

## Academic Senate Minutes

2/5/04

3:00 – 5:00 Commons

### Abstract

Agenda approved. Minutes of 12/18/04 approved. Consent item: Change Biology M.A. to M.S approved. Information Items: End-of-Year report for Graduate Studies subcommittee '02-'03; Appointment of Marty Ruddell, Education to University Documents Committee of URTP. Report from Provost Ochoa. Permission to hold Senate election without requisite number of nominees approved. Long Range Academic Plan approved. Proposed FACULTY GOVERNANCE ASSIGNED TIME '04-'05 approved. Resolution regarding Lecturers Compensation for Service on Academic Senate approved. Resolution supporting Proposition 55 approved.

**Present:** Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Phil McGough, Susan McKillop, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Victor Garlin, Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Eric McGuckin, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Charlene Tung, Myrna Goodman, Peter Phillips, Robert McNamara, Jan Beaulyn, Sandra Shand, Scott Miller, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Ephriam Freed, Amy Wingfield, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Brigitte Lahme

**Absent:** Birch Moonwomon, Heidi LaMoreaux, Derek Girman, Steve Winter, Jason Spencer

**Guests:** Katie Pierce, Elaine Sundberg, Rose Bruce, Judith Hunt, Lynn McIntyre,

**Report of Chair of the Senate** – no report

**Correspondence:** None

**Approval of Agenda** – *approved.*

**Minutes** of 12/18/03 emailed – *approved.*

**Consent Calendar item – From EPC: Change Biology M.A. to M.S.** E. McDonald gave a brief summary of the item. Their master's program has evolved into a program that would be considered an M.S. on other campuses. It passed through the Graduate Studies subcommittee and EPC unanimously. *Approved.*

**Information Items:** End-of-Year report for Graduate Studies subcommittee '02-'03; Appointment of Marty Ruddell, Education to University Documents Committee of URTP.

### Reports

**President Armiñana** – no report

## Provost Ochoa report

E. Ochoa started by saying the budget is on a lot of people's minds, so he thought he would address that topic for the most part. The campus will be faced in the Governor's proposal with a cut of approximately \$5 million, so we're beginning to look at what sorts of impact that would have on us. Keeping in mind that until the bond measure passes on March 2<sup>nd</sup>, we won't know if that scenario even is a viable one. So it's all very preliminary at this point. But based on the Governor's budget and the CSU's parsing of that budget, the campus will be faced with a cut of \$4.988 million approximately which is a little bit incidentally lower than the average percentage cut from the General Fund budget for CSU campuses across the system. Based on the fact in the CSU's plan for absorbing that cut would consist in part some FTES reduction, 5% reduction and in part some unallocated cuts. Our Vice President for Administration and Finance has calculated that the share to Academic Affairs under that scenario would be about \$3.4 million. So that's been the figure we've been trying to come to grips with in our first attempts at scoping it out. In order to start approaching what that scenario might entail, we have identified, first of all the FTES reduction which is about 348 FTES for the campus. In our first scenario we distributed that out to the Schools, calculated what the adjusted FTES target would be, adjusted the budget accordingly for that first layer and still left us with, after some additional savings from the Division salary savings, left us with a little under \$2.16 million of cuts that still needed to be addressed. We developed two calculations which up to now have been referred to as models, but he really needs to change the language because they are not really models. If you think of a model as some way that you can actually envision implementing something, they are not really models. They are more like the upper and lower limit of a range and we expect that, assuming the March bond passes and the Governor's budget remains largely unchanged through the Legislature, assuming all these things happen and we finally are going to have to do something with these figures, we know that the solution will come somewhere between these two end points. The end points themselves are not really viable plans. Keep that in mind. Nevertheless, in order to get a handle on the scope of the problem we're facing, the Schools were given these two end points to try to scope out hypothetically what the impact would be on our programs. The two end points were defined. One as absorbing the entire \$2.16 million out of the School budgets, that was the upper end point and the lower end point would be taking this entire \$2.16 million and distributing it across the board throughout the division. So that's also a scenario that's not terribly viable because of the magnitude of the cuts that would be required in the other units beyond the Schools, such as his office, the Library and ESAS. We're also operating, for the purposes of scoping these out, with the constraint that we are not to touch permanent positions. We're still going through the exercise of figuring these things out, so for example in his office they are looking at their budget to identify if we were to go to a proportionate cut, what would that entail, how would that happen. So this is what people are doing. This does create a situation where when an individual department is asked to provide information for scoping out these scenarios and the department only keeps in mind their scope of activity, the situation may look much worse or somewhat better than the average because our temporary faculty are not distributed evenly throughout the departments. Therefore, a department with a high proportion of temporary faculty in grinding out this calculation would end up with a huge reduction in instructors and if you

calculated ratios based on that it would look like, jeez, we're being asked to teach twice as many students with half the faculty or something. He said to keep in mind that nobody intends that to happen. The whole point is precisely to identify where these red flags are, where are the areas where this is not a viable approach in a mechanical way. Then the next iteration would be, alright here are the points where a mechanical approach would generate these problems, now to what extent could we rearrange or reallocate our faculty or our resources or FTE or whatever to mitigate that impact. That's the next iteration of the analysis we're going to have to do. So far the with the information we're collecting, is if we literally eliminated those positions and left everybody else exactly where they were before in terms of their assignments what would it do to the program. That's the maximum negative impact. Then we have to go back and say ok to what extent could we shift some things around to cope with that. That may handle some of the problem, but not all. So at the end of this iterative effort we will get to the point where we will have a pretty good feel for what this would do to our programs, cuts of this magnitude. That's the information we need before we can make any kind of plan or make any kind of decision or any kind of prioritization. We need to *know* what the scope of the impact would be. That's where we are now. He understands that sometimes it is very disturbing even to visualize certain possibilities, no matter how hypothetical. But the alternative to doing it in a reasonably open way is to do it behind closed doors. There are two problems with that way. One is that people get even more concerned about what's going on. And secondly that the information that you can gather when you do it that way is not nearly as good as when you ask people's participation, we would get a much poorer picture of what the actual situation really is. So he just asked for people's indulgence and we have to try to bracket these possibilities and defer our response to them until such time as we have to actually do some of these things. He knows it is hard to do. But we have to try our best to do that. For those departments and faculty that have been working on just one little piece of the pie and are concerned and don't have much of a sense of whether their particular scenario planning is worse or better than the average outcome, he did calculate some aggregate numbers that would give you a frame of reference relative to where your department or School is doing. In the worst, worst case scenario, upper limit, where the entire cut of \$2.16 million fell entirely on the Schools, just so you know the magnitude of what we're talking about, on aggregate, the SFR after those cuts were absorbed, the university wide average would be 24.56, we estimate. That is an average of School SFRs. Some Schools are higher and some Schools are lower. In fact, in this scenario planning some Schools are very much higher and some are lower. In particular, Business is off the charts relative to this university wide average. That's clearly a red flag that we're going to have to address. In the somewhat less draconian lower limit the SFR university wide would be about 23.77. This is relative to, for comparison, in '02-'03, which is the last SFR we had that was more or less stable, the university wide SFR was 20.9. So we're talking about significant increases in SFR, but not catastrophic as you might imagine if you looked at isolated departments. The Deans are working on what this would really imply, exploring possibilities for ameliorating it by shifting some assignments and trying to get to a fairly complete picture of what this will do. He could not at this point guarantee that this can be done without some kinds of impacts that he would find personally unacceptable. That's a possibility that hasn't been eliminated, we have to work through this exercise to really find out if that's the case or not. That's the

information the President needs to have to make an informed decision keeping in mind the academic mission of our institution.

R. Karlsrud noted that Provost Ochoa received something from him this morning which he was going to share with the body, but wouldn't now because he answered several of the questions with his report. He wonders about certain things that the Provost didn't address today. In other institutions and in public schools across the state people are looking at similar problems and similar budget scarcity and one of the first things they look to are that managers and administrators are part of the budget reducing scenarios and in Vallejo they sent pink slips to all the administrators in preparation of laying some of them off, reducing their time base reassigning them to instructional positions because they obviously they had as a first priority instructional quality. His first question is what is happening with managers in Academic Affairs and then across the university, are they essentially going to be protected in this period as we go back to a budget year that is substantially less of a budget than one when we had far fewer managers, that's a question a lot of faculty are asking as we look at jettisoning instructors who are actually doing the direct teaching in our classrooms. E. Ochoa responded that the President had made a commitment to permanent employees of the university which includes probationary and tenure-track faculty as well as permanent staff and administrators. So given that very explicit and public commitment, that's been taken as a given in our calculations. Whatever specific consequences of these cuts to the academic programs emerge, will emerge in the context of that commitment. He imagines that depending on what the impact is, that commitment may or may not be looked at again. He owes the President a full information set in order to be able to make the ultimate decision about what needs to be done for the academic integrity of the university. That's as far as we're taking it at this point. In his own review of his office and in the back of his mind, as he scans things, he thinks well, if at some point in the future we were to shrink here what would. . .but it's not something we're actually grinding out in spreadsheets now given where we started. R. Karlsrud said that the instructional units comprise about 66% of the budget in Academic Affairs was his understanding and it looks to him like the Schools are taking 100%, if we went in the direction of one of the scenarios where we've erased or eliminated instructional positions, it sounds like the Schools would be taking 100% of the hit to Academic Affairs. Does the same thing apply here, the same criteria that we can't do anything with permanent people even though we might be laying off an instructor or a FERP that have been here for 10 or 20 years? Is that the same problem with not looking at the rest of the division at the same time? If he was a Dean he would be concerned, if that's the direction the Provost was going in and he know it's not set in concrete yet, but we go into scheduling in two weeks. E. Ochoa responded that we will not have hard budget information, no matter what we do, until well after the schedule. We're not in control of that part. He knows that the upper limit of the range, would in fact not be reached, because there are some things we will be able to cut out of the other units of Academic Affairs. It's just that to get the ball rolling in the analysis, rather than wait until we parse through those other units and figure out what those cuts would be and then told the Schools ok, you don't have to go that far we can stop planning at this point. We just said ok, we know even if we don't find anything to cut in these other units, we have to cut, in other words this an interval that includes the range of possible outcomes but is actually somewhat broader than the range of possible outcomes. He could not come up with any other value that he could

guarantee that we couldn't go past except for this one. Because I know there will be non-zero cuts, but he doesn't know the magnitude within other units.

S. Wilson asked how are we doing with our target. E. Ochoa responded we are in very good shape. He thinks we're going to make it. S. Wilson asked if there were any sections offered using the Community Solidarity Fund this semester? E. Ochoa responded, no we haven't used that yet. There is a little bit of money in it. K. Pierce offered that there was about \$3300 rolling forward from last year, \$6600 contributions from this year, for the rest of this year it's expected to grow to about \$11,000 a month, that's the payroll pledge portion. She estimated that there would be \$10,000 to \$12,000 available to use for next year and it is projected to grow at a smaller rate next year as soon of those pledges have completed their period. S. Wilson said there are some people looking at the Community Solidarity Fund and saying is this being used and right now we've got students who aren't going to graduate because they can't get into a statistics class, because we can't open up more statistics classes and if we have enough money to open up a statistics class or something, we should be doing that he thought. E. Ochoa said he took note of the comment.

Chair Nelson welcomed Senator's back who had replacements in the Fall – John Kornfeld, Education, Charlene Tung, WGS and Scott Miller, Writing Center. She also noted that the presentation on the Green Music Center was deferred by the Executive Committee to the next meeting due to the large number of business items before the Senate. She also noted that there is an item regarding our elections that Chair-Elect Dreisbach needs to address today.

M. Dreisbach said that an email went out today with an update about nominations and giving the voting dates. She asked for the Senate's permission to run the election in case we don't have the requisite number of nominees for anyone category. **C. Nelson asked if there was any objection to moving forward with the election without the requisite number of nominees.** There is at least one nominee for each position. *No objection.*

## **Business**

### **Long Range Academic Plan – Second Reading – R. Coleman-Senghor**

R. Coleman-Senghor passed out a one page document that was a response to suggestions about deletions and additions. He said we felt it would be waste of paper to do it all over again. It will be posted. Items that were to be deleted were bracketed and those items to be added were underlined. S. Brannen suggested for Article V "SSU will strive to maintain an economically, socially, and culturally diverse Student body and a Student body that is diverse with respect to disability, age, gender and sexual orientation." R. Coleman-Senghor said he was going for not repeating the words. S. Brannen noted that the implementation refers to slightly different groups than the student population. He would like to see those two be the same. R. Coleman-Senghor said there was a Senator who pointed out this particular item and there was no concern in the first reading that we had. That correction will be made.

S. Shand asked if any of those items will be deleted. R. Coleman-Senghor said no, what he was bringing before the body were the items to be included and this particular item of the question of sexual orientation was brought forward by folks who are part of the Safe Zone group on campus and the economic status was brought by Bruce Peterson. What he tried to do was to restrict himself solely to those lines that were suggested for change. Of course it is opened up here again for further changes.

R. Armiñana spoke to item V, 6.3. He said there is an intention of doing that, but it is a working conditions issues part of the contract. The sentiment is correct. The language is proscriptive and goes beyond the ability of anybody here to do that, therefore it is not acceptable in that language. C. Nelson read the section. "SSU will provide subsidized faculty housing for junior faculty to help develop a sense of academic community" with subsidized to be deleted. R. Coleman-Senghor said yes. R. Armiñana said he objected to the verb – may, could, should – "will" won't fly. R. Coleman-Senghor said the last time we discussed it the word subsidized was featured. He said the change would be made to "may." E. McGuckin noted on that same point it says it supposed to develop a sense of academic community which sounds lovely and maybe should be in the document, but realistically aren't we doing this to attract and retain people who could not afford to stay here. He didn't know if the Senate wanted to be that honest. R. Coleman-Senghor said this document has been before you and he's responded to virtually every email that he'd gotten from folks and we'd be more than happy to change this language because it is the language of the Senate's document, if the Senate so sees fit.

V. Garlin noted in response to the President's concern there are various verb tenses throughout this and it might be appropriate to put it all in the present tense. Just say SSU provides and SSU strives to maintain and so on instead of changing these tenses, it also eliminates the problem that the President interprets the "will", a future tense to be proscriptive with respect to his responsibilities at the institution. R. Coleman-Senghor stated R. Armiñana was right about the nature of the proscriptive phrase and that the word "may" does not move in that direction and thus all the terms here will not comport well, that is turning them all to verbs of that sort will not comport well with the intent of what comes behind them in terms of what the utterance is really trying to say. Specifically, with regards to the President's remark, SSU "may" is what we're after. V. Garlin responded the (unintelligible due to a loud cough) of a document like this is not to provide options for administrative leadership. It's designed to be a statement of principles. It's not supposed to be a set a directions. He thought the President was correct if he interprets this as a directive to him to do something, he is correct in that is not the purpose of this document. For example, in its implementation, its talking about enrollment management strategies, he was surprised that the President didn't object to that because it lays out a variety of factors that is supposed to be taken into account – age, which would apply a change perhaps in our program of recruiting first time freshmen as compared to transfer students. Gender – which would suggest perhaps that the 2/3 – 1/3 distribution of males and females on this campus is inappropriate and in violation of this document and so on. It only makes sense as a statement of general principles. He didn't think putting "may" in it really corrects the problem because it just provides an option on a policy issue which is not what this document is about. He advocated for the document to be all put in the present tense. Then it's not

proscriptive or directive. R. Coleman-Senghor said she was fortunate to have a colleague with him who is a rhetorician, S. Miller, and he thinks a rhetorician will immediately tell you that it makes no sense to shape a particular language that is going to move you to a dead end. The point he hears the President making is that this lies aside of his aura of control or it is not a matter of simply a set of principles, it is a matter of a certain set of laws that we have to address. Now we may very well want to have subsidized housing, but also a statement of principles is a statement of common sense. We need to have a document that is strong so we that we can refer to those verbs that matter to us and where we do as faculty have prerogative, where we as faculty can make some kind of moral request or demand based on our prerogatives. What he hears from the President is that is it not only outside our prerogative, it is outside his.

R. Luttmann noted that in talking about faculty housing, looking over his notes from the fourth of December meeting, he saw that we proposed to take out the word subsidized and replace it with affordable. It seemed to him important as that was the whole point to make housing affordable. R. Coleman-Senghor said there was a discussion about affordability and remembered that Vice President Hunt spoke to the university being able to provide either subsidized or affordable. So we backed off any kind of notion of that sort and we seemed to have gone to the idea of just providing faculty housing. R. Luttmann asked VP Hunt if she had any objection to the word affordable. J. Hunt said yes, we could not do it now. Subsidizing is one mechanism for providing affordable housing, but whatever it is there isn't affordable housing right around here. If she was writing it she would write "the university will seek to provide." We can't say we do provide, because we don't. We can't promise anything in the near future. Eventually, we may be able to. Affordable is better than subsidized, but she didn't think it solved the problem.

S. McKillop suggested that the language under number 5 should also be "to seek" rather than "strive." R. McNamara responded to E. Martinez's suggestion of the term Hispanic. He had understood her concern was the use of the term Hispanic and where that comes from and he thought the suggestion was Latino/Latina. He asked if that was correct. E. Martinez said she was referring to the regionalism in this area is Latino and if we were on the East Coast it might be Hispanic, but in this region it tends to be Latino. R. Coleman-Senghor referred to the notes that she asked for Hispanic to be replaced by Latino/Hispanic.

S. Shand said she wanted to clarify Dr. Armiñana's comment pointing out about proscriptive language would be in section VI and down. Will this apply to Section V? "Will" in section V seems entirely appropriate and within our scope to do. E. McDonald spoke to the appropriateness of language. She could understand not wanting to have language in there that is out of our control, but then it also seems a similar comment should be made about IV. 2. "SSU will reduce teaching load by hiring sufficient faculty." That also is outside of our control in the same way as SSU will provide faculty housing for junior faculty is outside of our control. She thought we should be consistent. She supported V. Garlin's statement that the document is a statement of principle. And if we consider it a statement of principle, then both these statements are things that are what we would like to see in the future, what our ideal plan is. She thought this was a statement of what our ideal plan is. S. Brannen echoed E. McDonald's call for consistency. Senator Shand was referring to the

implementation plan where “we will we use enrollment strategy” to blah, blah, blah do this and that’s another “will” and she was for that. So will the university really do this. Again, is this what we wish or what will be done. C. Nelson asked if the Senate had consensus to send the document back to the Academic Planning committee to get consistent verbs. No consensus was expressed. R. Coleman-Senghor said the single sheet of paper represents his response to people who have sent him comments. He agreed that it is a statement of principle and at the same time we also need to think about what it is we can and cannot not do. The language suggested by VP Hunt is consistent language. We will look through the document and make sure there is a consistency of language that does not violated the substance of your approval.

**(Someone) called the question. Second. Vote on ending debate – Yes = 24; No = 0, Abstentions = 3. Passed. Vote on Long Range Academic Plan – passed on voice vote, one abstention.** R. Coleman-Senghor thanked the body. The document was worked on very hard. The leads on it were Dr. Susan McKillop and Dr. Moulton. We had with the committee broken down into small groups that we went away and worked on it - Paula Hammett from the Library, Rick Marks, Judy Abbott. A lot of different folks spend a lot time on this document. He thanked the body for seeing it through. S. Brannen asked for clarification for what will ultimately appear. R. Coleman-Senghor said they will find the appropriate language, clean up and make it consistent without making substantive changes. It will be on the Senate website within three weeks. S. Shand said there were so many conflicting recommendations, it was not clear where we ended up.

### **Senate Assigned Time for the 2004-2005 Academic Year**

C. Nelson introduced the item. Every spring semester the Executive Committee makes a recommendation to the Senate on how to distribute the assigned time units allocated to the Academic Senate for use by the officers of the Senate, chair of the standing committees and other positions in faculty governance. At the January 29<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Executive Committee, Provost Ochoa requested that the committee consider extending a temporary agreement that the Senate made with him for this academic year for reduced assigned time units for faculty governance from 54 to 48, that’s a reduction of 6 units. That agreement was made at the beginning of this last fall. It was to be temporary for this year only. The Provost did come back and ask the Executive Committee to recommend to the Senate that that temporary agreement be extended for another academic year. The Executive committee responded to the Provost’s request with a motion from Senator Luttmann that the Executive Committee request that the Provost maintain faculty governance units at 54 units and that the Executive Committee recommends to the Senate that those 54 units be distributed in the same manner that was done in the ’02-’03 year. The following distribution of units was presented:

#### **Proposed FACULTY GOVERNANCE ASSIGNED TIME ’04-’05**

<b>Position</b>	<b>Units</b>
Chair	12
Chair-Elect	6



Past Chair	0
Secretary	0
EPC Chair	6
APC Chair	6
SAC Chair	6
FSAC Chair	6
URTP Chair	3
Scholarship Chair	3
Sponsored Programs Chair	3
Lecturer Senators, each 1	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>54</b>

**V. Garlin moved that the Senate concur with the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Second. Motion to waive the first reading. Second. R.**

Whitkus asked to know what reasons there were to not wait for a second reading. R. Coleman-Senghor said it was crucial to do this as we are going to assigning. . .folks are in the position now where they have to make up their minds about whether or not they are going to participate in Senate committees. Elections are going on. We need to know what's there and what's not. E. Stanny asked if we make this recommendation to the Provost, then what is the impact on scheduling. Let's say we pass this, but will we actually get the 54 units, so for scheduling does it really have any affect? What is the Provost going to do if we schedule according to 54 units, when he recommended 48. She spoke in favor of waiving the first reading. E. Ochoa said we really won't have the kind of hard information that we need to be able to count on a schedule being actually mounted given that the budget situation is so unsettled. In that sense, this is a recommendation, then he would have to make a decision on resources, even if he made some sort of provisional decision quickly, it could be easily overturned by subsequent budget developments. He noted that whatever is resolved here at this point is not going to be the end of the issue. It will be subject to subsequent revisions. R. McNamara spoke to the motion to waive the first reading. The first reading is really for clarification if it wasn't too clear what it is we have before us, it is not to debate the pros and cons of it. He didn't think moving into a second reading is going to curb whatever concerns people have about it. He doesn't see it getting in the way of that. R. Luttmann clarified that the motion he made at the Executive Committee, said "if we get the 54 units" this is how we recommend to the Senate it be distributed. That's got to be in there because as E. Ochoa said we don't have a clue as this point what he's going to be able to do. S. Brannen argued for waiving the first reading and quickly move on to pass this to make a statement that we do not wish to work for free. We don't get paid enough to work for free.

**Vote to waive the first reading – unanimously passed.**

**P. Phillips moved to call the question. Second by S. Brannen. Vote to call the question – Yes = 25, No = 3, Abstention = 1 – Passed. Vote on recommendation of Executive Committee for distribution of assigned time units for '04 -'05 – Passed on voice vote.**

## Resolutions regarding Lecturers:

### Resolution regarding Lecturers Compensation for Service on Academic Senate – E. Stanny

There was a pending motion on this resolution to change eligible to entitled. The body turned first to that motion.

C. Nelson asked V. Garlin, who originally made the motion, to briefly capitulated for the body the reason for the suggested change to refresh memory. S. Brannen stated it was his statement originally that than V. Garlin moved. He reminded the body of his argument. If the word eligible is used it allows for us to give them nothing. If the word entitled is used then they have to be given something. He was neither stating for or against either way, he was just trying to make it clear to the Senators what eligible means. V. Garlin said he remembered that it was to make them eligible for compensation within the distribution model. C. Nelson said according to the argument V. Garlin just made the language should state eligible and not be changed to entitled. E. McDonald said she argued to keep the word eligible rather than entitled because she believes the word entitled puts us in the same place that we were before that says somehow the lecturer units are more preserved than units for anything else. So if our pool goes down to say 3 units what she believed the word entitled would mean would be that those 3 units would go to those Lecturer Senators and nothing to anyone else. The word eligible means that is one constituency that also should be considered for compensation just like the other constituencies, Standing Committee chairs, etc.

C. Nelson said she understood there was some confusion about what was going on with the resolution. If you take into account all the strike-outs and changes the bottom language is what you end up with, with the word eligible in the resolved clause still up for vote by the Senate. R. Karlsrud said he was opposed to the word entitled as we're basically discriminating between all the lecturers who serve on other committees who may be doing just as much work as anybody sitting on the Senate that is a lecturer. He also said that even though it is likely that we will see fewer lecturers next year than this year, we could have a year when we see 8 or 9 lecturers sitting on the Senate. Would they all be entitled to compensation for sitting on the Senate? Was he interpreting the word entitled correctly. C. Nelson said according to S. Brannen's clarification yes. R. Karlsrud argued for eligible so the Senate has discretion. R. Coleman-Senghor shared R. Karlsrud's points. The idea of eligibility from entitlement is quite different because in fact no one on the Senate as an officer now is entitled. The units are distributed by the Senate Executive Committee, so these folks would be entitled to whatever units we did have available. He would vote against the term entitled. **V. Garlin said this may be part of a larger question. He had a strong suspicion that question of Senate assigned time is going to return to this body this semester and he thought it might be wise to table this question in deference to the larger question of the meaning for this institution of the compensation people receive serving on this body. Second.** R. Luttmann asked what was in place if we did table this resolution. C. Nelson said we would have the original resolution without all the strikeouts. **Vote to table – Yes =10, No = 17, failed.** P. McGough said that Faculty Standards and Affairs has produced the resolution before us because the original resolution, that has a history

more complex than the plot of War and Peace, is huge. To replace eligible with entitled would send us backwards into the complex plot and he opposed it. R. Coleman-Senghor applauded E. Stanny and her committee for working long and hard on simplifying this statement. He thinks they came up with a good plan. Anyone can be eligible if they are franchised. We're just stating that these folks are franchised in a particular way. That doesn't mean that you have to give someone something just because they are eligible to get it. We've clarified the language, we've identified the lecturers as a part of our body who can be recipients of our largess. M. Dreisbach said one concern she had was that the original resolution was meant to be compensation to the three elected Lecturer Senators. In this revision there is no mention of those three Lecturer Senator seats, it's just the word lecturers and so if we have 54 units of assigned time and end up having 6 lecturers serving on the Senate, we have been assigning one unit per seat, what happens, do we split units, do we take them away from someone else? She thought it was confusing to drop the Lecturer Senator seat. E. Stanny responded that we considered putting the qualifier Senator Lecturers, but then we decided not to because of the possibility that some Senator Lecturers might not be eligible for their unit, so we wanted to make sure at least if there was this bigger pool of 54 units, at least three went to lecturers. The idea is that three would definitely go to the lecturers and if one couldn't take it, then a lecturer that was on the Senate, not a Senate Lecturer could receive it. M. Dreisbach said there is not mention of three units and that could be lost on future generations. E. Stanny said if you put any number in this document you're (unintelligible due to room noise) something that isn't fixed. We wanted to get away from that. So you get into really convoluted language if you get into if this, if that. We just wanted leave it open with the idea that the Executive Committee would use their discretion and practices that had been followed in the past would be used. M. Dreisbach clarified that she wasn't advocating for the three units, but the Lecturer Senators. C. Nelson asked to stop discussion and move to the upcoming time certain.

### **Resolution supporting Proposition 55**

C. Nelson introduced the item. The Chair of the Statewide Academic Senate, Bob Cherny, requested that all Chairs bring this to their Senates for their consideration, a resolution in support of Proposition 55 which is the K through University Educational Bond Act. It provides money for a lot of capital projects. The benefit to Sonoma State would be \$3 million to pay for equipment and furniture in the Darwin renovation. Sonoma State's proposal for a Multi-Disciplinary Teaching Facility did not make it high enough on the list to be included in the first year of this bond. We have a guest from the President's office, Vice President Lynn McIntyre who would like to speak to this matter.

L. McIntyre said the tradition she's seen over the years from this body has been to take up consideration of bond issues. As was said the Statewide Academic Senate has urged you to take it up also. The Alumni Association has endorsed this both statewide and at Sonoma State. Earlier this week the Associated Students also endorsed the bond measure. She thought the resolution speaks for itself about what would entail. As far as the county in general there are about \$60 that comes to K-12 schools in this county and Santa Rose Junior college has the main build out of the Petaluma campus which would be about \$26 million.

*(At this point the tape was damaged. What follows is an outline until the point when the recorder noted the tape malfunctioning and started a new tape.)*

**S. Wilson moved to waive the first reading. Second.**

**Question called. Vote on waiving the first reading – unanimous**

**S. Wilson called the question on the resolution. Second. No objection.**

**Vote on Resolution in Support of Proposition 55 – passed unanimously**

**RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 55 – THE KINDERGARTEN-UNIVERSITY  
PUBLIC EDUCATION FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 2004**

**Whereas**, Proposition 55, the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2004, provides \$12.3 billion in bonds to relieve overcrowding, reduce class size and repair and upgrade California's elementary, middle and high schools, community colleges and universities; and

**Whereas**, the 2004 Statewide School Bond measure is the second half of a two-part statewide education bond package to repair, upgrade and build new school facilities, and the first half of which, Proposition 47, was overwhelmingly approved by California voters in 2002, and passage of the second half of the package is equally important to improve student achievement and better prepare students for the modern workforce; and

**Whereas**, California schools and colleges are severely overcrowded, with more than 700,000 new students expected to seek enrollment at a California college or university by 2010; and

**Whereas**, the California Postsecondary Education Commission estimates the state will need to spend approximately \$1.5 billion per year through 2010 to maintain existing higher education facilities and to provide for expected enrollment increases, Proposition 55 will provide \$1.15 billion a year for higher education for two years, including \$920 million for Community Colleges, \$690 million for the California State University, and \$690 million for the University of California; and

**Whereas**, Sonoma State University received \$26 million from the passage of Proposition 47 to renovate Darwin Hall and will receive an additional \$3 million from Proposition 55 for scientific equipment that will complete the renovation project; and

**Whereas**, Prop. 55 will allow our public colleges and universities to make seismic and other safety improvements to older buildings as well as build new labs, classrooms and research facilities; and

**Whereas**, Prop. 55 will give students more access to the technology and computers they need to meet academic standards and compete in the modern workforce; and

**Whereas**, the 2004 Statewide School Bond provides a much needed boost to our state's economy, and putting Californians to work building a better learning environment for our children is a wise investment in these difficult economic times; and

**Whereas**, the 2004 Statewide School Bond funds must be spent on school construction, not on overhead, and projects must comply with strict accountability requirements, including mandatory audits, to safeguard against waste and mismanagement,

**Therefore be it resolved**, that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University supports Proposition 55 - the Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2004.

**The body returned to the amendment to the Resolution on Lecturer's compensation**

**There was a vote on the amendment to change eligible to entitled which failed.**

*Discussion continued on the whole resolution. Recording picks up again near the end of that discussion.*

R. McNamara said that it is a much cleaner statement of the will of the body than what we currently have and he thought some are not comfortable with the fact that if as we now call a Lecturer Senator specifically voted into this body as a lecturer were not eligible to sit here at the table we do have the issue of what happens with their compensation. And there could be another lecturer sitting here not being compensated. So he thinks this is minimally a statement from the body that we feel they should at least be eligible, nobody really is entitled given the situation, but it is a statement, it's not perfect and it's probably going to go on, but it's certainly much cleaner than what we're currently living with. S. Wilson addressed M. Dreisbach's concern. Last year the Lecturer Senators didn't get any units because they all had 15 units. If you're in a situation where you could wind up having the Lecturer Senator's not getting any of this assigned time and this precious assigned time winds up going unused when there is another lecturer on the Senate, and that was brought up last year. V. Garlin said if the lecturers are entitled to anything this precious assigned time, he's be happy to put some money on it, it won't go to any lecturers who are sitting around the table, who have other duties, that would be his guess. If we were in the position to keep track of our legislative history as well as Congress or the Legislature, he's be happy with the notion that this is the intent even though it isn't stated here, but we all are capable of crafting language which puts in what we want to have happen and if hasn't happened we ought to do it. He was happy to withdraw his objection based on the comments of his colleagues and in particular by S. Wilson who has more standing around the table here than he does on this matter. He presumed that FSAC consulted with the lecturers on this and if the lecturers are satisfied with it, he thought it would impertinent of him not to be. He stated his support for the resolution.

**M. Dreisbach called the question. Second. No objection.**

**Vote on Resolution regarding Compensation of Lecturer's Elected to the Senate – Passed on voice vote.**

**Compensation for Lecturers elected to the Academic Senate**

Whereas typically full time faculty are assigned three Weighted Teaching Units (WTU's) of indirect instructional activity in recognition of service that is not direct instruction while part time faculty are typically assigned WTU's solely for direct instruction.

Therefore be it

Resolved that the lecturers serving on the Senate be eligible for compensation out of the WTU pool allocated by Academic Affairs.

**Adjourned 5:05**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*