

# Academic Senate Meeting Minutes

February 8, 2001

3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

## ABSTRACT

Agenda modified and approved. Minutes from 12/7/00 approved. Announcements regarding Mayors visit and Ad Hoc Faculty Housing Committee. Election nominations report. "The CSU at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Achieving the Highest Levels of Quality and Meeting the Needs of California" document presented and discussed. First Reading of Resolution on vote of No Confidence in Chancellor Reed from P. Phillips. First Reading on Senate Budget Committee proposal. Feedback sought from faculty for Accountability Report for Chancellor's Office.

Present: R. Luttman, A. Merrifield, L. Brooks, P. Phillips, S. McKillop, W. Poe, W. Boda, E. Martinez, T. Wandling, H. LaMoreaux, V. Garlin, D. Dove, S. Tiwari, D. Trowbridge, T. Nolan, R. McNamara, C. Merrill, C. Nelson, P. Marker, S. Miller, R. Deorsey, R. Armiñana, B. Goldstein, L. Furukawa-Schlereth, E. Carlson, S. Pridmore, J. Filp, S. Heft, M. Driesbach, S Moulton

Absent: P. McGough, D. Hammond, G. Parker, H. Smith, R.L. Thomas, M. Rattigan

Guests: K. Crabbe, R. Bruce, L. Deming, S. Kashack, J. Hunt, E. Sundberg

Call to order 3:15pm

Rick Luttman chaired the meeting for Phil McGough.

## Announcements from R. Luttman:

Rohnert Park Mayor Jake McKenzie will be visiting campus Feb. 22nd and will meet with the Executive Committee and the Senate. Please think of topics or issues you might want to discuss with the Mayor.

A faculty ad hoc housing committee is being created to advise A&F on the new housing project starting this summer. Faculty are encouraged to become members. Please advise R. Luttman or the Senate office if you are interested.

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda. Agenda was modified. - *Approved*  
Approval of Minutes - 12/7/00 - *Approved*

## BUSINESS

## 1. **Announcement of Elections.**

R. Luttman advised the Senate of the nominations received thus far. They are:

Chair-Elect

Noel Byrne

Secretary to the Faculty

Peter Phillips

Les Brooks

At-Large Academic Senator

Geri Olson

Victor Garlin

Steven Winter

Statewide Academic Senator

Andy Wallace

Phil McGough

Member of University Wide RTP Committee

Dianne Romain

Phil McGough

Margie Purser

Sue Hayes

Tim Huston

Luttman invited nominations from the floor. M. Driesbach nominated Johanna Filp for URTF. No other nominations presented.

Ballots will come out a week from Monday.

## 2. **"The CSU at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Achieving the Highest Levels of Quality and Meeting the Needs of California" - attachment**

Susan McKillop gave a few minutes introduction to this document.

This document was created by the Statewide Senate as a response to the Master Plan. Master Plan does not reflect what we do now. A handout was passed around that gives an overview of the document. S. McKillop pointed out a couple of important points. The CSU gives out twice as many masters as the UC system but there is a \$11,000 per student difference in funding from the State. The document argues that the UC should be totally funded too so as to lessen conflict with UC system. McKillop emphasized the importance of reading this document. It will come back to Statewide with comments from Senates and the final document should reflect faculty support. It is not to be cited or published yet. We only have two weeks to respond. This is a chance to go straight to legislature. Written responses are encouraged. Please think about who the audience should be for this document.

P. Philips- This document should be mandatory reading for senators as least. It is rich with data and could provide valuable knowledge.

R. Luttman- Also voices support.

P. Marker- Thanks to McKillop and Phillips for their work on the Statewide Senate.

### **3. FIRST READING: Senate Budget Committee proposal - attachment**

R. Luttman - Structures & Functions drafted this proposal for a Senate Budget Committee and it was discussed at the Executive Committee of 2/1/01. Executive Committee supports resolution, but does not have agreement on membership provisions. Even though we already have budget committees such as PBAC and VPBAC, CRC, and we have faculty representatives on all these, none are Senate committees and thus do not fall under faculty governance. Because of impact of budget on faculty work this Senate Budget Committee is needed.

The following passage from the Statement of Collegiality was read:

“The collegial process also recognizes the value of participation by the faculty in budgetary matters, particularly those directly affecting the areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility.

W. Poe -It makes more sense to be Senate subcommittee rather than Executive Committee subcommittee.

V. Garlin -There is no chair designated. Proposed that Chair of the Faculty be the chair of Budget committee.

T. Wandling - Questions language of proposal. What is knowledgeable and why are people appointed?

R. Luttman - Appointing was decided because we are not giving authority to the committee, but recommending people who have a record of expertise in budget matters.

A. Merrifield - We should opt for democracy whenever possible and hold elections.

Phillips - Proposed to strike knowledgeable from the proposal. This committee would deal more with policy than actual budget decisions. People could become knowledgeable over time.

C. Merrill - Secretary of the Senate could be chair.

L. Brooks - We want committee to get information. This is an information getting committee, not policy making committee.

S. Miller - The proposal needs clear articulation - how this will enrich our work?

E. Carlson - Will committee receive administrative support?

P. Marker - Proposal needs strong rationale. Is budget a purview of the Academic Senate?

D. Trowbridge - If you want to gather information than you need the representatives from other budget committees on proposed committee.

A. Merrified - Chair and Chair elect sit on budget committees.

C. Merrill - There is no report about budget that comes to the Senate from faculty, we only get reports from administrators. We could ask for regular reports from already existing budget committees.

L. Brooks - There is no deliberation among faculty about budget on those existing committees. This committee give faculty the opportunity to deliberate about the budget.

A. Merrified - This is a first reading and it is not appropriate to advocate. Let's move on.

L. Schlereth - Agendas for CRC and other budget committees are on web. Faculty have considerable deliberation on these committees

V. Garlin - Concurs with Schlereth. Still on the other budget committee are under the jurisdiction of Vice Presidents. They are different in tone from faculty meetings.

P. Marker - Advocacy again.

R. Luttman - Should APC and EPC chairs be on committee? These seem concerned with budget matters. Both chairs at Executive committee meeting felt it was not necessary and could become burden. Better if it was Chair or Designee.

W. Boda - Past chair might be good chair for it.

R. Luttman - This was discussed at Executive Committee. However, past chair does not get any release time.

R. McNamara - Would this committee report to Executive Committee rather than full Senate?

R. Luttman - Executive Committee would pass information along as appropriate. Let's take this up at next meeting.

**4. FIRST READING: Resolution from Peter Phillips, and Phil McGough's alternative - attachments.**

P. Phillips - This resolution originated at Stanislaus and was modified by faculty here at SSU.

**There was considerable procedural discussion about whether P. McGough's resolution could be introduced that this meeting. It was decided that it will be introduced as a substitute motion at the appropriate time. It cannot be introduced today since a first reading does not constitute action.**

P. Phillips - **Let this motion be called Resolution of No Confidence in Chancellor Reed.** It seems timely. Phillips welcomes faculty input for changes in language, but wants it to retain an express message to Chancellor Reed from this body.

J. Filp- Not clear how this will benefit us as faculty or change our conditions?

A. Merrifield - Point of Order - Advocacy.

P. Phillips - The intent of the resolution is to eliminate merit pay and imposition of the latest CFA contract. A No Confidence vote is the strongest statement faculty use. It puts pressure on the Chancellor to think through the FMI process.

W. Boda - Why person are you using a person's name if we are focusing on FMI?

P. Philips - That person is most responsible for continuation of FMI process.

T. Wandling - Would like a history of No Confidence votes. Has this happened before and what came of it?

P. Phillips - There is a long history of No Confidence votes by faculty for a variety of reasons.

T. Nolan - What is status with this resolution rest of the CSU Senates?

P. Phillips - Does not know, only Stanislaus has passed it.

S. McKillop - Chico won't touch it, McGough's resolution is pulled from SLO.

E. Carlson - What is role of CFA here?

V. Garlin - CFA sole bargaining representative for faculty.

E. Carlson - What is Academic Senate role?

V. Garlin - Refers Carlson to Academic Senate handbook, and Senate Constitution.

Reads purpose of Senate: The purpose of this organization shall be to exercise the rights and authority specifically delegated to the Faculty by the Board of Trustees as well as the Chancellor of the California State University, including the legislating of policy governing the awarding of grades and granting of degrees; to serve as the primary consultative body in the University in formulating, evaluating and recommending to the president policies concerning (a) curriculum and instruction, (b) appointments, promotion, evaluation and granting of tenure to members of the faculty, and (c) academic administrative matters of the institution; and to serve as the primary body through which members of the faculty may express opinions on matters affecting the welfare of the University.

D. Trowbridge - Is interested to know what the Statewide Senate does. We need to consider a unified voice vs. individual senates.

L. Brooks - Asks if will Peter get information about what other campus will do. If it is a concerted effort then people may feel differently.

P. Phillips - Each senate needs to stand on own beliefs. Statewide tends to be more reserved.

R. Armiñana - The Chancellor did not impose the contract - The Board of Trustees implemented.

P. Marker - Proposes that it be electronically sent to all faculty for feedback. It needs to include a rationale to articulate how the resolution furthers the institution's mission. Irony that it has not gone to members of CFA.

V. Garlin - It has always been in the jurisdiction of senates of to vote No Confidence and to engage in fair comment of anything to do with the university. Comments on what goes on in collective bargaining is ok. There is a clear connection between roles of the two bodies.

P. Phillips - In response to Marker's remarks, brought resolution as a senator, not as position within CFA.

D. Dove - Has anyone done a systematic analysis of negative effects of the resolution?

Chair closed discussion on this resolution for this meeting.

**5. Accountability Report - (TC 4:30) Rose Bruce, Elaine Sundberg and K. Crabbe - attachment.**

R. Bruce - This report is mandated from the Chancellor's Office. Would like Senate involvement. It needs to be sent off to the CO by March 5th. R. Bruce would like to get ideas and advice on the indicators for accountability from the faculty. All campus were required to do accountability reports starting last year. Goals in our report are conservative so we can come in over them. This indicators are only for regularly admitted students. R. Bruce provided a quick overview and solicited comments.

D. Harris - 1st page 100% figure. Seems better to use "no less than 90%."

P. Phillips -The retention levels seem lower that state average. Does the increase in residency influence retention?

R. Bruce - We hope so.

Nolan - do you have to use percentages?

R. Bruce - Yes.

J. Filp - We need a systematic survey about retention issues. This would help EPC look at what can we do from a educational policy side.

Marker - Comment on #2 Access to CSU. Concern about minority issues.

R. Bruce - There is an understanding from the Chancellor's office that we are admitted all students who are eligible, so this goal was not required.

V. Garlin - Issue of our goals vs. Chancellor's goals. No goals set by Chancellor's office in area of diversity. Should this be a continuing commitment on our campus? Has our campus prioritized these goals?

R. Armiñana - We have to adopt a document before we prioritize it.

B. Goldstein - We have been emphasizing retention, diversity, satisfaction - all are very important issue for us.

S. Moulton - Questioned data about SFRs. She Pulled data from class size summary. Identified large class sizes for GE and Sophomore classes. Suggests looking at class sizes for freshman - sophomore courses.

R. Bruce - passed out handouts about this issue showing SFRs over time. Data taken from FAD.

M. Driesbach - Retention rate data needs explicit codes.

T. Wandling -pg. 5 relationship with K-12 seems off.

E. Sundberg - The column needs to be realigned. Then the numbers will make sense.

Luttman - The Chancellor's Office is making clear what they want to happen by the goals they have selected. Are the numbers realistic - particularly retention? We have no idea why people are leaving campus - if they go to another campus - that is still good. If housing is an issue, then we need to deal with that. Class sizes are a concern. We say we want to get more diversity - this goal directly conflicts with retention rates goals. If we fall under pressure of Chancellor's Office goals we may compromise on other principles.

E. Carlson - Does not see that diversity creates a conflict with retention rates.

A. Merrifield - Faculty are concerned about quality. We have a commitment to give people an education, we want to get it right not get it done fast. We also have a commitment to get people through in 4 years if possible. These are not mutually exclusive ideas.

W. Poe - At-risk students bring risk to retention rates. Retention is not a good criteria.

C. Merrill - Can we keep quality and just focus on retention? We don't want to push students through.

R. McNamara- Quality education is number one priority and diversity is part of a quality education. If that goes against retention then there's a problem.

W. Boda -One retention strategy she's heard from other schools is to do everything in our power to get students to finish class - such as never failing them.

K. Crabbe - We need to organize the institution so that if people want to graduate in four years they can.

B. Goldstein - Thinks this is a useful discussion and wants to continue this conversation

L. Brooks - We really don't know why people leave, they do not respond to surveys. Perhaps we should ask why people stay.

K. Crabbe - Some of that information was gathered in the WASC study - we can go back to that document.

**Reports deferred.**

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:00**

*Minutes respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*