of California standards.

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:02 AM

Deleted: , one of whom will be a Trustee

Question for President Armiñana

The President was asked for an update on the Periodic Reviews for the Provost and Chief Financial Officer. The President said they were waiting for more names for the committees.

The Chair encouraged faculty to step forward and serve on these committees.

Return to Provost Report

The Provost passed out a sheet of information from the Institutional Research officer. R. Bruce noted that it is a summary of the results of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA Faculty Survey that was given at SSU in '04-'05 and 125 faculty responded. The full report is on the web at: https://www.sonoma.edu/aa/ir/annual_reports/0506/pdf/heri_faculty_survey.pdf.

She said she was happy to answer questions about it. A member asked if the survey could show how many hours per week faculty were working. R. Bruce said they are working on an updated survey on workload that will be able to show that. There was a question about the salary satisfaction portion of the report. R. Bruce said that section has been removed, as there had been incorrect assumptions in the definition of the data categories.

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:04 AM

Deleted: Report

Special Report: Fees in Trust Report – L. Furukawa-Schlereth

L. Furukawa-Schlereth thanked the body for the opportunity to talk to the Senate about a new development in the world of CSU finance. The topic is called the

Revenue Management Program and it represents a substantial change in the way the CSU receives student fee money and manages that money. Since it is such a profound change from what the CSU has been doing for the last 50 years, he felt it was important to report on it to the faculty leadership and Senate representatives.

Slide

CSU proposed AB 1802, an amendment to the Education Code which would allow for the deposit of student fees into a local trust account

As a result, the University would operate almost exclusively out of Trust instead of the General Fund

L. Furukawa-Schlereth discussed the background of the CSU proposal AB 1802. He noted that previously the CSU role was to collect the student fee money and then deposit it into the state treasury. AB 1802 allows the campus to deposit student fees in a local trust account. Then the campus itself would have more responsibility to manage these fees. Also the campus would operate out of this Trust fund and not out of the State Treasury. This is a remarkable change.

Slide

Discussions with state control agencies were necessary to gain support for the change

Significant modification of existing business processes will be required

Policies and guidelines will need to be re-written to accommodate the necessary changes

This proposal put out by the CSU was met with suspicion by many state agencies. But it was passed and put into the Education Code by Governor Schwarzenegger. What this does is make the CSU more like other universities rather than a state agency. All business processes will need to be looked at and streamlined. It is a much improved system. That is the primary reason we wanted to do it. It makes the financial area more efficient and cost-effective.

Slide

With the authority to deposit all student fee income in local trust, the CSU has begun its implementation of a brand new operating model

- All operating funds will be deposited and maintained within the new CSU Central Bank

-Delegation of Fiscal Authority is being completely revised

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:06 AM

Deleted: more

Once this was passed, the CSU decided to create a CSU central bank that all 23 campuses would use. Well Fargo bank was chosen to be both the depository and disbursement bank. So starting on January 2nd, Wells Fargo bank will be the chosen bank. Your paycheck will now say Wells Fargo instead of the State of California. AB 1802 required that the delegation of fiscal authority had to be completely revised. SSU did already have management of some local funds, but they were small potatoes compared to student fees. We will now be managing \$1.8 billion among the campuses and this gives the financial officers and their staffs more responsibility. For SSU this mean we will be managing and investing \$22 million dollars.

Slide

Prior to the passing of AB 1802 (Chapter 79, 2006) Education Code 89721 authorized the following revenues to be deposited in local trust accounts if no debt was associated with the program:

- Gifts, bequeaths and donations**
- ANY student loan or scholarship funds**
- Fees, rents, deposits and charges for services, materials and facilities**
- Housing Fee**
- Fees for Instructionally Related Activities**
- Fees for Parking, health facilities or health services, CERF and other self-support programs**
- Revenue from Lottery**
- Monies received for special projects**

L. Furukawa-Schlereth said the legislation did pass and we are in the process of implementing it.

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:12 AM

Deleted: doing

Slide

AB 1802 – Passed effective July 1, 2006

Amended Education Code 89721 – “The Chief Fiscal Office of each campus of the CSU shall deposit and maintain in local trust accounts....”

(L) Monies collected as higher education fees and income from students of any campus of the CSU and from other persons pursuant to Section 89700

Allows the CSU to deposit revenue from student fees into the State University Trust Fund

As of January 2, we will begin to deposit our fees into Wells Fargo. We cannot deposit money we receive from statewide revenue bonds or money received outside the regular budget act. They will continue to lobby to be able to deposit these funds locally, and capital funding as well.

Slide

AB 1802 authorizes all CSU operating funds to be deposited within CSU Central Bank not the State Treasury

-Governed solely by CSU Delegation of Authority

-The only funds that MUST continue to be on deposit in the State Treasury in an account with the State Controller are:

**Proceeds from the sale of revenue bonds
Interest and principal for SRB debt
Appropriated Capital Outlay – Budget Act
Governed by the funds enabling legislation**

Slide

CSU will have greater fiscal control over its revenue and cash

Fiscal operations will be more efficient

CSU will be able to control and optimize its banking activities

**-Central banking
-Centralized investments
-Savings on services
-Gains on investments
-Improved SRB ratings**

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:13 AM

Deleted: as well

The primary reason to do this is to have greater fiscal control over revenue and cash. We believe this will be much more efficient and should allow us to contain costs, if not reduce costs in financial services operations. We should be able to enjoy greater synergies and returns through central banking and investments, etc. The big change is that we have now added to the portfolio of the chief financial manager, the concept of treasury. Treasury is separate from accounting. It relates to the ability to manage cash. This is an area where the campus may want to look at policy. The rule of thumb for managing cash is that you do not want it sitting around idly. You want to invest it in a financial instrument, and keep it there as long as possible with the highest possible return, while maintaining liquidity and not losing principal. We would then want our students to pay as soon as possible. And we would now want to pay bills on the last day possible. We get to keep the interest earnings after we pay the state treasury. To get the legislation passed, we had to agree that the state treasury would not lose any money. They have calculated that to be about \$5 million for the whole CSU. So the CSU has to make more than \$5 million through efficient business practices or better returns. The incentive to do so is high. He said now they need to do careful analysis to know when to invest these cash resources. There are a large number of people working on this financial change. He explained all the committees working on it. They are hiring an investment advisor system-wide and working out a fair way to allocate the interest between the campuses. 2006-07 is a transition year since we are changing mid year. He explained more of the positive impacts of the new program. The development of policy around collecting student fees will probably be of most interest to faculty. He said he was proud of the financial staff that was pulling this together at SSU.

Questions

Will any people in the state treasury be laid off because of this transition? Will the savings be passed on to the campuses in terms of faculty salaries or travel money? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he did not know about the state treasury office, but he thought SSU's financial services office staff might be reduced. He noted that we do not have lay-offs on our campus, so people will probably be reassigned. What happens to the savings will be the call of the President.

What does Wells Fargo bank get out of this? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said they will have a major customer and make money. Do we have to pay a fee to them? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he did not know. Has the state required any indemnification against abuse? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that the state has put in place extensive audits every three years. Most of the treasury functions will be done centrally.

Motion to extend by five minutes. Second. Approved.

(A student senator asked a question that was very hard to hear.) L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that from a purely financial perspective it was in the university's interest for students to pay in a timely manner, that is, at registration. The student asked if there was a grace period. L. Furukawa-Schlereth reported what he knew and discussed the difference for financial aid students. He reiterated the need for SSU to

develop a policy on the payment of student fees and he assured the student representatives that students would be part of the policy recommending process.

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:18 AM

Deleted: s

A Senator noted that some upper division students wait until second registration to register because they can pay later and departments end up canceling classes that could otherwise have been filled up. Would this new process help with this problem? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that he did not think finance should drive the equation. He thought enrollment management questions should drive it. Unless there is a CSU mandate, it would be a local decision as to what would be in the best interest of the academic mission.

The Chair asked Senators to write down their questions for the next meeting or send them by email to L. Furukawa-Schlereth.

Sabbatical Policy Revision – Second Reading – C. Ayala

C. Ayala said the last time he presented the policy he spoke about the changes made and asked for questions.

Motion to amend - section 2.7 restore existing percentages of weights used in sabbatical criteria. Second.

A member noted what the faculty collective bargaining agreement states about sabbaticals, the history of sabbaticals in the university and voiced support for the motion. Another member voiced support for the motion and did not understand why URTP needed to have more flexibility to give sabbaticals to junior faculty. Another member argued heatedly that the committee could not reasonably evaluate the quality of another faculty member's proposal since they do not have the expertise in all fields. C. Ayala noted that the chair of URTP requested the change in weights. They felt the 50/50 split gave them more flexibility for close calls.

Vote on motion to amend – *Approved*.

A member was concerned about section 2.10 and the deletion of the sentence: If the president's decision alters the recommended ranking from that of the University RTP committee, at the request of the University RTP committee, the president shall meet with the committee to discuss reasons for the changes. **She moved that the section not be deleted. Second.**

C. Ayala said that FSAC talked about this today and agreed to re-insert it. A member recalled his experience with the sabbatical policy that brought him to request a revision. He said it was almost impossible for him to figure out how the ranking was done. A member voiced support for the motion as it explicitly showed that the President could re-rank the list.

Question called. No objections. Vote on motion to reinstate the sentence from section 2.10 – *Approved*.

A member voiced concern that the responses to the sabbatical proposal do not go to

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:20 AM

Deleted: es

the faculty until the end of the process. He gave evidence from other CSUs showing how faculty receive feedback at each level. He also argued that the timelines were cumbersome. He suggested to the body that the policy did not meet the standards needed.

The Chair requested that the item be postponed to the next meeting. No objection.

EPC recommendation re: post-grad and unclassified grad student admission – M. Halavais

M. Halavais introduced the resolution and gave its legislative history. She then introduced Margie Purser, Chair of the Graduate Studies subcommittee, to speak to the resolution. M. Purser explained the evolution of the issue in the subcommittee. Students had started coming to departments saying they were in a particular graduate program, but had been admitted as unclassified post-bac graduate students and not admitted to a particular graduate program. She noted that in order to meet target, they found that admissions had decided to admit unclassified graduates that were not associated with any program. She explained how the unclassified graduate status has been used in association with programs. Graduate programs are now concerned about this and that extra resources are not coming to take on these extra students. They want the university to stop admitting people in this category until these issues are worked out.

There was more discussion about what is happening to people who have been admitted under this category and how this issue was playing out across all the graduate programs. It was asked how many students this affects. M. Purser said about 40.

First reading completed.

Endorsement of Statewide Senate Resolution on Cornerstones – Second Reading – C. Nelson

C. Nelson noted that more information was requested at the last meeting about Cornerstones. That has been sent out over Senate-Talk. She refreshed the memory of the body about comments made at the last meeting. She noted the Executive Committee did not want to change the resolution.

Question called. No objection.

Vote on Endorsement – Approved.

**Sonoma State University Academic Senate
Resolution Endorsing Statewide Academic Senate Resolution AS-2771-
06/AA/FGA "Fulfilling the Principles of Cornerstones in the New Strategic Plan"
Passed unanimously by the Academic Senate CSU on 11/9/06**

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:23 AM

Deleted: ,

Resolved: That the Sonoma State University Academic Senate endorses Academic Senate CSU Resolution AS-2771 / AA/FGA, "Fulfilling the Principles of Cornerstones in the New Strategic Plan." (*follows*)

Resolved: That this resolution be forwarded to the Academic Senate CSU, and CSU campus senates.

Fulfilling the Principles of Cornerstones in the New Strategic Plan

AS-2771-06/AA/FGA - November 9, 2006

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge the CSU, the Access to Excellence Steering Committee and the Access to Excellence Campus Review Groups to give highest priority to the following Principles of the original Cornerstones academic strategic plan which have not yet been implemented or achieved, so that adequate support for faculty, graduate programs, and infrastructure will be addressed:

Principle 4 - The California State University will reinvest in its faculty to maintain its primary mission as a teaching-centered comprehensive university. Faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity are essential components of that mission.

Principle 6 - Graduate education and continuing education are essential components of the mission of the California State University.

Principle 8 - The responsibility for enhancing educational excellence, access, diversity, and financial stability shall be shared by the State, the California State University system, the campuses, our faculty and staff, alumni/ae and students.

and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU send copies of this resolution to the Board of Trustees, Chancellor, campus presidents and provosts, campus senate chairs and Access to Excellence Steering Committee members.

RATIONALE: *The original Cornerstones has been championed by the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor's Office as a far-sighted plan for the CSU for the twenty-first century. While many of the Principles of Cornerstones have been or are being implemented, several have not. In the Chancellor's Office's "Evaluation of Achievements under Cornerstones," Principles 4, 6 and 8 were singled out as not yet having been "well addressed." These three provide for adequate support, including infrastructure, for the performance of faculty duties, for funding graduate programs, and in particular the independent EdD programs, at a sufficient level, and reducing the "salary gaps for all categories of employees for whom such gaps exists." The Academic Senate CSU strongly believes that these Principles should be given highest priority to the successor strategic plan on Access to Excellence.*

Endorsement of Statewide Resolution on ACR 73 – Second Reading – C. Nelson

C. Nelson noted that the state-wide resolution urges the CSU to achieve a 75-25 ratio of tenure-track to adjunct faculty. The targets system-wide have not been met. She then described the local resolution with added language applauding the SSU administration for meeting this ratio and urging them to also address SFR issues. Questions were raised at the last meeting about what exactly SSU's numbers were and it was pointed out that ACR 73 was meant for large urban campuses. She gave highlights on the information requested. She said the measure of the ratio is FTEF, not headcount. The state-wide averages for 2002 were: 63% tenure-track; 2003 66% tenure-track; 2004 66.1%, 2005 63%. For SSU the percentage we have for this Fall is 65% tenure-track, so we are only 2% higher than the system-wide average. She reminded the body that the resolution states that we commend the administration for its progress in achieving the 75-25 ratio. In terms of SFR, the current overall is 21.56 to 1, lower division SFR is 28.01 to 1, upper division: 18.86 to 1. She was also asked to provide the breakdown by gender of the faculty by a member of the Executive Committee and she found that for adjuncts the numbers are men 133, women – 168; tenure-track men 144, women – 124. She emphasized that the State-wide Senate is trying to get the Board of Trustees to move on this law. She said the statewide Senate is urging campuses to create their own resolutions. Fullerton has passed one already and is sending it around as a template. She offered various options for dealing with the endorsement before the body.

A member noted the CFA lecturers council's position on ACR 73. The President asked the body to address their solution to the Legislature as they did not put a single penny behind ACR 73. He wanted some accountability to the Legislature. A member noted that C. Nelson was comparing SSU's 2006 numbers to system-wide 2005 numbers and asked that SSU's ratio be tracked too, as we may have dropped too. R. Bruce was asked if she knew the numbers. She said that the campus had been up to 73%, so the ratio had gone down. It was pointed out that the mean length of service for lecturers is 5.3 years and that more tenure-track lines are needed and lecturers shouldn't be underemployed.

Motion to table. Second. Approved.

The Chair thanked the Vice President Furukawa-Schlereth for the champagne and wished everyone a fabulous winter break.

Adjourned

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:26 AM

Deleted: suggested

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:27 AM

Deleted: that was passed

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:27 AM

Deleted: '

Edith Mendez 1/30/07 9:28 AM

Deleted: o