Academic Senate Minutes
December 4, 2003
Commons 3:00-5:30

Abstract

Agenda amended and approved. Special Guest Dr. Richard West, Vice Chancellor of the CSU. Provost Ochoa report. President of the Associated Students Report. Minutes of 10/30/03 and 11/13/03 approved. Consent items: Music Department curriculum changes; Geography revised concentrations approved. Excellence in Teaching Award revision; Emeritus Policy revision approved. Information Item: SAC endorsement of FERPA policy. Draft WASC Special Report noted as future agenda item. From FSAC Resolution on Lecturer's on Senate Compensation – Second Reading postponed to next meeting. From APC: Long Range Academic Plan – Second Reading extended to next meeting. From S&F: By-Laws change regarding replacement of officers approved. Constitutional Amendment changing lecturer eligibility for voting and service to 6 WTU's – First Reading withdrawn. Resolution on posting of grade with PeopleSoft software handed out.

Present: Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Victor Garlin, Birch Moonwomon, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Martinez, Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, Mary Dingle, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Myrna Goodman, Peter Phillips, Robert McNamara, Sandra Shand, Bruce Peterson, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Ephraim Freed, Greg Tichava, Elizabeth Stanny, Karen Grady

Absent: Phil McGough, Susan McKillop, Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Elizabeth Burch, Steve Cuellar, Derek Girman, Steve Winter, Amy Wingfield, Elaine McDonald.

Proxies: Rick Robison for Raye Lynn Thomas, Anne Greenblatt for Jan Beaulyn, Brynn Mccandles for Jason Spencer

Guests: Katie Pierce, Rose Bruce, Judith Hunt, Rand Link, Jeff Langley, Katharyn Crabbe, Art Warmoth, Wayen Downen, Shawn Bungard, David Schwartz, Thomas Shepley, Dan Butler, Ben Newman

Approval of the Agenda – R. Whitkus asked to put on the agenda a resolution regarding the posting of grades on PeopleSoft. No objection. Resolution added to end of new business. *MSP*

Special Guest: Richard West, Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer of the CSU.

C. Nelson introduced the Vice Chancellor. R. West stated it was a pleasure to be at the Senate and he always enjoyed coming back to Sonoma. He shared with the body what he knew about the fiscal matters of the state and their connection to the CSU. The general theme and living on a day to day basis with what's going on in Sacramento, there really is a fiscal crisis. It is not anybody's imagination. There is a serious imbalance between expenditure and revenue and he thinks it's generally accepted that the reason for that is not so much because of a slow consumer based economy or recession but rather some of the overhang of what in retrospect was a super heated economy around dot.com activities. So the revenues of the state are really based on more than that trend line would suggest in collection of tax revenue, personal income

tax revenue, based on stock options and gains in the stock market up through the '99-2000 period. So it really wasn't a reduction in revenue it was coming back to a trend line over a period of time what that growth in population and inflation would suggest that the revenue trend line should be, there was really extensive revenue growth there for several years. Unfortunately, expenditure kept up with revenue growth and that's what the problem is now. We have committed expenditures for various programs and there isn't the revenue to fund it. The last two budget cycles have been difficult, but have really yielded postponement of the reconciliation of expenditure and revenue. We have now really a budget for the current year, the state has balanced the budget on about $15-18 billion worth of borrowing. It's made up of three or four different groups. The big element was $10.7 billion or so of longer term debt, being five year debt in the budget that's never been sold, and its really that issue that was threatened to be challenged in the courts. There was a separate $2 billion pension fund obligation of employee contributions for the state employees contribution to PERS that was capitalized and funded as a debt and that was challenged in the courts and upheld by the courts. It has not been sold either. So none of the debt that really has been proposed for balancing the budget has really occurred, so that gets into the discussion you see in the papers today, the idea of having a proposed ballot measure for approving $15 billion of debt. As far as he can tell 15 is not a scientifically derived number by any means it is simply that 10 plus the 1.9 that wasn't funded this year, plus a little bit more. That is very essential to us and anyone who is part of state government to have any hope of getting through this year. If that is not passed in one form or another there will really be problems with 1/3 of the state budget or almost $30 billion dollars out of balance, if that wasn't to happen. Even if it does happen, there's $10-15 billion of reductions that have to occur. That's the rather stark future that we have. What does it mean for us? We know we've been proposed for mid-year reductions of about $23 million made up of two types. About half is undesignated and the other half is targeted by the Governor's proposal for outreach programs. We have said that we don't think that's appropriate, that we think outreach programs are essential and that we would prefer, given a choice, to have that undesignated. So the entire amount would be undesignated. Of course our first preference is not to have any cut, but that's not realistic. Nothing has been done. It is simply a proposal. The legislature is not likely to act on that in his judgment before the middle of January. We will have to do some planning and will talk to our Presidents next week about different scenarios under which we might have to do some mid-year cuts. But it's about 1% of our budget from the state and it does come mid-year which makes it all the more difficult. Both of those cuts are annualized in the budget year '04-'05, but we shouldn't think of that as the only cuts we are likely to receive. He suspects, this year, if everything falls into place from the perspective of selling debt, possible revenue increases, curtailing expenditures, our reasonable scenario would be similar to what we had this year which is a $300 million reduction after the revenue generated from a 30% fee increase. So this puts a lot of very dark cloud over any planning that we're able to do. This very uncertain environment makes admissions processes very difficult. Our academic calendar is not consistent with the budgetary calendar in Sacramento. How it plays out. . .this is a different political environment. The recall election changed the political assumptions. To what degree and for how long only time will tell. He does think there is an expectation out of this election that there will be a balanced budget in over a year or two year period. He offered to answer questions.

R. Luttmann stated he was glad to hear that he intends to object at the Governor's office to the cut in outreach funds. This is something that is very critical to us at Sonoma State.

We're a small campus compared to the system and we've very conscious that we have quite a bit less diversity than most campuses and for us an outreach program is essential to trying meet our goal of becoming more diverse. We would strongly support your efforts to change the Governor's mind on that. R. West stated the Chancellor has already been very public about that. S. Wilson asked what plans R. West has with complying with the Supplemental Report Language that these unfortunate cuts should effect instruction last and having to look for alternative sources of funding to keep instruction going. R. West responded that the Supplemental Report Language is just that. It's supplemental request for a report. It does suggest some intent with the language, but it is not law. It was also done at time before we took $80 million in cuts last year and before these cuts. He thinks we're at the stage where we have to downsize the whole institution. It will mean enrollment reductions. He thinks we have stretched everybody as far as we can. Whether we are successful in our negotiations through that process with the Legislature and the Governor, we'll see. But in his mind, we have to comply with the intent of that, which is to serve students through instructional programming. It was also done in a time when we had a much more balanced budget. So it's going to be very difficult to keep everybody happy. It's going to require all parts of the university to reduce the size of the institution. V. Garlin stated on this campus, as is probably true on all our campuses, most of the energy from budget cutting is absorbed in the instructional part of our program. He asked for some hints what kinds of economies the system plans or projects in the area of administrative costs and the acquisition of fixed assets and in high cost items, such as CMS. R. West responded that we will look at everything. He said they have reduced expenditures in those areas from '01-'02 to '02-'03. He thinks fixed assets are always the first things that are examined and reductions in those areas seems to be true. CMS, we have deferred $13-16 million of one time expenditures through the system last year. We'll be looking at it again in the spring for next year. Unfortunately, our capital program does continue on and it lags the economy, so buildings that were approved three or four years ago require equipment and furnishings and custodial support and energy support as they come online. That itself is about $15 million next year of new costs that we didn't have this year. We have another $25 million in employee benefit costs for health premiums. Our operating costs are going up much faster than any investment in some of the fixed asset issues or some of the other services area. But he thinks they will be making reductions in all areas. B. Peterson stated he was an advisor in the EOP program and he understood that not only outreach was being targeted, but there's the possibility of the elimination of EOP grants for all our students. He wondered how realistic that is and is the Chancellor's office and Trustees going to be lobbying to cut that off? R. West responded that all the outreach programs including EOP is not sensible and sometimes the Chancellor's comments about where we are in the public forum are interpreted that at all costs we would protect all programs. Really our theme is we have to look at a contracted institution if we're going to take substantial cuts in all areas. So that's not to say there won't be some reductions, but we're not going to eliminated wholesale a program like EOP or the grants program. Obviously, the fee increases make grants and financial aid more important. That's just not realistic in a state like ours. It's not realistic with the mission of the university. E. Martinez asked about the Chancellor's office International Programs and hoped that nothing was going to impact on the International Programs. She stated that SSU has the second highest ratio of students participating in the Academic Study Aboard programs. They run a very lean office and staff, so she hopes nothing will impact them. R. West responded there are three enrollment based programs in the Chancellor's office. International Programs, Summer Arts and CalStateTeach. He thinks they did reduce the enrollment a little bit for

International Programs, but (*unintelligible*) we pushed Leo a bit (*unintelligible*). P. Phillips stated that the Department Chairs and the Deans have been told on campus that we cannot exceed our FTES for Spring. In other words if we were to exceed our enrollment targets, that we would have financial deductions from our Schools. Our understanding is that this is a Chancellor policy not to exceed our enrollment targets for Spring. This creates a scenario whereby you could reach your target in a School and still have openings in classes that students want to take and may not be able to enroll. Is this the Chancellor's strategy to get students contacting their legislators and involved and angry about the system and trying to get support. R. West responded no, that was not the driver, but in a way you could argue that. There is always a tension anytime there is a downturn in a business cycle or any cycle that the issues of quality, affordability and accessibility play off each other. What we don't ever have is a good clear understanding with the State about what their obligation is for which of those objectives because the Master Plan blends them all together. We took a $300,000 million cut last cycle and we still grew. So our average funding per student from the State went down. So when the legislature passed as part of the budget bill that there would be no growth money and no inflationary money for '04-'05, that was a given. We instructed the campus not to exceed their budget target. There's only one campus, if any, who may exceed their target. Now we're into the situation where we're going to reduce targets again, so I don't think that will play out as an actual penalty. But it was something we did to bring our funding and enrollment into alignment. We felt we wanted to say to the State that they have the obligation to provide accessibility and there's a certain cost associated with that for each student. We have reduced that by $800 in the last two years. That was the driver. P. Phillips asked then it is likely that Schools budgets will not be reduced if they exceed their targets. R. West said that's a campus call. He can't speak to a School. There was some discussion between R. West, R. Armiñana and E. Ochoa. E. Ochoa said that campuses would not be allowed to keep their fees if they exceeded target. R. West said if you are below target there will be reduction because you are not serving the students. P. Phillips said there would be a penalty if you exceed enrollments now. R. West said we had proposed that earlier, but there is no campus in that situation. P. Phillips said then it is not a Chancellor policy. R. West said it is not a policy, but there is no campus that meets that test. His data shows that we are at or below target on every campus except one. E Ochoa said we were substantially above target in the Fall relative to where we should be if we want to come in on target. R. West said, yes, it's annualized and there may need to be some controls in the Spring. C. Nelson thanked the Vice Chancellor for joining the Senate. (applause)

Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs Report - (E. Ochoa) T.C. 3:15-3:45

E. Ochoa stated that the comments made by R. West brought up an interesting question. Now that the emphasis and attention at the system level is being placed on, not coming too far below target because most big campuses have actually slightly over compensated and are coming in below target. How much attention are they going to pay to a little campus going above target. He said he needs to get a bit more of a read on that. You didn't hear R. West say that they haven't explicitly modified their earlier stance, that campuses that come above target would not get their fees. We need to get a sense of how strong is that position. But assuming they hold that position, we are trying to come in right on target. Right now the Fall census numbers were higher than they should have been without some contraction in the Spring to compensate for it and in fact that number has gotten worse over time because of an interesting development which is that PeopleSoft being a real time system has been capturing the contract courses that have been coming in after the census date and

have swollen up the Fall totals to 100 FTES above the total prior to the original census date. Right now we're trying to cut our FTES relative to what it would have been by about 181 FTES, so about 80 FTES are based on the mid-year cuts that we anticipate will be passed and have to have an impact on enrollment. But the 100 are from this other problem. It's partly a technical problem and partly a policy question. We have had the practice on this campus allowing contract courses to be entered into the system well past the census date. It hasn't hurt us in the past, but now it does. We need to seriously consider now making the census deadline a hard deadline and not allowing any courses to be added after that day. That may require us to change our practices. If we have unavoidable lead times in terms of setting up internships, we may consider setting them up in one semester to run the following semester. Or if possible compress it so we come in before the census date. He didn't think all internship programs have this problem, but a substantial number do. We're working with the Deans to try to see if we can come up with better processes, by changing our procedures and eliminate this problem. The other item he was asked to address was the role of the Academic Senate in the Strategic Planning Process. Staring from the beginning, an important part of his job is to allocate resources in support of our academic mission, in doing that he is faced with a lot of competing demands for all kinds of worthwhile activities, programs, initiatives and so forth. It's important to have some sort of criteria or sense of priorities in order to make those decisions instead of making them arbitrary or an expression of personal sympathies or some other unsupportable (*unintelligible*). He felt that he needed a strategic plan that clearly identified the priorities flowing out of a strategy for our division to carry out that part of his job. Seeing as this is the core of what the division and indeed the university is about, it seemed to him natural to reach out in partnership with the Academic Senate to develop such a plan. That was his initial approach to the Chair of this body, to join him as co-Chair in a Strategic Planning Committee that would go about developing such a plan in a way that involved the entire division that was designed to capture the best thinking and intelligence of all its members, doing it through a process that would ensure that people felt represented and could recognize themselves in what emerged. And even if their favorite program or priority wasn't coming at the top at least they could accept the process as a legitimate one and thereby abide by the results. From the start he's seen this as a partnership between the Senate and his office. That's why as the conversation began we first moved from his initial approach to Chair Nelson to a selection committee for the full committee which involved members from this body as well as administrators and himself. That's why we also started the process with community meetings which were designed to really tap into, in the widest possible sense, the thinking and mindset of the division as well as to engage everyone in the process and raise the profile of the process with the division. He thinks it succeeded doing that. Now the committee has been working. As you know out of the first committee meeting came a strong recommendation by the community that we add a few more members to the committee and we include at least one stakeholder that had not been captured before in the original membership and we did that. He's feeling pretty good about the way the process is going so far, but he knows there are questions about what's going to happen next and what's the endgame on this. To some extent none of that is set in stone, but he gave a general sense of how he sees this working. If he says something the co-Chair disagrees with, then we'll have to sit down and figure out what should be the alternative. He thinks we have key members of the Senate in the committee right now, we have majority faculty representation. There is a collaborative process of crafting the plan right now. But then of course, whatever comes out of that has to be shared with the community and it has to be shared with all significant entities within the division and the Academic Senate is obviously is a very key and prominent one and he fully anticipates that whatever they come up with in the committee will come before this body and the body will

have an opportunity to have substantive input into that product. He expects the product will undergo revision after the feedback received from the community and the Senate. In addition we have some members of the Senate who are in the committee by virtue of their position within existing Senate committees, i.e. APC Chair and EPC Chair. These individuals undoubtedly will want to bring the document back to their committees for more focused feedback from those committees. In turn those committees may share their thoughts with this body. He thinks there will be plenty of opportunity for input. His expectation is that if they do their job right in the committee, he expects by the end of the process the Senate will look forward to endorsing this document because we have captured the sense of the community. If this body felt for some reason it had to take a negative stance vis-à-vis this document, it means we didn't do our job right. That's as far as he's gotten in his own mind.

P. Phillips asked about R. West's statements about targets and their financial implications. He said the Deans are very worried about going over target for fear of losing money and will start closing classes once target is reached. E. Ochoa responded that what R. West said is that this is not going to be an issue because no campuses are coming in over target. He didn't say it's not going to be an issue because we are not going to enforce this. That's the part he needs to nail down. It's not that we're going to penalize the Deans. If the campus gets penalized and we have to return some money, it will have to come from somewhere and even if we bring it off the top, ultimately it comes down to our Division and ultimately if the Division doesn't have any money centrally, we have to turn to the Schools. P. Phillips said that in Fall we over enrolled and we still have most of those students that are still going to want to take classes and theoretically you could have a class that had openings in it, students in the department that want to take it and you couldn't enroll them because we had reached our target. And that seems totally opposed to what our institution is about. E. Ochoa responded that we don't want to continually raise our SFR. P. Phillips asked for flexibility. E. Ochoa said he would pursue the comments made by R. West.

R. McNamara said he was disappointed to hear what he took to be a dismissal of the SRL and his understanding is that it was to be adhered to at Long Beach and not on a campus level. Maybe others heard that differently. How much discretion do the campuses have with the cuts that are coming down from the Chancellor's office. There's a lot of talk about protecting instruction, but he's not clear how much real discretion there really is. E. Ochoa responded that he thinks we do get some clear direction and in fact, both the stance they took initially against over enrolling and now against under enrolling, they are both stemming from the same posture which is the time has come to stop trying to absorb cuts while continuing to perform at the same level. The time has come to scale our level of performance in terms of enrollment to funding that the state gives us. So if we have to face these cuts, it will be reflected in enrollment. That much we are being told. The bottom line is the target for the campus. We don't actually have the cuts for the mid-year yet because the Legislature hasn't passed them. We were told they won't give us dollar amount, but will give us revised targets for the year that will reflect anticipate the cuts. Those will be coming to us very soon. We sort of know where we are and that's why we're doing what we're doing in the Spring. We expect they should be pretty much what we're shooting for now. There will be confirmation of that soon. And there will be cuts coming later, if the Legislature passes it, that will be consistent with those target reductions. The hard constraint for us will be meeting that target and then coping with the eventual cuts that come down the pike.

N. Byrne said there's seems to be some confusion between what R. West said and our budgetary committees, that is he described the $3 million mid-year cut with one half roughly to be targeted to outreach programs. The other half is undesignated, but his understanding is that the other half expressed exclusively as a reduction in FTES which seems to designate the reduction to direct instruction. E. Ochoa responded the way they've come up with the 80 FTES for the Spring, through a verbal communication with the President he got information excluding the outreach piece, the cuts would be about $300,000 for the campus. So we took that and treated it as growth money, except it's negative growth. We took 79.9% of it to be the share of that cut that would fall to Academic Affairs and then we worked it out to about 40 FTES, but that's annualized so you have to multiply by 2 and that's how we got the 80. There's still about 20% of that $300,000 that will be cuts in other parts of the university. N. Byrne asked of the 79% of the budget that does go to Academic Affairs, doesn't 50% go to direct instruction and the balance to operations. If that were the case, does the 80 FTES represent the entire 79% or the 55%. E. Ochoa said is only means we have to generate FTES in reduction because the reduction we need to show the Legislature in response to cuts is the one at the growth funding rates, that is higher than the actual marginal cost of instruction for us which is little more than half of that. What that means is we're asking the Schools to ratchet back their FTES by an amount of FTES that will reduce their costs by significantly less than the cuts we're going to have to face. We will have to find other ways to find money beside canceling the sections that generated the 80 FTES, correct. That could be in a variety of ways at the School level.

R. Coleman-Senghor said in describing the process by which the Strategic Plan will come to the Senate, you characterized it as an endgame which the Senate would have a voice in it and if in fact, the Senate does not support it, there's something wrong with the process itself. Yesterday he attended a meeting in the School of Science and Technology and one of the first questions that was posed to me was while I was presenting the Long Range Plan, what does this plan mean, isn't there another type of planning going on on campus, isn't the Vice President engaged in planning? Then the question came from that body, what does it mean for the Academic Senate Planning committee, is it moot? He asked the Provost to describe his conception of the relationship between the present document and the document that is emerging from the process you outlined. E. Ochoa responded that an important part of this exercise involves looking at the environmental constraints we face, externally, threats and opportunities and other parameters that have to factor into what we decide to do and also taking stock of our internal resources, our own strengths and weaknesses and what can we realistically expect to accomplish. One of the key pieces in the internal assessment is the Long Range Planning document that was generated by your committee because it represents work that has been on-going that preceded the effort we're engaged in now and is in fact part of the foundation of what we can hope to accomplish in this current exercise. So at a minimum, there's a lot of thinking that has gone into the Long Range Plan, there's a lot of institutional history that's captured and elements of the Long Range Plan will find themselves emerging in the actual Strategic Plan. In terms of the organizational issues, that one he's much more fuzzy on as he thinks we have to stay open. One of the things about strategic planning is that if conditions change or new information comes in, you have to adjust. Likewise with this Strategic Planning exercise, the process of going through strategic planning will transform all of us, myself and the committee members and hopefully the community that has also been interacting with this process. Therefore we need to take stock at the end of this first cycle and assess, ok how did this work, how did this involve the various stakeholders in the community what conclusions can we draw about how we're currently organized. He's totally open to what might come out. We may decide to carve out specialized roles for the two types of committees, another

one would be have one committee absorb the responsibilities for planning, there's lots of possibilities and it's too early in the process to be able to assess which way we want to go. R. Coleman-Senghor observed that it is not just that we are engaged in planning, but engaged in the revision of an already existing plan, one which has been approved by the Senate. V. Garlin stated that we all understand that this process is about legitimacy. He appreciated Provost Ochoa willingness to incorporate aspects of the process which perhaps were not initially expected as part of his effort to make this legitimate. V. Garlin's continuing concern has to do with the role of the Senate and its function. Endorse is a different word than ratify or approve or pass or enact. It suggests that there's very little choice involved on the part of the endorsing body. He hopes we're able to develop a review and comment process that will go back and forth sufficiently so that concerns of the Senate as an institutional body of the faculty will be able to communicate to the Strategic Planning group its concerns in a way that will make it possible for this body to unanimously endorse the document as it eventually emerges. In order for that to be a genuinely legitimate process and genuine process of legitimacy he thinks that has to happen. He looks forward to that. C. Nelson stated it is her intention that anytime a draft comes out of the Strategic Planning committee to make arrangements to bring it to this body for discussion and comment and take those comments back to the Strategic Planning committee.

President of the Associated Students Report - (J. Spencer) proxy Brynn McCandless

B. McCandless wanted to let the Senate know that the Associated Students Executive Board will be working through intercession to craft a message and media campaign in response to the mid-year Governor's budget and the unavailability of classes for students at SSU and other CSU campuses. And also send us any students you have contact with that might be interested in getting involved in this topic. We really want to effect a change at the state level and we really need bodies. If you come across any passionate students, please send them our way.

Approval of Minutes – Minutes of 10/30/03 and 11/13/03 were emailed to the body. On 11/13/03 minutes page 9, change it's in the resolution to its. *MSP*

Consent Items:

EPC: Music Department curriculum changes; Geography revised concentrations.

Greta Vollmer, a member of EPC presented the items and invited body to question the department representatives if needed. **No objections.**

FSAC: Excellence in Teaching Award revision; Emeritus Policy revision

E. Stanny introduced the items. **No objections.**

Return to Reports

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

No report

EPC, FSAC and SAC

No report

Information Item: SAC endorsement of FERPA policy

K. Grady said that SAC went through the policy and made revisions when Kathryn Crabbe brought it to them. SAC has approved it.

Draft WASC Special Report (included in packet)

C. Nelson asked Rose Bruce to speak to this item. R. Bruce said when we had the WASC visit in 1999 four areas surfaced that needed attention – alignment with institutional priorities, assessment in GE and in the major, and diversity. So we have drafted a response that indicates what has happened in each of those areas in the past five years and what impact it has had on the campus and there's some introductory sections that talk about what's happened new to the entire campus, changes in personnel, new buildings, that sort of thing. All of these reports have gone through the appropriate committees, but if anyone see a substantive issue that's missing we'd appreciate hearing your feedback on that. The final report will go out on January 20. R. Coleman-Senghor noted that APC has been working very closely with Rose Bruce and we've conveyed to her our concerns about the language of the report and particular items in the report. She has assured us she welcomes our input and as she takes the language from us and see if it fits in. If it does not, effectively APC will write a response of its own. If you have issues or ideas, please forward them to APC and we will look forward to that. R. Bruce said to sent it to APC for planning, EPC for assessment, and with respect to diversity, it's the Campus Climate Committee. M. Goodman asked if this was the final report. R. Bruce said no. M. Goodman noted on the page where it says report preparation, it's says the during the months of December 2003 and January 2004 revisions to the final report were made to the report before final submission and reviewed and approved by Provost Ochoa. Have we reached January 2004? R. Bruce said no, but we will be doing that and we wrote it that way so we don't have to update it. P. Phillips noted that the report says "Admissions Policy and the EMT were brought to the Academic Senate for extensive review and consultation. Some faculty members felt that in the past these topics did not receive a thorough reviewing." Aren't we leaving out the fact that the Senate voted not to have the admissions policy that the current administration is implementing? R. Bruce said she would include that information. **R. Coleman-Senghor moved to discuss the WASC draft. E. Mendez second. Vote on motion – passed on voice vote. C. Nelson said the WASC draft will be given a time certain at the last Senate meeting of the Fall semester.**

BUSINESS

Resolutions regarding Lecturers:

    a. **From FSAC Resolution on Lecturer's on Senate Compensation – Second Reading - attachment – E. Stanny T. C. 4:10**

E. Stanny clarified the resolution's language. R. McNamara asked whether we have three units designa[ted] for Lecturer Senators. E. Stanny said yes. R. McNamara asked what happens when we have more t[han] three? E. Stanny responded that right now the allocation of units is informal each year and beco[mes] formalized by the Senate. The units are allocated and then the Senate approves the allocation. Right n[ow]

three units are allocated to lecturers and those are going to the Lecturer Senators, those elected at-la
but sometimes the at-large Senators can't take the units because they have too many units to be abl
take them and so FSAC decided to leave this issue open about how the three units be allocated am
lecturers, so if the Lecturer Senators couldn't use them they could be allocated to lecturer who w
perhaps serving on the Senate, but not as an at-large Lecturer or holding some other Senate position s
as Chair of a committee. R. McNamara said he thinks we're in a bind on this and its not real clear
Nelson stated that her understanding of the consequence of this resolution is that there will be
protected units for lecturers within the total number of units we have to allocate for faculty governanc
we have six lecturers, they would be on the table with the various positions that have received units
the Executive Committee makes an initial decision on how to allocate them and then brings it to
Senate. Under this resolution the Executive Committee would have to make a choice about the very is
you are raising. **R. Coleman-Senghor moved to drop the word "each" in the resolution and cha
lecturer to lecturers serving on the Senate. Second. S. Wilson called the question. No objection. Vote
calling the question – passed voice vote. Vote on motion – passed on voice vote.** M. Dreisbach noted
we had some question on the original resolution about whether the compensation would be by seme
or per year and she understands the allocation is by year, but there is no mention of that in the resolut
E. Stanny responded since we are not specifying the number of units we don't have to address that. W
leaving it really flexible because we don't know what's going to happened with the units allocated
Academic Affairs. We wanted to get away from that. We wanted to support compensation for lectu
but leave the flexibility open to how those units are allocated depending on what the conditions are
Brannen noted that the word eligible is different than entitled. Presumably, this allows us to give no u
to lecturers and he hopes the lecturers are aware of the ramification of this wording. R. Karlsrud as
why we distinguish between Senate service and service on Senate committees. It sounds like some
could be doing a lot of work on Senate committees couldn't eligible for compensation, but someone do
less work on the Senate would be. He thought the reason we had compensation for lecturers was that
body was requiring lecturers to serve on the Senate. What we are doing now is that the other service is
equal. E. Stanny said we did consider this issue. If one of the at-large lecturers couldn't use the u
allocated to them and someone who was chair of FSAC and a lecturer that they be eligible for the unit
Dreisbach stated her original understanding was that the compensation was for Lecturer Senator seats
it makes sense to have eligibility for compensation for Lecturer Senator seats because just as any lectu
can run to sit on EPC or FSAC and not be compensated, because we added these specific seats to
Senate that we were adding the compensation. R. Coleman-Senghor observed that the original inten
was recognition of the work of lecturers on the Senate and within the university and we did use
language that this was a symbolic expression of our commitment to them. The problem here is
symbolism doesn't always work in terms of the details of contracts. If we keep the symbolism intact,
eligibility issue is one that clearly says we will continue that process, that on the Senate we
symbolically compensate three or more members depending on the determination of the Execu
Committee for their work. V. Garlin said he was troubled by the conversation as it confuses debating
example the Chair of FSAC or SAC should get compensation with a very different issue which is the
and status of lecturers in university governance. Leaving the lecturer's compensation up to
determination of a body which is dominated by tenure track faculty members is really not a good syst
He moved that the word eligible be changed to entitled. S. Brannen second. E. Stanny said that FS
used the language eligible so that the lecturers would be considered in a pool with the other ten
tenure-track faculty equally because if you put entitled in here you are putting them at the top of the p
instead of the equal pool. W

SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC LONG RANGE PLAN

*REVISED FROM THE 1994 GOALS AND IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES LEADING TO A
NEW ACADEMIC ACTION PLAN FOR SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY prepared by the Academic
Planning Committee based on THE ASSUMPTIONS FOR LONG RANGE ACADEMIC
PLANNING (Adopted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs Council, May 1993)*

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES:

1. The University is committed to the belief that students should acquire appropriate skills, learn diverse modes of inquiry and be exposed to a variety of perspectives in their course of study. Along with inter-disciplinary inquiry, the University recognizes and fosters inter-disciplinary perspectives as valuable for full intellectual exploration.

2. The University promotes active involvement in learning and close human interactions throughout the curriculum and throughout the campus

3. The University recognizes and fosters the richness which results from diversity and multiple perspectives in the curriculum and the entire campus community.

4. The interaction between the campus and the surrounding community is an integral aspect of curriculum planning and implementation in graduate and professional/applied programs.

I.   THE NATURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

1.   SSU is a community of faculty, staff, students and administrators dedicated to the common purpose of achieving and maintaining excellence in teaching and learning.

2.   SSU is committed to achieving and maintaining excellence as a distinguished public undergraduate liberal arts and sciences institution in California and to offering selected graduate programs of the highest quality that meet professional and community needs.

3.   SSU is an important educational and cultural resource.

4.   SSU continually examines its programs, procedures, and structures, and makes modifications as indicated, to ensure that it is serving its mission, its students, and its community.

5.   Even if additional funding becomes available, it is the institution's goal to grow only modestly over the next ten years.

Goals:

1. All activities undertaken by the University are designed to achieve and maintain excellence in all services delivered.

2. Every effort should be made to insure that our size is commensurate with the announced mission of the University.

Implementation:

1. Students of high academic achievement from diverse backgrounds who demonstrate potential for success are actively recruited and supported.

2. Disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary program options are offered in the curriculum.

3. The University encourages programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels and affiliated centers which address emerging needs of SSU's service area, including outreach activities that link SSU programs with communities, businesses and schools.

II.   EDUCATIONAL COMMITMENT

1. SSU is committed to teaching as its primary mission.

2. SSU is committed to supporting its faculty in developing and maintaining excellent teaching, including support for classroom instruction (facilities, equipment, class sizes) as well as support for scholarly and professional activities that develop expertise in the content and process of instruction.

3. SSU is committed to increasing its student retention and graduation rate.

4. SSU places high value on human interaction in all facets of a student's education and so is committed to offering small classes.

5. SSU is committed to excellence and diversity in its faculty, student body and curriculum.

Goals:

1. To foster outstanding teaching, high rates of student success and diversity in the University community.

Implementation:

1. Systems of support and reward are designed to encourage the professional and intellectual development of faculty and staff and intellectual discovery by students.

III.   Governance and Administration

1. The Governance and Administration of SSU involves four major constituencies:
   (a) faculty,
   (b) administration,
   (c) staff, and
   (d) students.

2. SSU is committed to a governance of faculty, administration and staff based on collegiality, joint planning and accountability in areas regarding human, financial and physical resources. Insofar as possible students are participating partners in these areas of responsibility.

3. The faculty has primary responsibility in those matters fundamental to the educational mission of the university (e.g., academic programs and other curriculum matters, degree and graduation requirements).

Goals:

1. Institutional structures and lines of communication ensure involvement of all major constituencies of the campus in decisions related to governance and administration of the university.

2. Budget and policy committees will include faculty representatives from the various units in addition to representation by members of the Academic Planning Committee. Student representation is included on these bodies.

Implementation:

1. Efforts will be made to preserve and enhance the shared responsibility and mutual support by all those involved in the academic enterprise of the institution.

IV. COMMITMENT TO FACULTY

1. SSU is committed to support and to provide adequate resources to fulfill the faculty's primary function of teaching.

2. SSU is committed to support and provide adequate resources for the scholarly, creative, and professional development of its faculty.

3. SSU is committed to support faculty participation in campus governance.

4. SSU is committed to facilitating faculty service to the community.

Goals:

1. To support faculty as teachers and scholars.

2. To promote faculty development, a strong shared governance system, and faculty service to the community.

Implementation:

1. SSU will reduce class sizes to reflect class sizes of comparable campuses in COPLAC and the CSU.

2. SSU will reduce teaching load by hiring sufficient permanent faculty.

3. SSU will support professional and scholarly activities by establishing a minimum allocation of released time, sabbatical leaves, and travel monies.

4. SSU will set as a priority adequate funding each year for R & D to support teaching, curricular innovation, and the professional and intellectual components of faculty activity.

5. SSU will provide for recently-hired faculty with support for professional development such as orientation and internal funding for research, program, and curriculum development.

6. SSU will continue its support for the Center for Teaching and Professional Development and the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.

7. SSU will provide release time for key members of the Academic Senate.

8. SSU will provide support for Centers and Institutes that support scholarly activities and community service.

9. Through the Offices of Development and Alumni Affairs, SSU will seek ways to promote faculty development and community service projects supported by private sources of funding.

V.   STUDENT POPULATION

1. The class level distribution of the student population should reflect a balance appropriate to a high quality four-year undergraduate program and selective graduate programs.

2. SSU will recruit on a state-wide basis for quality at the freshman level with mandated priority to be given to local freshmen and upper division students who meet the CSU eligibility index. SSU will give junior transfers from the service area (including re-entry students) that have completed their GE requirements a high priority for admission.

3. SSU will increase its percentage of underrepresented ethnic populations (e.g., Native American, Hispanic, African American) to accomplish two purposes:

   (a) to ensure that the entire student population is exposed to an educational experience that reflects the cosmopolitan nature of contemporary society, and

   (b) to serve the under-represented population of the service region.

4. SSU values the presence of international students, and will admit sufficient numbers of these students to strive for a distinct international presence in the student body.

5. SSU will strive to maintain an economically, socially, and culturally diverse, and age and gender diverse, student body.

Goal:

1. To attract a diverse population of students with high academic potential.

Implementation:

1. The University will use enrollment management strategies, developed through consultation by faculty, staff and administration, to maintain a balance of student backgrounds related to such factors as age, ethnicity and national origin.

2. The University will adjust these enrollment strategies as necessary to support an optimum balance of offerings appropriate to a liberal arts and sciences university and to respond to curricular change and newly developed programs.

VI.   FACULTY STAFFING POLICIES

1.   SSU's highest staffing priority is to retain tenured and tenure-track faculty and those permanent staff essential to its academic mission.

2.   Faculty salaries will reflect CPEC parity for comparable institutions.

3.   SSU will provide subsidized faculty housing for junior faculty to help develop a sense of academic community.

4.   SSU will maintain a core of permanent faculty able to respond to its changing needs, maintain currency within academia and a willingness to engage in multi and interdisciplinary discovery; and will keep temporary faculty numbers to the minimum required by programmatic needs to enrich the curriculum or respond to student needs. We will minimize the hiring of temporary faculty and as vacancies occur we consider it imperative to refill positions with full time tenure track faculty.

5.   SSU seeks disciplinary and cross disciplinary faculty who value involving students in scholarly pursuits, research activities, and broad General Education.

Goals:

1. To maintain 75 percent tenure/tenure-track faculty and 25% part-time faculty.

2. To reach an SFR of 18:1.

3. To maintain an appropriate ratio between major and General Education offerings and not to destroy a department to handle lower division freshmen increase needs.

Implementation:

1. SSU will continue to seek ways to attract and retain quality faculty through the active encouragement of intellectual and professional activity within and beyond the classroom, including recognition and support of faculty research and teaching.

2. SSU will provide orientation sessions and development programs for new and continuing tenure-track faculty. Appropriate bodies for this task include, but are not limited to, the Office of Sponsored Programs, the Faculty Sub-Committee on Professional Development, Library professionals and the CMTS staff.

3. SSU will provide programs to enhance the development of professional and support staff members and the Center for Teaching and Professional Development.

4. The interests of the faculty and members of the professional and support staffs shall be represented by the faculty governance system and by the Unions.

VII. CURRICULUM

1. **SSU provides a liberal arts and sciences education that prepares students for fulfilling public and private lives. SSU offers select professional and graduate programs.**

2. All undergraduate liberal arts and sciences majors are structured around a course which includes attention to the structure and methodology of the field of study and, where appropriate, emphases which can be effectively supported with available resources.

3. To prepare students for active involvement in the community, SSU provides a broad range of opportunities for students to become involved in socially responsible community service.

4. SSU encourages disciplinary and interdisciplinary innovation in both its pedagogy and its curriculum.

Goal:

1. To achieve and maintain excellence in both undergraduate and graduate programs while promoting diverse pedagogical approaches and encouraging academic innovation.

Implementation:

1. Academic departments/programs will conduct periodic reviews of their curricular offerings to ensure thorough coverage of fundamentals of the major, to respond to emerging needs and directions in the major field of study, and to assure timely completion of requirements.

2. Efforts will be expanded to include internships, team projects and community-related educational experiences as part of both undergraduate and graduate education.

3. **New mechanisms will be developed which are explicitly designed to encourage academic innovation, including new disciplinary, interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary approaches to education on the campus.**

VIII. GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

1. SSU offers selected graduate and professional programs that are consistent with the educational mission of the University.

2. Graduate and professional programs are created and maintained in response to demonstrable needs.

3. Graduate and professional programs do not compromise the integrity and quality of undergraduate curriculum and programs.

4. Graduate and professional programs are appropriately staffed and are provided with resources adequate to offer courses in a timely manner and to administer the program without straining department resources or faculty.

5. Some graduate and professional programs are collaborative efforts between SSU and professional communities or other institutions in its region or state.

Goal:

1. To offer a limited number of high-quality graduate and professional programs which can be completed by students in a timely manner while enhancing their intellectual development and professional preparation.

Implementation:

1. Periodically review graduate and professional programs, and take appropriate action in response, with regard to the University mission, demonstrated needs, effect on undergraduate programs, staffing, administration, and resources.

2. Provide adequate resources to ensure that students have timely access to courses, access to faculty, appropriate library and other informational resources, and opportunities for professional experiences such as teaching and research assistantships and conference attendance and presentations.

3. Provide adequate resources to ensure that faculty have time and support for teaching, advising and mentoring, thesis supervision, program administration, accreditation reviews, and development of their own scholarship to support graduate-level teaching.

4. Provide adequate resources to ensure that programs, departments, and schools have needed staffing, space, equipment, and operating expenses specifically for their graduate and professional programs.

5. Identify and provide adequate resources to support graduate students not situated within a single program or department, such as ITDS students.

6. Encourage collaboration among faculty, departments, and campuses to benefit the quality of graduate and professional programs and of students' experiences.

IX. GENERAL EDUCATION

1. General Education programs are philosophically coherent and have clearly defined and regularly assessed goals.

2. Permanent faculty responsible for developing and teaching General Education will consider General Education as an essential part of their teaching and curricular development responsibilities.

3. The GE program embodies and expresses the basic values of SSU (See Universal Principles).

Goal:

1. To provide undergraduate students with a challenging, meaningful and enriching General Education program.

Implementation:

1. Faculty work to define what students who complete the GE program should know and be able to do, including the identification of intellectual skills and basic knowledge which all students should acquire as part of an SSU GE program.

2. Faculty work to develop a variety of strategies to promote students' awareness of the coherence of SSU GE programs, and how they relate to the basic values of SSU.

3. In addition to courses presented along traditional disciplinary lines, each student should be able to experience the following: thematic arrangements, cohorts of students, linked courses, team-teaching.

4. To the greatest extent possible, undergraduate students have the benefit of GE courses taught by full-time permanent faculty.

5. Faculty who share responsibility for specific categories of GE meet regularly to plan and review the content and effectiveness of courses offered.

6. There is a core of permanent faculty responsible for the curriculum in all GE Areas. G.E. courses are taught by faculty with expertise in GE pedagogy and motivated to engage lower division students.

X.   PHYSICAL RESOURCES

1. SSU is committed to a process assuring maximum flow of information and participation by all segments of the campus community in decisions pertaining to campus planning.

2. SSU values and recognizes that its physical and social environment, and its instructional spaces, are integral parts of the educational process. SSU will design new buildings, as resources become available, on a scale that supports the educational process and clearly defined needs. These buildings will be designed as models of energy efficiency and environmental sensitivity.

Goals:

1. To use existing physical facilities and any new buildings as they become available in such ways as to maximize the educational goals of the campus.

2. To maintain the beauty and educational effectiveness of the physical campus setting.

Implementation:

1. The President and all administrative officers shall actively promote physical changes that reinforce the ideals and mission of SSU, including excellence in instruction, close faculty-student interaction, and the enhancement of a true learning community.

2. The Campus Planning Committee shall develop further mechanisms to involve all constituencies of the campus community in decisions affecting physical changes on the campus.

3. The Space Utilization Committee shall articulate priorities for making space utilization decisions, including instructional need, departmental need, offices for new faculty, and communicate to the campus as it conducts an ongoing review of space utilization on the campus.

4. The President's Campus Planning Committee and the Provost and Vice President's Space Utilization Committee shall meet on a regular basis in order to anticipate the impact on academic programs of any proposed changes in physical facilities and utilization of existing space on the campus.

XI.   INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT

1. SSU provides infrastructure, staffing, educational technologies and equipment to support curricular needs.

2. The campus recognizes the vital role the University Library plays in supporting the curriculum, providing access to information resources, and fostering information competency skills necessary for successful lifelong learning.

3. Universal campus access to current information technology is necessary to enable effective teaching and learning. Within the context of instructional programs, the University will develop opportunities for the use of such tools by students and faculty.

Goals:

1. To prepare students who can engage in lifelong learning; are competent in finding, evaluating and using information resources; and who can function effectively in an age of ever-changing technology.

2. To enable students to experience and master basic elements of the methodology and structure of their field.

Implementation:

1. SSU will develop and implement criteria for the cost-effective use of educational space, technology, equipment and other resources that reflect the complexities of SSU's educational mission and are based on adequate input by knowledgeable faculty. These criteria will be used by all campus planning committees.

2. SSU will provide adequate staffing for instructional and computer labs, library, and department offices to support instructional needs.

3. SSU will provide adequate and equitable level of resources to support the instructional mission of the University Library.

4. SSU will provide and maintain equipment necessary for instruction by faculty in the academic disciplines.

5. SSU will support a campus computer network and will support, maintain and refresh faculty workstations.

6. SSU will maintain an adequate physical infrastructure for instructional support, including sufficient classrooms, electrical and network access.

7. The Administration will provide support (release time, equipment, materials) to faculty to develop project-based curricula.

8. The Institution will support academic and curricular innovation.

XII.   STUDENT SUPPORT

1. SSU faculty clearly articulate for students the learning objectives of their programs. Admission, academic and career advising is provided by faculty and career professional staff. SSU faculty and career professional staff provide admission, academic, and career advising.

2. SSU provides learning assistance appropriate to a student's levels of preparation and offers programs that enhance academic achievement of students at all levels.

3. SSU faculty and staff support activities that complement the formal curriculum and provide rich opportunities for personal development beyond the classroom.

4. SSU makes available maximum opportunities for student financial assistance corresponding to the requirements of state, federal and private funding sources.

Goals:

1. To foster programs that contribute to a meaningful living environment and enhance opportunities to integrate personal growth into academic and philanthropic experiences.

2. To support effectively students from diverse economic backgrounds so that they can secure the maximum opportunities for personal growth and intellectual achievement.

3. To address the full range of student needs, including personal and financial support as appropriate, to enhance student experience on and off campus and to integrate academic endeavors with the practice of citizenship.

Implementation:

1. Faculty and staff develop effective advising procedures and carefully monitor these to ensure that all students receive timely and effective advising.

2. Students partake in a variety of learning approaches: integrative/cross cultural teaching, disciplinary offerings, cooperative and collaborative learning experiences, participation in especially those for that support the success of disadvantaged students--tutorial programs led by junior and senior level students, and effective use of technology. Insofar as possible, students should have the opportunity to participate in research projects and serve as teaching and research assistants.

3. Students have the opportunity to augment their financial situation through on-campus employment.

XIII. FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY

1. SSU faces an increasing need to rely on funding for academic programs and student support from the students themselves and from sources other than state resources.

2. Certain professional and applied programs, mainly at the graduate level, may of necessity be offered on a self-support basis, through Extended Education, or through local community partnerships.

Goals:

1. To develop increased sources of funding to support the academic mission of the university in a time of reduced support from traditional sources.

2. To assure that any revenue generating initiatives should not detract from the University's primary mission.

Implementation:

1. Proposals for new academic programs projects or activities, which require additional funding, will provide the Academic Planning Committee and the Education Policies Committee with information justifying their merits. The justification will be based on three criteria: contribution to educational effectiveness; sources of funding; and cost of implementation.

2. Incentive programs are developed for faculty to engage in research projects which generate funds for research assistantships, release time for faculty, and resources to hire additional faculty and staff and buy equipment.

3. Research is undertaken which supports the teacher/scholar, student/scholar model of teaching and learning, and serves the needs of the community and society while tapping the resources of local, state, and national governments, non-governmental organizations and business associations. This generates community goodwill and promotes political and budgetary support for the campus.

4. The University will adhere to the guidelines governing cooperative relationships.

Senate 10/2/03 handout revised from version in packet

e wanted eligible, because that's what everyone else is, eligible. R. Karlsrud argued that using entitled makes it more clear that we are distinguishing between the service of a lecturer on the Senate and other Senate committees. This smacks to him of unfairness. M. Dreisbach noted research done by the Senate office about what happens on other campuses and there are campuses where the Schools provide compensation for lecturers serving on committees. **V. Garlin moved to postpone the item to the next meeting. P. Phillips second. Vote to postpone – passed on voice vote.**

From APC: Long Range Academic Plan – Second Reading – attachment – R. Coleman-Senghor T. C. 4:30

R. Coleman-Senghor started by stating how important the document is. It is a document of the Senate, a document which the Senate has approved and now is under revision. He said

that what is before the body is a revision and he has asked for comments on the revision. The existing document began in 1991. This document is the product of an entirely different relationship between administration and faculty. This document was initiated under President Benson, Vice President Farish, there was an entirely different institutional structure on the administrative side that has overlooked this document. Many of you who are here on this body were not present at the same time as the people who established the founding language and principles. What is before the Senate then is a request by APC for the body to take a look at the language of the document and see whether to not it reflects the Senate's sense of two things – that this is keeping in the spirit of the previous document though updating the previous document because of technical changes, organizational changes and other kinds of institutional transformations that have taken place since the original language. The document itself as you can see was revisited in 1995. Now we have been engaged in the process – a year and a half worth of meetings to work through the document reaching out to various sectors of the university for its consideration. Now it is before the Senate. He asked the body to recognize that this is an instrument that the Senate had approved, that it is, in fact, a plan. He can speak to the difference in his mind between the Strategic Planning that is going on now through Provost Ochoa. He offered a metaphor. If you think about the Long Range Plan, you can think of it as a map. He would like the body to think of Provost Ochoa's initiative as one in which there is a charting of a course to arrive at particular ports. What he's looking for is an instrument to allow us to arrive at destinations, but also an instrument with which he can respond to a storm, the current budgetary crisis. He needs that. We need that. The Long Range Plan is a set of foundational statements that he hopes the Strategic Plan will refer to and align itself with. Then that would mean the voice of the faculty will be heard within this document. He does not expect to conclude the discussion today. But he really believes we should have this document solidified before the WASC report goes forward in March.

E. Martinez commented on the Diversity section and asked to add a word. She offered that Hispanic should be replaced with Latino/Hispanic. Latino relates more to this region and for many people Hispanic connects to a Spain/European heritage whereas Latino connects to the native or indigenous to the Americas heritage. R. Coleman-Senghor wanted to hear everyone's comments and asked that people send specific language to him by email that he can then share with the committee. S. Wilson thought it was an impressive document and commented on IV on page 3, Commitment to Faculty. What he noticed was the support for professional development, there's nothing excluding lecturers here, is there some way we can have this manifest itself towards increased professional development for lecturers? R. Coleman-Senghor said there was a discussion on this and their take was that lecturers are faculty. Perhaps under implementation we could identify a language there of the need to have professional development resources for lecturers. B. Peterson commented on the section on Diversity under implementation. It says we want to use enrollment management strategies to maintain a balance. He's not sure we're there yet. He will forward language to R. Coleman-Senghor to create or achieve a balance. Also such factors as age, ethnicity and national origin – we also need to include economic status. R. Coleman-Senghor said we received a very interesting statement from Safe Zone which spoke exactly to that issue, but also to the question of sexual orientation. He went online and looked at other CSU policy statements along this line, for example San Luis Obispo, there's explicit language about sexual orientation. There's also explicit language at the University of California. He went off site to other campuses in the Midwest and was surprised to find that there's explicitly language again there in terms of sexual orientation and socio-economic standing. That will be something we will discuss and he thinks will be incorporated. B. Peterson said that throughout here there are comments about outreach and retention efforts and he thinks

with the threat to outreach funds from the Governor's proposed budget it is crucial we have that in here and he applauded that we're making a statement that no matter what the Governor says this is important to us. R. Coleman-Senghor asked if the language was adequate. B. Peterson said yes. M. Dreisbach thanked the committee for their work on the document. She appreciated having the added time to look at it and had a number of little suggestions that she will send in writing. One substantive suggestion she had was under Educational Commitment on page 2, bullet one, she suggested "SSU is committed to teaching *and learning* and it's primary mission." V. Garlin commented on Universal Principles number 4 about the interaction of between the campus and the surrounding community. His understanding is that the concept of the service area is no longer part of the lexicon of the CSU. That is to say, each of the CSU campuses is viewed as a statewide institution. He was troubled by the concept "surrounding community." He didn't know what that was, a community of interest, a geographical community, the north bay. He also wondered if the terms graduate and professional/applied programs is meant as he thinks it should to exclude undergraduate programs. Applied programs – who decides whether a program is applied or not and whether or not it is important to "consult the surrounding community" in the design of the curriculum of a particular department. He thought number 4 would be improved by clarifying language with respect to "surrounding community" and "applied programs." R. Coleman-Senghor noted this was one of the few sections that was not revised from the original document, but that does not mean it shouldn't be subject to improvement. We talked about the idea of the concept of the service area. While that might be a position that the state has taken, it fails to realize the practical dimension with respect to our commitments to the business community, the social services agencies we are involved with, the cultural arts we are connected with, the towns around us, the junior colleges and high schools we are involved with. It was the conclusion of the committee that we have a local function and responsibility. For that reason we did not change the language. If V. Garlin feels that the term surrounding community is not descriptive enough, then he invited him to provide the committee with descriptive language they might be able to use. E. Ochoa stated he thinks it's true the CSU is no longer holding hard and fast to service areas that for example would prevent one CSU campus from operating a graduate program off campus in an area that could be seen as encroaching on another campus. On the other hand the notion of the service area in a softer sense, endures. For example, San Diego State has been made to accept applicants that are CSU eligible within its local area. Notwithstanding their impacted status and that was a directive from the Chancellor's office. V. Garlin said the legislature. E. Ochoa said yes, there is a sense that there is a local community that we serve. He didn't think there was a problem with that notion enduring in this document. R. Coleman-Senghor noted that we are also obliged to draw from our service area students with respect to our enrollment. E. Ochoa said for example we are currently impacted for first time freshman and to the extent that we adopt more restrictive admissions policies those would not apply to the local service area students. They would continue to be admitted as long as they were CSU eligible. R. Karlsrud commented on Commitment to Faculty on page 4 where it says SSU will reduce teaching load by hiring sufficient permanent faculty. He said the way most campuses reduce teaching load is by hiring permanent faculty and lecturers and he didn't think that should be left out. He suggested striking the word permanent. R. Luttmann commented on page 5 Faculty and Staffing Policies, VI, item three says SSU will provide subsidized faculty housing. The word subsidized could be problematic for several reasons. He suggested changing subsidized to affordable. Subsidized might invite the IRS to consider that there are imputed additional compensations being given to people and also some faculty might regard this as a fairness issue, that colleagues are given additional compensation in kind. To avoid these complications, we should take the work subsidized out. R. Coleman-Senghor noted that the

point was made by Vice President Hunt when she spoke about contract implications, so we're very much attuned to that. R. McNamara thanked R. Coleman-Senghor and the committee for their work. He said he was glad R. Coleman-Senghor was on the Strategic Planning Committee. He was still unclear how the two were going to blend in the long run and was not sure who could respond to that, particularly since you have so many specifics here. What if there is a contradiction between what comes out of the Strategic Plan and what we have here. For instance, on the future of graduate programs, we specifically state here as a goal to fund them and what if there is a difference in the Strategic Plan. That's just one. C. Nelson stated that the body was discussing the Long Range Plan and not the relationship between the Long Range Plan and the Strategic Plan as an agenda item. While the question is appropriate for this body to consider, she did not think it was appropriate for this discussion. Some discussion continued. **The chair ruled the discussion out of order. R. Coleman-Senghor moved to appeal the ruling of the chair. Second.** R. Coleman-Senghor argued that describing to this body the relationship between statements made in this document and how these statements will be taken in the future has a lot to do with the body's sense of the efficacy of the document. That's why he wants to speak to it. He would rather appeal to the Chair rather than have her overruled. V. Garlin argued that the ruling of the Chair creates the impression of the openness of the discussion of planning which many people around this table have worked very hard to employ. He asked that the question be answered. The relationship of the document to other documents before the body or the institution is a proper question. He asked the Chair to reconsider her decision. The gavel was passed to the Chair-Elect. C. Nelson stated the Chair is following Robert's Rules of Order. If the body wishes to reject Robert's Rules of Order as far as she is concerned that is what the body is doing. She appreciated the comments and does not have a problem being overruled by the Senate on a procedural matter. R. McNamara stated his intention was not to debate this at all but to hear from the Chair of APC his reflection on this. **The question was called. Second. Vote on calling the question – passed on voice vote. Vote on overruling the Chair – 9 yes, 5 no – failed. The matter was put over to the next meeting.**

From S&F: By-Laws change regarding replacement of officers – Second Reading – attachment – M. Dreisbach T. C. 5:00

M. Dreisbach proposed an amendment to the original proposal. It was handed out. The past chair was included in the proposal. She overviewed the proposal. **She moved that the body accept the change in the by-laws as amended. Second.** S. Brannen asked about the Secretary not being able to assume the position and what would be the provision for that. M. Dreisbach said that Structure and Functions has spent a lot of time debating whether or not we should do away with the role of the Secretary based on a suggestion from our current Secretary and after a long debate we decided to retain the role, its not duties that are performed. She said we could have special election for the Secretary, but the will of Structure and Functions would be in that case to have it appointed by the Executive committee. We also discussed do you include in the by-laws every conceivable possibility when rarely does any of this ever happen. R. McNamara said in the case of the Chair-Elect for less than one academic year, did the committee consider that the Past Chair pro forma would jump into that role? M. Dreisbach asked S. Shand to speak to it. S. Shand said we did consider it and while it worked well during C. Nelson's term, but what happens if the Past Chair is not available or interested. By opening it up, the Past Chair can be a candidate, but not restricting it. **V. Garlin moved that the word leave be added to the amendment in front of "vacancy or resignation." Second.** R. Whitkus argued that we're talking about a vacant seat, not a person. **M. Dreisbach moved to change the wording to "vacancy,**

resignation or one semester leave." Second. Vote on M. Dreisbach's motion – passed on voice vote. R. McNamara called the question. Second. Vote on calling the question – two thirds vote achieved. Vote on amendment to the by-laws regarding replacement of officers – passed on voice vote.

Constitutional Amendment changing lecturer eligibility for voting and service to 6 WTU's – First Reading - attachment – S. Wilson & B. Moonwomon – T. C. 5:15

S. Wilson stated that this is an issue that continues to live on. It was referred back to committees and has made it back to the Senate for a first reading. The rationale is currently the threshold for criteria for eligibility is half time, which then raised the question what does half time mean, does it mean 7.5 units or 6 units. Most people think it means 7.5 units, but in order avoid controversy the amendment specifies 6 WTU's. The reason is that some lecturers have asked about eligibility for voting in the Senate. For instance, Duane Big Eagle who came up with the whole idea about having lecturers on the Senate is not eligible as he doesn't teach 7.5 units. The issue here is increased franchisement and access to faculty governance for more faculty. S. Brannen did not have a strong opinion on the eligibility threshold, but did have strong objections to language in some of the Whereas'. He disagreed with the third Whereas which says that the indirect units the full time faculty get is not easy to quantify. He said it is tedious to quantify it, but it is able to be quantified. Every time he has applied for tenure and promotion, he quantifies his indirect work. He gave examples. The whereas which states not all lecturers refrain from such work, it's true not all do, but in his department most do. The tone of those two whereas' is that we don't really earn our extra 3 units. He objected strenuously to that. He was offended and said the tone sounded like his work was not appreciated. That those 3 units are somehow mysterious and next thing you know we're not going to get them. He stated he would vote against it if it is not modified. E. Mendez noted that something was brought up the last time this issue came up about the possibility of proportional voting. She asked if that was investigated. She felt it important that everyone vote, but it would be unfortunate if the full time tenure faculty were out voted by the number of lecturers involved. There is a role to be played by the tenure-track faculty. She favored a proposal that set up a proportional voting system. M. Dreisbach noted that Laurel did research on this and called other CSU campuses using proportional voting. They are not using electronic voting. We have been moving to electronic voting, although the evaluation of that is coming up in the future. It's literally having to sit down and put things in piles. Laurel, for one, was quite concerned about the tediousness of it. M. Dreisbach said that at the second reading she has data for the body regarding how many people we are actually talking about, what percentage of lecturers would gain. R. Karlsrud agreed with S. Brannen about his point about quantifying the indirect units. He said the statement was false and wouldn't want to support a document stating that. He noted that the issue of compensation really needs to be thought through. We're going to have a lot of problem with our budget next year and the year after that without having to worry about how many lecturers we're going to actually compensate. We are encouraging people to get involved in activities for which there will be no compensation. As a Dean he made sure he didn't ask anyone to do work they didn't get paid for. It would be unfair. S. Shand spoke to the issue of clarification of the scope of the term faculty, she said when the original change was being discussed there was a great focus on inclusiveness for lecturers. With the language as it's now written as 50% allows SSP II and IV's to continue the tradition we've had on campus of being eligible to vote on the Senate. If we change it to teaching 6 units, SSP's do not always teach 6 units. She didn't believe that was the intention, but brings it up for consideration. M. Dreisbach offered another example of quantified workload. R. Coleman-Senghor stated the body was

not to debate the document, but we can speak to the readiness of the document and he argued given the kind of suppositional language, vague terms such as "somewhat ambiguous", these are very generalized, hazy, ambiguous terms in their own right. He did not think the document was in shape to be acted upon. He also asked what will this mean as we grow in numbers of part time faculty as we are not aligned with the 75%-25% model that we have within our own planning document. He suggested that it be referred back to the makers that they remake it and bring it back as not as a second reading. V. Garlin asked who was the author. S. Wilson identified himself as the author. V. Garlin suggested he withdraw the amendment, if he wishes. He thought R. Coleman-Senghor's suggestion was a good one and he suggested to the author that he withdraw it and take cognizance of what has been said here and resubmit it at a later date. S. Wilson said he was grateful for the feedback on the amendment and was sorry people interpreted this as denigrating all the work people do outside of the classroom. That was definitely not his intention. His intention with those whereas clauses was that the quantification of that indirect is part of what people are calling the unbundling of the profession. Everybody should be doing the stuff to keep the place running and when you've got people who are supposed to not be doing what you need to do, that's not good and that's the issue he was trying to address. He was perfectly willing to take the comments under very serious consideration and would be happy to communicate with everybody and take the motion back and re-write it, if the body would let him do that. C. Nelson said absolutely. She asked for any objection. R. Coleman-Senghor said S. Wilson needed to formally withdraw the amendment. C. Nelson said she thought we just did. S. Wilson said yes. **The amendment was withdrawn.**

Resolution on posting of grade with PeopleSoft software – R. Whitkus

R. Whitkus passed out copies of the resolution.

P. Phillips asked if the body had a quorum. C. Nelson verified the body did not have a quorum. **S. Brannen moved to adjourn. Second.**

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom