

## Senate Minutes

9/4/03

3:00 – 5:15pm Commons

### Abstract

Chair's Report. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes deferred. Information items noted. Robert McNamara and Rick Luttmann voted to Executive Committee for '03-'04. List of faculty eligible for emeritus status approved. Constitutional Amendment: Lecturer Eligibility for Voting and Service First Reading. From S&F: By-laws change to SSP rep for APC First Reading. Procedures for emergency Senate action First Reading. Report from President, Provost. Senate reassignment time recommendation approved. Joint CSU/CFA 2003-04 Supplemental Report Language document discussed. Report from President of Associated Students and Chair-Elect.

**Present:** Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Victor Garlin, Birch Moonwomon, Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Eric McGuckin, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, Mary Dingle, Raye Lynn Thomas, Derek Girman, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Steve Winter, Meri Storino, Myrna Goodman, Peter Phillips, Robert McNamara, Jan Beauly, Sandra Shand, Bruce Peterson, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Jason Spencer, Greg Tichava, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Nancy Cunningham

**Absent:** Phil McGough, Susan McKillop, Heidi LaMoreaux, Steve Cuellar, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

**Guests:** Judith Hunt, Rose Bruce, Katie Pierce, Jane Kerlinger

Meeting began 3:05

The Chair called the meeting to order.

### Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

C. Nelson welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the Academic Senate for Fall 2003. She noted that L. Holmstrom now has a Please Speak Louder sign that she will raise if she's having trouble hearing you. This is hopefully to help you raise your voice and allow her to take as accurate minutes as possible. C. Nelson noted a seat for "guests." If any guest wants to speak, there is a place at the table for them. She welcomed new officers, senators and people returning to the Senate in new positions. She announced that the Associated Students are looking for a member of the Senate to attend their meetings on Mondays 12-2. She informed the Senate she is unable to attend due to scheduling conflicts and asked if another member is interested to let her know. She asked Senators to note that she intends to do her best chairing the meetings according to Robert's Rules as appropriately as possible and to set a tone of respect and decorum in this body. She hoped the Senators will follow the example she is going to try to set even if she has to respond to the speak louder sign every five minutes.

**Approval of the Agenda** – agenda amended with a time certain for Provost Ochoa's report – *MSP*

**Approval of Minutes** – R. Luttmann asked for deferral of the minutes until the gaps in the minutes due to inaudible recordings be filled in. E. Mendez suggested when the gaps are filled, the minutes be sent out on Senate-Talk for approval instead of taking up time at the meeting. C. Nelson proposed setting a deadline for people to get back to L. Holmstrom with corrections to the minutes. Hearing no objection she stated that she would return with procedures at the next Senate. **Minutes deferred.**

### **Information Items**

C. Nelson noted the information items. They were end-of-year report from Senate committees: Senate; Senate Budget; Scholarship; Structure & Functions; Sponsored Programs; General Education. R. Luttmann noted a number of committees where not on the list and asked if we were still waiting for them. The answer was yes.

## **BUSINESS**

### **1. Election of two Senate members to Executive Committee for '03-'04. T. C. 3:15**

C. Nelson explained that two Senate members are elected at large to serve on the Executive Committee for one year. She opened the floor for nominations. V. Garlin nominated R. Luttmann. P. Phillips nominated R. McNamara. No other nominations were offered. **C. Nelson asked if there were any objections to Senator Luttmann and Senator McNamara serving on the Executive Committee this year. No objections.**

### **2. Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – attachment T. C. 3:30**

C. Nelson presented the list of faculty eligible for Emeritus status to the body and stated that it is the purview of the Academic Senate to approve the list. This list has been recommended to the Senate by the Executive Committee. She asked for discussion. S. Brannen asked what privileges are bestowed on emeritus. She responded that they have library rights, parking privileges, access to an office, etc. *MSP*

R. Luttmann asked if plans were being made for a recognition dinner. L. Holmstrom responded that the dinner is planned for October 9<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 in the Commons. Invitations will be coming very soon.

### **3. Constitutional Amendment: Lecturer Eligibility for Voting and Service – attachments – First Reading – M. Dreisbach T. C. 3:35**

C. Nelson noted that this item was on the last agenda of the Senate for '02-'03, but since it was not completed it returns here as a first reading. A new body is considering the item, so the item is considered anew.

M. Dreisbach introduced the resolution concerning lecturer eligibility for voting and service to be set at 6 WTU's. R. Luttmann clarified that the language about 6 WTU's refers to the idea that lecturers would need to carry 6 WTU's each semester to be eligible.

S. Brannen noticed that in the current constitutional ballot there is a constitutional amendment to change the lecturer term to three years. He asked how we could reconcile giving them 3 year appointments to the Senate when they may not have a three year appointment with the university and that the outcome of that election affects how he thinks about the current item.

M. Dreisbach stated that S. Brannen clarified part of the issue, but that we have to treat this separately. S. Wilson argued that by lowering the eligibility from 7.5 units to 6 units it would decrease the chances of people dropping below eligibility.

R. Whitkus remembered from the last meeting question that S. McKillop raised that we should address before we worry about voting on this as well as the proportionality of part timers to full timers in terms of running faculty governance, where the proportionality should be of a certain type and whether we should consider this before full vote on this matter is taken up. C. Nelson stated he reminded her of research L. Holmstrom gathered over the summer on the eligibility of lecturers throughout the CSU system to serve and vote on their Academic Senate, that will be in the next packet.

R. Coleman-Senghor when one drops out contractually one is not part of the faculty is his understanding. If we need clarification on this we should get it. R. Luttmann suggested that for the next Senate meeting these two question need clarification – if a person is elected to a position such as the Senate and during the term of office falls below the 6.0 or 7.5 which it is now, do they lose their seat. And if they do lose it, do they lose it permanently or until such time as their teaching load is restored. He asked for clarification on exactly what the proposal would be in terms of those questions. M. Dreisbach responded that S&F has been dealing with this as they have been approached by Faculty Affairs regarding how to pay the unit to the lecturers, what happens if they fall below, so S&F is looking at it in relationship to your questions. It is a larger issue and that's why Laurel has started to collect some information from other campuses, but she was not sure how much guidance it would give us since we seem to be unique.

B. Moonwoman urged for plenty of time to discuss this at the next Senate. V. Garlin agreed with R. Luttmann's point and noted that probationary faculty are appointed year by year and they are fully eligible to serve all Senate positions including those whose term is more than one year. In his judgment he thought that should not be an issue for lecturers. E. Mendez argued that 6 WTU's "per semester" needs to be put in the resolution for clarification.

B. Moonwoman stated that passing this constitutional amendment would enfranchise about 30 more people. R. Coleman-Senghor stated that while this might at this time enfranchise 30 more individuals, the question is what will be the effect of this proposal. As it stands now, that question has not been answered, and asked that it be referred to Structure and Functions so we do not rush to judgment. C. Nelson stated that the item cannot be referred at a first reading.

**4. From S&F: By-laws change to SSP rep for APC - attachment - First Reading – M. Dreisbach T. C. 3:50**

M. Dreisbach stated that currently according to the bylaws the SSP representative to APC is appointed. The change would be to make it an elected position. She noted that the proposed language is in the Senate packet. B. Peterson asked if the distinction between SSP I and SSP II and above needs to be included in this proposal since SSP I's are not included in the faculty. C. Nelson offered that this could be offered as an amendment at the next reading. S. Brannen asked for the rationale that prompted the change, the pros and cons. C. Nelson stated the pros and cons can be debated at the next meeting. The rationale behind this was given that the 5 Schools and the Library elected their representatives, that SSP have a similar status within employment group should have the same right to select their own representative to APC. R. Luttmann noted that who does the appointment for the SSP member is not clear currently so something needs to be done in any case. B. Peterson stated that the SSP's have a three person election committee and those people would be appointed through that.

**5. From S&F: Procedures for emergency Senate action- attachments – First Reading – M. Dreisbach T. C. 4:05**

M. Dreisbach presented the procedures for emergency Senate action and noted that in the past there has been discussion about what constitutes a session and why would there be a need for an emergency session. We have gone to Robert's Rules for clarification of what is a session, she quoted "any meeting which is not an adjournment of another meeting commences a new session. In the case of a permanent society having regular meetings, every week, month or year for example, each meeting consists of a separate session of the society which session can be prolonged by adjourning to another day." She argued that the definition of session is the Senate meeting on Thursdays, so rarely, but occasionally there needs to be faculty input or decision making on some issue. We discussed this at length in Structure and Functions last year not wanting to take any decision making power from the Senate, but be able to act for the Senate through the Executive Committee. So we have this proposal whereby the Chair would call an emergency meeting and we wrestled with finding a definition for emergency. She outlined the proposal and noted the rationale was in the packet.

S. Brannen asked if notice being sent out means everyone is invited. M. Dreisbach responded yes, the notification is that the emergency meeting is open to all the Senators. S. Brannen noted that that many people could not fit in the Sue Jameson room where the Executive committee usually meets. M. Dreisbach said it is not an

Executive Committee meeting and a suitable space would be found. S. Brannen asked where the 2/3 vote of the Executive committee to waive a quorum occur? M. Dreisbach responded that it would occur at the emergency meeting.

R. McNamara asked was there a discussion of calling a full session of the Senate in those rare times when there is an emergency, because it sounds like we're calling for a emergency session of the Executive Committee meeting, but inviting the whole Senate. M. Dreisbach responded that the fear was we wouldn't have a quorum and this was a way to have faculty input to a decision that was to be made and being able to suspend the need for a quorum.

E. Mendez asked if we should have in this a 48 hour notice to guard against abuse by the Executive Committee to call an emergency meeting from 5 minutes time hence. M. Dreisbach stated that since these would be very rare occurrences, the discussion concluded that creating a way for faculty input was most important. S. Wilson asked if the 2/3 vote of the Executive Committee to waive the quorum was of the Executive committee members that were at the emergency meeting or a quorum of the Executive Committee? M. Dreisbach said she would think about that and have an answer at the second reading.

R. Coleman-Senghor said it was a moot issue if the body does not show up for an emergency meeting. He stated the language of the document spoke to the constituted body and the constituted body is the Senate. The Senate failing a quorum then passes the quorum over other to the Executive Committee who then can make a quorum. Failing to make a quorum of the Executive Committee the issue is then moot. R. McNamara asked for clarification on the voting at the second reading. He stated he has concerns about giving this power to an Executive Committee maybe unnecessarily and would like to language to clear state whether it is an emergency meeting of the Senate or the Executive Committee. M. Dreisbach responded that it is an emergency meeting of the Academic Senate. R. Coleman-Senghor restated his previous understanding of proposal. R. Luttmann stated that a normal quorum of the Executive Committee is more than half and this would be 2/3 of those voting.

V. Garlin remembered that this original issue was that the administration would come to the faculty as ask for faculty opinion in an emergency matter and the faculty would be paralyzed with respect to that and then the administration would act without an expression of faculty opinion. We have to devise a system which lets the faculty legitimately express it's viewpoint to the administration or any other outside body. We do have a Chair of the Faculty, who is always in session and he stated he presumed she will always be available to represent the faculty if none of the representative bodies can be called into session.

S. Brannen suggested that since these are emergency meetings of the Senate, then as much as possible they be held on alternate Thursdays which would permit most Senators to attend. C. Nelson stated that amendments can be made on the second reading. L. Burch asked who decides what is an emergency? C. Nelson stated we are sliding into comments that would be more appropriate at a second reading. S. Brannen asked to please define "require" in the definition of emergency. N. Byrne

stated that in the discussion of Structure and Functions the notion of emergency is consistent with the points V. Garlin made namely if an action is going to be made by the administration which would ordinarily take account of faculty input and is going to be made anyway, even without faculty input, that is an emergency. C. Nelson said discussion was closed for the first reading and the body could continue the discussion in a energetic and substantive way at the next meeting.

C. Nelson describe the structure of the meeting to come. She wanted to start some reports because Provost Ochoa's report contained budget information which related to the next two business items and it makes sense to have them all in one place.

## Reports

### President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

R. Armiñana reported as is his custom he would not give a report for the first Senate, but would be happy to answer questions.

R. Luttmann asked about the casino that is proposed to be built in Rohnert Park. Has the administration of the university taken a position pro or con on the casino or whether it sees any positive or negative influences on the campus that might be associated with that development?

R. Armiñana stated the university will not take any political positions about the establish of any business near anywhere. Therefore the answer is no, we will not take a position and neither will the President personally. R. Luttmann asked has the university any money by the Indian tribe that is proposing the casino. R. Armiñana responded that his understanding was that there had been some discussion, but nothing has been offered concretely at this moment. R. Luttmann requested that the Senate be kept informed of any negotiations at this point. R. Armiñana responded as in any way we would keep you informed of any other gift that we have. The university does not see the Indian tribes as any different than any other legitimate group or business that comes to the area.

P. Phillips asked about the President's end of the year report on the website. There is a statement that Enterprises has made a profit of \$700,000 this year, you are certainly to be congratulated on that profit. Will that profit be shared with instruction to help us with our budget deficit? R. Armiñana responded that will be a decision of the Board of Enterprises. P. Phillips asked if it would be the President's recommend to that Board that part of that money go to instruction? R. Armiñana responded that he did not know of other commitments that the surplus has been committed to or planned for. He stated currently he did not have a recommendation.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated that he had a call from a reporter and it seemed clear to him that there is a lot of rampant rumor about what is happening. He wanted the Senators to understand how delicate things can be with endowments. Any kind of approach by an individual seeking to give the university monies is something that is carried on at a very private level to protect the person interested in the endowment.

He encouraged the Senate to wait for a formal proposal and not respond to rumor. R. Coleman-Senghor asked when the opening of the Green Music Center is anticipated and is there an approach to reconfigure the Green Music Center so we begin to move part of our faculty and part of our programs in to the Green Center. R. Armiñana stated that, on R. Coleman-Senghor's comment, what he will be doing it to assure the Senate that the university, under my leadership, will not accept donations from whomever which are not in keeping with the mission and the academic freedom that faculty must exercise. Some of you know we have turned down such offers in the past. We think we are within 4 to 4 1/2 million dollars from being able to construct phase one of the music center. We hope to start construction in the late Spring. From the start of construction, it is a two year process. The complex has two phases: the concert hall and some facilities first and the second piece is another facility of about 300 seats and some rooms, faculty offices, etc. We are looking at the possibility of the second "thing" to include more classrooms, more faculty offices. We have more of a problem in the future at the university with faculty offices. It would have one large classroom of about 300 seats and then other classrooms for about 70 that could be divided into 35. That would be a state supported project that hopefully could be included in the March 2004 bond issue for education. It would be a multi-disciplinary facility. This is all, at this moment, preliminary discussions. There would be a two phase submittal, one is to get some rough numbers that would run anywhere from 17 to 20 million dollars that would create space for about 650 to 700 FTE, and because the Music Center creates FTE if you add both you reduce the cost to the state from about \$30,000 per FTE per space to half of that. That could be very important. This campus will face running out of space for students and faculty around 2005, 2006. That's not a good situation. The second phase will a much more consultative process with the multi-disciplinary constituencies of the faculty about actual programming. Once the first sketch is approved it is one year before that consultative process would begin.

V. Garlin appreciated R. Armiñana statement that endowments be consistent with the mission of the university, and enhance and support academic freedom, intellectual inquiry and the purposes of the academy. He stated he was also called by the press asking for comment about an endowed Chair. He asked would you not agree that in the present context of a political battle in the community where the university is sited, the appearance of being brought in as an interested party is something that the university would want to avoid.

R. Armiñana responded no. He will not treat this group in any way different than we would treat somebody else. He will not make differentiations because of how they appear. He stated he didn't think we have the right to treat one interest different than the others.

V. Garlin stated that he did not mean that groups be treated differentially. He argued that we are in the midst of a political process. We generally do not get an offer from a business that is involved in some political process. That is what is different, not who the donor is, but what the context is.

M. Dreisbach thanked the President about the update regarding the Music Center and involving more faculty in the process of the second phase. She suggested that in

the first phase when space is being planned even in a preliminary fashion, because architecture does impact so much process and programming, she asked him to consider consulting with faculty members in the preliminary phase so we can have input about space.

R. Armiñana responded that to get it submitted will literally happen in days. It's basically rough FTE and that's it. There is no drawing, it's very rough. We're only hoping to get a placeholder. If the bond measure passes the CSU would get approximately \$75,000,000 and at that point we would make it into a real project with real detail.

#### **Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs - (E. Ochoa)**

E. Ochoa added to President Armiñana's report that there is clear recognition that there is need for substantive faculty input on the "phase two" and we will start on that right away. However, it's clear we can anticipate a wait, and because the deadline is days away and we won't be able have influence on a one page summary, but we will still get started right away. E. Ochoa brought a PowerPoint presentation for the body concerning the budget for Academic Affairs. (*The charts and graphs can be downloaded from the Senate website – <http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate>. I believe you can understand the sequence of the documents via these minutes. Putting the documents on the website preserves the color. LH*)

The first sheet gives you a big picture of the budget reductions we are facing on the campus. We have different types of mandated cuts from the legislature for different functions that are labeled targeted. Next we have in red three items that represent increased costs. In green we have sources of money that helping us address these increased costs and cuts. He then showed what this looks like graphically before addressing them in detail. If one looks by division, clearly we have the largest as we are the largest division. If you look by type and how each type hits each division, you see another slice at it. And then you could look at it as both dimensions at once, by division and by function.

Specifically, in Academic Affairs this is what it looks like graphically. The growth allocation makes a big difference. If the campus is not growing, all of the cuts would have to be absorbed. Looking at it in detail with the numbers in front of us, we can see that the problem prior to the growth allocation was nearly \$5,000,000 for Academic Affairs, the growth allocation helps break it down to about 3.3 million and then we have the famous 1.3 million that went to address instruction specifically. As you can see the 1.3 million makes up for more than the targeted SFR increase. However, that still leaves us with 2 million dollars in cuts. We have identified a number of them, but we are not all the way there yet. We do face a problem in the coming budget cycle because there won't be any growth and this one time money may not necessarily be there. The 1.3 million consisted of two pieces. One was \$650,000 of university reserves that were dedicated for this purpose and the second piece was rollover money. We have more rollover money than we are going to need for the second semester. Of course, a lot of that money was in the various Schools and they had certain purposes in mind for that money, so it's not like it's going to be painless, but there's enough there that at least a good portion of the intention of the

rollover money will be accomplished. However, for the '04-'05 budget, we are going to start that process now of identifying how we are going to come up with those reductions. This was done very quickly and some of it was done before he arrived at SSU and the finishing touches are being put on now, but in terms of how we are going to come up with the 1.3 million will be a longer term process that he hopes to carry out this year in consultation with this body.

R. Luttmann asked where the 30% increase in fees for the students shows in his figures. E. Ochoa responded that his understanding was that was already factored in to the budget allocations and cuts. It's wasn't until the budget was passed that we fully understood the cuts we were facing. They turned out to be not quite as bad as we feared.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked about the \$249,000 in utilities increases. He stated that L. Furukawa – Schlereth had shown the campus was setting aside almost that amount in case of increases. What happened to that? R. Armiñana responded that it was part of the reserves that was not used. R. Coleman-Senghor asked what the utilities increase represents. E. Ochoa replied that he would have to defer that to L. Furukawa-Schlereth (who was not present). R. Armiñana replied that it is what is expected. It is part of an increase this year. R. Coleman-Senghor stated he thought it should read "utilities reserve."

V. Garlin stated he thought the understanding last year was that 1.3 million dollars would be more or less sufficient the level of instruction, the number of sections in Fall of 2003 at about the level we had in 2002. Everyone understood it was an approximation. As it has turned out in our Schools we are mounting fewer sections than we mounted in the Fall. In his school of Business and Economics in the Fall of 2002 they had 101 sections, in Fall of 2003 we have 85 sections. Has it turned out that the 1.3 million has been transferred to Academic Affairs and have those funds been distributed to the Schools for the maintenance of the Fall program, if not, what will be the process for distributing them and what are the plans the university has for maintaining the level of instruction even at the low level we have it now relative to the Spring of 2002 in the Spring of 2004? E. Ochoa stated his understanding of the 1.3 million. The money was provided to maintain the level and quality of instruction. That did not necessarily entail a precise number of sections. As far as the money being distributed to the schools, these are bookkeeping entries. The Schools are mounting a Fall schedule and planning for the Spring with these monies in mind. We have exceeded our enrollment of target, there has been more of an increase than anticipated in terms of capacity utilization of sections we do offer. In Business, they may have ratcheted up the class limits too far. The Schools were probably doing this because they are aware we have to come up with the cuts. The 1.3 million helps us deal with the increased SFR, but not the other cuts. The Schools have looked for ways to make classes available to students, meet our enrollment targets and yet save money. In the final analysis, that will lead to reduction in the number of sections. That will happen. There's no sense kidding ourselves.

E. McDonald asked about what the percentages are here compared to what we hear in the news about the CSU and how that relates to the supplemental budget language about protected instruction. E. Ochoa responded that he did not have a

chance yet to get the percentage numbers, but has been trying to deal with the actual dollar cuts. In terms of supplemental budget language, we have discussed that and we are in fact meeting the spirit of that language and intent of that language. But the budget we received is at cross purposes and puts us in a bind. We will have classes for the students we admit and we will not allow classes to grow to the point where the quality of the instruction is degraded.

R. L. Thomas asked is there an estimated timeline for complete the identification of the remaining cuts? E. Ochoa responded that they should be complete in a couple of weeks. R. Luttmann asked about how the University Community Solidarity Fund is going and how that will impact the Spring. E. Ochoa responded that President Armiñana had told him there was not much money in that fund, so we haven't talked about it. R. Armiñana stated the fund held less than \$20,000. R. Luttmann asked for a report about that at the next meeting. R. Luttmann asked how the deficit increased so much from last Spring when it appeared that with the 1.3 million and the student fee increase the deficit would be offset. R. Armiñana responded that in the Governor's January budget there was a revenue assumption of 25% for undergraduates, 20% for graduates. That was taken into consideration at that time. That number changed to 30% for all students. From January to the end of the budget there was not a major increase in tuition revenue remembering that 1/3 goes to financial aid. There was also two other additional budget reductions to the January budget by the legislature. And for the very first time in the history of the CSU no recognition of mandatory cuts which are the red items in Eduardo's chart. We always thought that those mandatory cuts would be funded as they had always been and they were not.

N. Byrne noted that practice at the university has been that the Vice President's Budget Advisory Budget committee meet within roughly 48 hours before the President's Budget Advisory committee and of course these issues are of relevance. The President's Budget Advisory committee meets a week from today will the Vice President's Budget Advisory committee be meeting next week? K. Pierce responded that it will be the Tuesday afternoon following the PBAC.

B. Peterson stated he saw \$717,000 cuts in Student Services and didn't think they were feeling it all yet. Have they been fully implemented and can you share what kinds of cuts are coming? E. Ochoa responded those cuts will be soften, we anticipated those will be more in the order of mid \$200,000.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated the problem as presented in one of enrollment management and the Chancellor has asked each campus to come up with a strategy. If we are going to limit enrollment into the institution, that's one way, but the other problem is limiting the number of units taken by students. What do we do from a policy point of view with limiting the number of units students can take so we are not actually working for nothing. E. Ochoa replied that a small step had been taken in that direction. We have stopped approving requests for taking more than 19 units. We're only allowing those in cases of graduating seniors in their last semester. Beyond that we have not specifically addressed it, but that's something we can look at as well. R. Coleman-Senghor asked shouldn't all the Schools be able to come up with their own strategy? He hoped that is what the direction would be.

R. Karlsrud stated people in the Schools are scared. Even though they have reduced the number of sections in the Fall and amazingly increasing FTES by eliminating caps, they anticipate more cuts in the Spring. He asked to know what kind of cuts are you anticipating giving to the Schools and how do you plan on them making those cuts. Almost all the money in the Schools is tied up in direct instructional costs. There is very little other. The School of Social Sciences is operating on 50% of the OE it has ten years ago. E. Ochoa responded that it is well known that 90% of the budget of any School is salaries of positions. Even though we have money to help with the target increased in SFR, we still have the 2 million and there's no other place to go. The best we can do is provide as much flexibility to the Schools and Departments as possible in coping with it, but we cannot get away from the numbers.

**From Executive Committee: Senate reassignment time recommendation – attachment – C. Nelson T. C. 4:20**

C. Nelson introduced the item and stated that each year the Executive Committee recommends how the Senate reassignment time will be allocated. Provost Ochoa asked us at our last Executive Committee meeting to make a good faith effort to come up with a reduction in reassignment time that roughly parallels the budget cuts the whole CSU is being asked to come up with. That came out to 6 units. There was extensive debate in the Executive Committee. Several Senators argued that we are under funded in reassignment time as it is and we did this with only the greatest reluctance. Rest assured that the point was strongly made that faculty governance is one of the most important principles to us at the university. She noted the Executive Committee's recommendation is that three units be derived from the Chair of SAC and three units from the Chair of APC. The units from APC were volunteered by Bob Coleman in order to try to act in good faith. SAC does not currently have a Chair, so since the units will not be used this semester this seemed a logical place. This is the recommendation from the Executive Committee to the Senate. A couple of years ago the Senate requested to ratify the assigned time recommended by the Executive Committee. Since it is a recommendation it is a motion.

S. Brannen asked if this is a one time reallocated and would be revisited next year. C. Nelson responded yes and referred to the original motion in the Executive Committee that it is for one year only. B. Peterson asked if it is expected that SAC will be without a Chair for the entire Fall semester. C. Nelson responded that she wasn't sure, only that they do not have one now and the units are not being used. R. Coleman-Senghor observed that he would not have given up anything unless he thought it was for the best. As he watched the deliberations he noted that newer faculty are chairing EPC and FSAC. He hoped that Provost Ochoa would recognize this and we found no way out of the quandary, so he thought it was best as a Senate to show ourselves as part of the process. But we did time and again come back to the overworking of the faculty and we pointed out time and again that we didn't want the younger, newer faculty members who are assuming these position to be overburdened. He stated it was a self-protected act for his colleagues. He hopes Provost will take our recommendation namely to rotate this burden from one committee to another and he also hopes that he will find a way to direct funds to the affected Schools.

R. Luttmann stated he did not oppose the recommendation under the circumstances and thanked Professor Coleman for his generosity, however he objected to the principle of across the board cuts. Saying that is an abrogation of the rational function we are serving. Faculty governance is absolutely essential to the functioning of a university. It is written in the statutes that faculty have certain responsibilities. We cannot expect people to serve in faculty governance if we do not give them fair compensation. He expects and hopes that in the '04-'05 year the assigned time will be back up to 54 units. And in any case that discussion should take place before the planning of the Spring schedule. It is absolutely fundamental not to tell people that when they stand for election and believe they will get units and then tell them they will not. R. McNamara thanked Robert Coleman for his generosity and brought up the issue of shared decision making on this issue. It seems like a mandate and could have been brought up at the VPBAC where the expression of the importance of faculty governance could be made.

**Motion to approve Executive Committee recommendation by J. Beauly and second by L. Thach.**

E. Ochoa responded to R. McNamara's point. He stated he did not mandate the cuts. He came to the Executive Committee and asked them to take a serious, hard, good faith look to see if they could find a way clear to reducing the assigned time used by 6 units. He stated he would abide by what this body decided. S. Brannen stated he understood why the Provost would want the Senate to give back units, but essentially it is a request for us to take a pay cut. You're asking us to take a pay cut and he stated he thought it is just as appropriate for us to ask the administration to take pay cuts to save money, so I make a formal request to members of the administration to take pay cuts commensurate to the 6 units we are saving money for you. (Several here, here from the Senators) He stated he was speaking against the recommendation and would vote against it. E. McDonald expressed her thanks to Bob Coleman and the members of SAC for reducing their units. She stressed this motion is for this year only. And that is was clear in the Executive Committee that these 6 units would not necessarily be lost in the future.

**B. Peterson called the question.**

**Vote on calling the question (ending debate) – Yes = 18; No = 5, approved**

**Vote on recommendation from Executive Committee for reassignment time for '03-'04 – Yes = 16, No = 13, abstention =3 , Passed**

**Motion to extend the meeting by 10 minutes approved.**

**7. Joint CSU/CFA 2003-04 Supplemental Report Language document – attachment – B. Moonwoman T. C. 4:50**

B. Moonwoman stated this item was brought by several people. The document expressed the intent of the legislators. The document tells us the "legislature intends that CSU shall implement budget reductions in order to protect the primary educational mission by prioritizing core classroom instruction, student services and libraries and shall mitigate the budget impact on these by

apportioning resources using alternative funding sources and reducing administrative costs and shall report to state offices and committees next March and November of 2004 – numbers of faculty, represented staff and distinct from that MPP employees, student enrollment, class sizes, number of course sections and program expenditures and the use of alternative funding for 02-03 and 03-04." The point of this report, of course, is to show compliance. She stated that herself and the others who were bringing this to the Senate's attention wanted to see this be attended to all year long and right away as Spring course schedules are made and budget committees start meeting and making decisions. Think about lessening rather than deepening cuts for the Spring, think about reducing course caps, about reinstating release time for people who are doing jobs that impact immediately on instructional programs, think about putting courses back into the curriculum that have been taken out. C. Nelson asked if there was any specific action she wished the Senate to take today. B. Moonwoman replied there is no specific action being asked for today. C. Nelson stated this is a discussion item.

V. Garlin offered to explain the politics between CFA and the CSU that generated this document after the meeting to anyone interested. He stated this is the policy mandated by the legislature on the CSU and every campus of the CSU. We are all obligated to follow it no matter what our position on campus may be. He stated it was a path breaking action by the legislature for us to keep in mind. R. Coleman-Senghor asked who the audience was for the document. M. Dudley-Flores asked if this was mere window dressing language that gets appended to document coming from state legislatures or is this serious material? If compliance is key, she asked as a methodologist, what are the measures? She suggested getting a legislator or other primary drafter of this language to the Senate to give some insight. R. Armiñana gave the Chair of the Senate a copy of a letter he had just received that day from Patrick Lenz and Sam Strafaci to David Hawkings from the CFA because there were truly the ones that negotiated the language and this might be helpful in clarifying some of the issues. C. Nelson stated she would make the letter available to the Senate at the next meeting. C. Nelson stated the body was running out of time and asked to return to this item at the next Senate meeting. No objections noted.

**Motion to extend meeting by 5 minutes for reports. No objections.**

**President of the Associated Students - (J. Spencer)**

J. Spencer reported that Associated Students are in the middle of a drive to register students to vote. He asked the Senators to take a moment in their classes to talk about this, knowing time is of the essence in the classroom. If not possible, if you could share with your colleagues to mention to students that it is important to vote. He reminded them that he does not know all the students on campus, but does have a commitment this year to have qualified students on all committees. If you have a stand out student or a student you know is interested, please remind them that those opportunities are available and send them to him or to the Vice President for University Affairs, Richard DeLeon in the Associated Students.

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

M. Dreisbach reported on the current faculty vote on Constitutional amendments. She stated the vote has been extended to Monday at 5:00pm as we have not received the 50% of eligible faculty voting. This is a one-time extension. She thanked and commended Bob Coleman who was running up and down the halls yesterday with fistfuls of sealed and signed ballots and more than encouraging his faculty to vote. She asked all the Senators to take on the responsibility to really talk it up and remind your colleagues that this is very important. We're close. Early this afternoon we were at 46% of faculty voting. She suggested they could write a personal note and have their AC's send it around to their faculty. Here's an opportunity to have a voice.

No reports from Standing Chairs.

### **Meeting adjourned 5:15**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*