

**Academic Senate Meeting  
Minutes of December 19, 2002**

**Abstract**

Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 11/14/02 and 12/5/02 deferred. Report from Senate Budget Committee. Resolution on Academic Planning amended. Resolution on Advising Issues tabled. First reading Lecturer's Resolution on Tenure Track Hires. First reading Resolution regarding Provost Search Committee Chair.
--

**Present:** Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Ephraim Freed, Victor Garlin, Derek Girman, Bernie Goldstein, Myrna Goodman for Peter Phillips, Sandy Heft for Raye Lynn Thomas, Robert Karlsrud, Heidi LaMoreaux, Rick Luttmann, Phil McGough, Eric McGuckin, Robert McNamara, Edith Mendez, Scott Miller, Jen Minnich, Birch Moonwomon, GerryAnn Olson, Liz Thach, Karen Thompson, Tim Wandling, Art Warmoth, Helmut Wautischer, Richard Whitkus, Steve Wilson, Amy Wingfield, Steve Winter

**Absent:** Ruben Armiñana, Jan Beaulyn, Wanda Boda, Steve Cuellar, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, John Kornfeld, Susan McKillop, Marcus Payne III, Peter Phillips, Jeffrey Reeder, Elizabeth Stanny, Raye Lynn Thomas, Sunil Tiwari

**Guests:** Rose Bruce, Jacqueline Boman, Leslie Deming, Perry Marker, Katie Pierce, Elaine Sundberg

**Meeting Started:** 3:10 p.m.

**Approval of the Agenda:** Change Business items #3 to #1, #4 to #2, #7 to #3, #5 to #4, #6 to #5, #1 to #6 and #2 to #7.

**Approval of Minutes of November 14, and December 5** deferred to the first meeting of the spring semester

**A Merrifield, Chair, Senate Budget Committee** reported from the Budget Committee meeting which took place earlier in the afternoon. A written report will follow. The Budget Committee members felt that, although there were numerous suggestions and points of view expressed at that meeting, the overall mood was overwhelmingly collegial and cooperative. The primary issues were presented, at the meeting, by L. Furukawa-Schlereth. He reported an estimated additional reduction for SSU's 02-03 budget year of \$1 million, sixty thousand. At this time there are no plans for additional charge backs or cuts to Academic Affairs. The total cut for Academic Affairs is approximately \$2.5 million and will likely become permanent for fiscal year 03-04. \$7 million is a possible total for AY 03-04. The committee applauded the efforts of L. Furukawa-Schlereth for attempting to close the estimated gap of \$1.6 million without taking any additional funds from Academic Affairs.

The Budget Committee is supportive of R. Armiñana's policy of no layoff of permanent employees. They also recommend support for continuation of the searches as the highest priority. They are concerned about curriculum and institutional integrity at Sonoma State if more students are admitted at a time of fewer resources.

The committee requests that the President, the Provost and VP of Administration & Finance keep us informed as the budget challenges continue and they specifically asked VP Schlereth to report, at the first spring Senate meeting, how he proposes to close the \$1.6 million gap. They also ask that the spirit of cooperation in yesterday's deliberations continue through the process.

**Steve Wilson** inquired if layoff of lecturers is anticipated. **P. McGough** responded the Chancellor's Office might determine whether searches go forward. **B. Karlsrud** spoke in favor of canceling searches. \$50-\$60 thousand for searches reduces forty sections next year. Continuing the searches will risk driving up the SFRs. **A. Merrifield** - The numbers for the searches are widely inflated. We are not yet convinced that eliminating permanent positions is a way to save. Also, seventy-five percent of the searches is for replacement of retired faculty. **V. Garlin** asked for clarification that there is a commitment to forty hirings as well as forty searches. He reported that the President said we are committed to forty searches but not forty hirings. **B. Goldstein** responded that there is a commitment to hire but there is a possibility we may not have the funding. **R. Coleman-Senghor** - Has the Budget Committee thought about the implications of no hires vs. hires? **A. Merrifield** - We believe we should go ahead with the searches while we are waiting for more information. **R. Coleman-Senghor** - Did the Budget Committee propose a strategy for partial hires/full time hires? The part-timers want scenarios. **K. Pierce** reported that \$180,000 is set aside for recruitment and relocation costs. **B. Goldstein** - we are looking at all options including partial hires. 14% to pay back is devastating but the forty searches are still on track and there will be more information after the holidays. **T. Wandling** applauds the decision to continue searches. Retraction of hiring during a budget crisis is not healthy. Discussion was ended due to the uncertainty of the budget.

## Reports

**R. Armiñana:** absent

Noel invited the Provost to present a report and requested that other reports be postponed, if they are not urgent, in order to cover the business matters.

**B. Coleman-Senghor:** AP guidelines will be available for discussion at the January faculty retreat.

**B. Goldstein,** asked if anyone had questions for his response. There were no questions. He wished everyone a happy holiday.

**L. Furukawa-Schlereth:** absent

**Item #1 Resolution on Academic Planning - Art Warmoth** The purpose of the Resolution is to assure APC and EPC that we are heading in the right direction with planning and that our liberal arts and sciences curriculum is valued. This will become more of an issue due to budget cuts.

**R. Whitkus** - This document is a good way to start but he notes that on page 1, the second Whereas is not strongly supported and makes the document less strong. Also we can't say "many" and in the second part of the sentence he recommends changing the word "overshadowed". These are not based in fact. He also believes that the University's historical role as a small, high quality institution shouldn't be rooted in the past. "We may become larger." He suggested changing the document to say "we come from a small high-quality ....." He proposes a friendly amendment to change the second Whereas.

**A. Warmoth** - The Resolution was unanimously passed by APC and EPC with considerable support. There is a particular source for "small, high quality". It is not just campus tradition. The WASC accreditation documents assert "SSU is becoming a small, high quality institution."

**S. Winter** pointed out the same phrase is in the university's Mission Statement. "uniqueness of SSU and a special character emerges from its relatively small size" It's straight from the Mission Statement. **B. Coleman-Senghor** agrees with R. Whitkus on omitting "many" and "overshadowed". Liberal arts should be liberal arts and sciences. He asks that the impact of more residential students, as well as the current budget crisis be considered. He believes there is sufficient evidence that the "small, high quality" role is threatened. Change "overshadowed" to "changes have threatened" **V. Garlin** thinks the amendments strengthen the Resolution. He is concerned about the noun "faculty". It is a collective noun. You cannot say "some faculty". **R. Coleman-Senghor** - Faculty can stand as a collective noun. It's not "the faculty". **The motion to amend passed.**

**P. Marker** noted that SSU was founded in the late 1950's as a teaching college but the School of Education is not mentioned in the Resolution. **A. Warmoth** - The School of Education is covered under "liberal arts and sciences and professional programs.

**P. McGough** - We are facing a 14% budget cut. What is the point of the Resolution? **R. Coleman-Senghor** - This is a stage of planning, a part of our general strategy. **S. Miller** thinks the Resolution, as written, is not coherent and will abstain from voting. **P. McGough** agrees. The Resolution doesn't hold together and he suggests taking a poll among the faculty to see if they agree. **B. Coleman-Senghor** - The APC committee is comprised of informed people who received input from EPC and other committees. The consensus was not narrow and the statement reflects a growing concern regarding programs initiated by the President and their impact. With additional residential students the costs of public safety and recreational needs will go up and have an impact on courses delivered. This Resolution is the product of three months of deliberation and is a reflection of institutional data. **T. Wandling** spoke in support of the Resolution.

"We need reaffirmation of the University's Mission." **S. Wilson** also spoke in favor. There has been too much growth without support. He also thinks The School of Education could be more recognized. **V. Garlin** agrees with S. Wilson. "Fidelity to a mission is not resistance to change." It is a commitment to a vision of an institution. He applauds the committee's work. It is also important to meet the fiction that faculty governance is an entity that speaks for itself and that there is a silent majority out there. There is no silent majority.

**Marilyn Dudley-Flores** asked if the changing demographics of students should be mentioned in the first Whereas since we seem to be moving to enrollment of upper-class whites. She invited help in the rewording. **B. Coleman-Senghor** suggested "significant changes in demographic makeup, ethnicity and background". The shift from re-entry age students to traditional age students was also mentioned. **B. Coleman-Senghor accepted these as important changes and requested a hand vote to these amendments. There were 18 ayes, 0 no's and 5 abstentions.**

**Item #2, Resolution on Advising Issues - K. Thompson** - This Resolution was developed on appeal of the Associated Students and advisers. The main thrust of the Resolution is that an advising coordinator be appointed from the faculty. Two changes have been made to the Resolution as follows: After Therefore add "at the beginning of Spring 03". Take out the last two clauses. A Resolution regarding the Advising Policy will be ready by March 31<sup>st</sup> from the Associated Students.

**P. McGough** - The Resolution points to technical work needed and a request for an in-depth advising review. Why not take care of technical problems first rather than appoint an expensive coordinator? **K. Thompson** - Leadership is needed. **A. Warmoth** - A faculty coordinator is a good idea. It's about having a faculty member responsible. The Resolution focuses too much on the online problem. We also need to distinguish between GE and major advising. Advising Center is needed for GE and a faculty coordinator for majors. He would like to see the Resolution address broader issues. The audience should be the President. Academic Affairs should not be responsible for fixing the situation. Instructional funds should not be used.

**B. Goldstein** is concerned about the responsibility being on one person. Perhaps advisers should be assigned to each student. He is appreciative of the committee's work but unfortunately it is a difficult time. **B. Coleman-Senghor** - Advising is a faculty responsibility. In the past the advising coordinator worked well. There is a failure of new technology to coordinate. He asked B. Goldstein to find the funds for reinstating a coordinator. As the number of freshmen is increased there will be more undeclared. Active mentoring is needed. **L. Deming** - The Resolution is premature and the focus is too narrow. There are too many advising issues. There is no substitution for one to one advising and the responsibility should not fall on one person. Is the emphasis on the website misplaced? More participation and discussion is needed. Given the budget constraints perhaps a person centered solution is better than technologically centered.

**R. Karlsurd** is worried about the resources and suggests the Resolution clearly identify the funding source. He also suggests the committee talk to Barry Godolphin and Bob Tellander to ask why the previous program was dismantled. **N. Byrne** - There has been discussion that this issue be tabled. **K. Thompson** moved to table it. **Marilyn Dudley-Flores** seconded. **P. McGough** - The EMT program was put in place partly to advise. In part it has done a terrific job. **A. Warmoth** suggested that SAC has the authority to go ahead and have the website fixed and consult with EMT regarding the coordinator job description. He suggested asking the Provost to attend a committee meeting.

**L. Thach** asked what is the level of support from the Associated Student? **K. Thompson** - There is no specific feedback. **A. Wingfield**, Social Sciences Student Representative - This Resolution is a step in the right direction. It is a short-term fix for a long-term problem. There should be face to face advising and when it is not available students go to the website. Something needs to be done about the website. A review of the Resolution will take months. **J. Minnich** - If the purpose of this Resolution is to appoint a person to look into these issues five out of six paragraphs focused on online issues is not the appropriate way to write this Resolution. The AS Resolution issues could be plugged into the Resolution since this Resolution does not address enough of the students concerns.

**N. Byrne** suggests tabling to next meeting. **R. Coleman-Senghor** agrees and suggests tabling to the third Senate meeting and brought back for a second reading. **K. Thompson** agrees to have it ready for the third meeting. **T. Wandling** - Outdated information should be brought to the attention of the departments and deans. **The motion was passed to table.**

**Item #3 Lecturer's Resolution, Birch Moonwomon** - This Resolution was passed unanimously by FSAC and seeks a good faith effort to avoid loss of employees. Serious consideration of lecturers should be given and is especially important in hard times. Forty faculty searches is unusual and is an opportunity to increase full time tenure track faculty and retain lecturers. Discussion followed regarding the wording of the Resolution. It was noted that the appropriate people on campus have approved the wording and Judith Hunt also spoke in favor of this Resolution.

**B. Moonwomon** moves that the first reading of the Resolution be waived. **M. Dudley-Flores** seconds the motion. **S. Heft for R. L. Thomas** opposes because not many senators are here today. **B. C. Coleman** is also opposed. The document has substantial impact and needs circulation in departments. **H. Wautischer** spoke in favor of waiver due to the timing. **A. Warmoth** - The value of a thorough debate outweighs the urgency. **V. Garlin** - The Resolution went to FSAC and Judith Hunt was present. The quality of our lecturers is high. The Resolution lends moral support to lecturers and hiring committees. He urges an affirmative vote.

**A vote was taken to waive the first reading. There were 10 ayes, 11 no's, 1 abstention**

#### **Item # 4 Resolution regarding Provost Search Committee Chair**

**N. Byrne** - As a sociologist he can affirm that it is well established in research and literature on organizations that systems of authority comprise both formal and informal. Customs and traditions carry weight. It is a long- standing tradition that chairs of provost search committees have been elected by the committee and that chairs have been faculty members. The Resolution was drafted by Noel and B. Crowley and requests that the President reconsider his decision to appoint the chair. This Resolution is not in any way a criticism of the person selected by the President.

**V. Garlin** supports the Resolution not only because appointment of the chair by the President is a departure from tradition, but because it is substantively important that the chair be elected by the faculty. The chair of the search committee is the first impression of the structure of the University and how it is run. The chief financial officer of the University as chair sends the wrong message about the University. The President's reasons for his choice are not credible.

**Heidi LaMoreaux** moved to waive first reading. The message should be gotten across quickly. The President's decision was condescending to the faculty. **B. Moonwomon** seconded that the first reading be waived. **B. Coleman-Senghor** recommended the first reading not be waived. He is not in agreement with the President but the document needs amending. **H. Wauticher** remarked that today's small attendance might weaken the message. **B. Karlsrud** also recommended not waiving the first reading. He would like to see committee members meet with the President and give the President the opportunity to change his position. **R. McNamara** - The President should be here when the vote is taken and there should be greater representation. **R. Luttmann** - The point is to make a statement regarding faculty governance. The searches will not get underway until the end of February. **A. Warmoth** thinks the first reading should not be waived. **N. Byrne** agreed with R. McNamara and does not mind if the first reading is not waived.

Meeting adjourned.