

Senate Minutes
5/22/03
Multi – Purpose Room, Student Union

Abstract

Report from Chair. Agenda approved. Minutes of 4/3/03 approved. Consent items: French Program Proposal, M.A. in English, M.A. in Psychology proposals and Candidates for Graduation approved. Information item: Memo re: GE Mission, Goals and Objectives implementation presented. Report from President. Report from Provost. Resolution on University Community Solidarity Fund approved. Proposal for B. S. in Engineering Science approved. Proposed Grade Appeal update from SAC approved. Constitutional Amendment: Voting and Service Restrictions approved for Fall ballot. First reading of Constitutional Amendment: Lecturer Eligibility for Voting and Service. Reports from Vice President of Administration and Finance, EPC, APC, and Structure and Functions. Good of the Order. Installation of New Officers.

Present: Noel Byrne, Catherine Nelson, Rick Luttmann, Steve Wilson, Susan McKillop, Victor Garlin, Wanda Boda, Robert Karlsrud, Eric McGuckin, LeiLani Nishime, Heidi LaMoreaux, Robert Coleman- Senghor, Liz Thach, Sunil Tiwari, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Derek Girman, Steve Winter, Robert McNamara, Peter Phillips, GerryAnn Olson, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Scott Miller, Jan Beauly Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Birch Moonwomon, Helmut Wautischer, Ruben Armiñana, Bernie Goldstein, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Ephraim Freed, Greg Tichava, Art Warmoth, Elizabeth Stanny, Karen Thompson

Absent: Phil McGough, Tim Wandling, Steve Cuellar, Jason Spencer, Marcus Payne III

Guests: Sandra Shand, Katie Pierce, Brian Diller, Jeffron Thaesfeld, Elizabeth Martinez, Melanie Dreisbach, Judith Hunt, Rand Link, Elaine Sundberg, Myrna Goodman, Eduardo Ochoa, Richard Rodriguez, Margurite St. Germain, Brian Jersky, Saeid Rahimi, Jagan Agrawal, and many, many guests from off campus that were not recorded.

Meeting began 3:05

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Noel Byrne

N. Byrne reported on a terrific dinner he had with Bernie Goldstein and past Chairs of the Senate. He and the Past Chairs are working together on a resolution for Bernie and that resolution will be the first item of business at the next meeting of the Academic Senate. He asked the body to join him in congratulating Bernie for his wonderful service to the faculty at Sonoma State University.

The Senate applauded Provost Bernie Goldstein.

The President and in-coming Provost Eduardo Ochoa joined the meeting.

N. Byrne welcomed the in-coming Provost and offered him a chance to speak. E. Ochoa stated he was excited to join Sonoma State University and wanted to listen and learn at the Senate today.

The Senate applauded Dr. Ochoa.

N. Byrne reported that he would be distributing his last Report to the Faculty as well as a report from Scott Miller at the end of the meeting today. S. Miller's report concerns the processes of the Senate and views held by junior faculty member of the Senate. N. Byrne stressed the importance of S. Miller's report.

Correspondences: None

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda - Approved

Approval of Minutes 4/3/03 – Approved

French Program proposal – attachment

S. Toczyski briefly summarized the unit changes the French Program is proposing for their major. Questions were posed by E. McGuckin regarding the justification of the change and the affect on faculty workload. S. Toczyski responded that the French Program perceived a need for more writing experience among their students, particularly among students who had spent time in France during their coursework. In terms of faculty workload, she noted there will be fewer preparations and also some loss in the ability of faculty to teach courses of their interests. H. Wautischer spoke to the financial burden for part-time students that results from changing GE coursework from 3 to 4 units. N. Byrne noted that consent items are not debated, and allowed two more speakers. B. Goldstein highlighted the many implications university-wide of changing unit values of classes and recommended this topic to be an agenda item for the Senate. A. Warmoth noted that EPC has referred the matter of a trend on the university of changing courses from 3 to 4 units to APC to look at the bigger picture.

V. Garlin moved approval of the program. It received a second.

N. Byrne noted that as a consent item, if there are no objections we consider it approved. No objections were heard. The French Program Proposal was approved.

M. A. in English proposal – attachment

A. Warmoth reported that both the Graduate Studies subcommittee and EPC had unanimously approved the M.A. in English proposal. N. Byrne asked for any objections. No objections were heard. **The M. A. English proposal was approved.**

M. A. in Psych proposal – attachment

A. Warmoth reported that the M.A. in Psychology proposal was put forward to deepen the opportunities for professional development in the M.A. in Psychology and noted that in relation to other professional programs in Psychology, the unit total is fairly low. N. Byrne asked for any objections. No objections were heard. **The M.A. in Psychology proposal was approved.**

Candidates for Graduation – attachment

N. Byrne introduced the list candidates for graduation for May and the summer. He asked for any objections to the list. No objections were heard. **The Candidates for Graduation for May '03 and summer '03 were approved.**

Information Item: Memo re: GE Mission, Goals and Objectives implementation

N. Byrne pointed out the information item in the Senate packet. L. Nishime requested that the GE Goals, Mission, and Objectives be posted on the campus website.

REPORTS

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

R. Armiñana reported on current budget information. The Assembly is contemplating a bill that would cut \$69.5 million more from the CSU than the Governor's May revise. The Assembly bill also adds \$14 million for outreach. He stated he believed that the outcome of the budget talks will eventually be solved by five people – the leadership of the Democratic and Republican legislators and the Governor. He stressed that the budget process is very much in flux.

V. Garlin asked for confirmation from the President that the funds described in the President's Budget Advisory committee in the morning regarded as being used to help the budget shortfall would follow the recommendation of the committee and be used to maintain the level of instruction. R. Armiñana confirmed his statement.

P. Phillips asked the President if he knew anything about an article in the Press Democrat concerning certain members of the State Legislature being upset with the administration in Long Beach for refusing to comply with committee requests. The article implied that this is a threat from Legislators and that it could impact our budget, particular administrators. R. Armiñana responded that he had first hand knowledge of the issue. He stated that the article appeared to be talking about a segment of the last meeting of the Joint Legislative Audit committee on CMS. The committee requested more refinement or information on a few of the responses of the CSU to the Auditor's report. There are Legislators on the committee that are very unhappy about CMS and would like \$25,000,000 taken out of the \$90,000,000 CMS expenditures for next year. The Chancellor would not agree to the \$25,000,000 and a Legislator remarked that they could take it from somewhere else in the budget.

Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs - (B. Goldstein)

B. Goldstein stated that he would be speaking to some of the items that come up in the meeting. He welcomed the new Provost and talked about the transition book he's created for the new Provost to smooth the transition.

R. Karlsrud asked for a report on the admit data for Fall '03 with respect to the number of freshman vs. transfer students admitted. There are rumors that the university is over in

freshman targets and under in transfer targets. B. Goldstein responded that the university is ahead of target compared to last year. He did not have the breakdown of freshman and transfer students yet.

N. Byrne reminded the body that for business items, only three speaker pro and three speakers against would be heard in order to move through the agenda in the time allotted.

Resolution on University Community Solidarity Fund –*Second reading* - B. Moonwomon-attachment – T. C. 3:30

B. Moonwomon introduced the second reading for the University Community Solidarity Fund. She noted that the fund is already in existence and was established only to supplement the salaries of lecturer faculty to continue to teach courses. She advised the body that further documentation regarding how the funds will actually be dispersed has been created and has passed approval from the Provost's office and Dean's Council. She passed out this documentation. She noted the resolution was supplementary to the documentation of the fund, and it is the resolution that she would like to see passed at the meeting today. She read the resolved clauses of the resolution:

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate endorses the Sonoma State University Community Solidarity Fund and the campaign for donations to it; and

Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate will distribute this resolution and the Provost's documentation for the Fund to the Deans and department Chairs.

She noted that payroll deductions for this fund begin in July and that now was a very good time for people to make pledges.

B. Goldstein described the protocol for allocating funds briefly and noted its accountability piece. He urged a vote on the resolution. N. Byrne noted his contribution to the fund. V. Garlin argued for the resolution and at the same time noted that it is not a solution to SSU's problem. He argued it is a moral statement and statement of support. He further argued that the way to solve the budget crisis in the CSU is to get the Legislature to allocate sufficient funds to do our work and that within in universities the budget priorities need to be toward instruction. He noted he will personally participate in the fund. R. L. Thomas stated she supported the resolution and asked when the funds would be distributed. B. Moonwomon answered that the fund will not be distributed until next spring at the earliest.

H. Wautischer spoke in favor of the resolution. He noted that it is an emergency patch for two years. He argued that it also provides important value for the integrity of teaching and that the funds can help maintain a balance of academic integrity – access for students to courses taught by competent people. He asked the body that if they voted yes, they be prepared to sign a pledge.

N. Byrne offered that more people could speak for the resolution, but first inquired if anyone wanted to speak against it. R. Coleman-Senghor asked to be able to ask for clarification. He recommended a revision of the documentation of the fund disbursement to say that "fund disbursement will result in employment for lecturers" instead of "offering a course" to open up the various possibilities whereby lecturers may be employed. It was determined that the documentation for the disbursement of the fund was not part of the resolution and therefore could not be amended. R. Coleman-Senghor responded that he wanted clarification of the

thinking of the committee to know whether he would vote for or against. H. Wautischer pointed out that the committee's consensus was to retain as much power with the Deans as possible and the language of the funds allows the Deans to make these suggestions. N. Byrne noted that L. Nishime was next on the speaker's list and that the body had reached a time certain. R. McNamara called the question. L. Nishime asked where the fund says the funds will be disbursed equitably doesn't mean equally, but proportionally. B. Goldstein responded yes. N. Byrne noted the question had been called.

Vote on University Community Solidarity Fund resolution – Approved, one abstention

Resolution on the Sonoma State University Community Solidarity Fund

Whereas, due to the state budget catastrophe, Sonoma State University is expecting large cuts to the instructional portion of its budget; and

Whereas, although funds from the campus, such as monies that have been held in reserve, are now being directed to the problem, the campus budget for instruction for the next two academic years, at least, is in danger of under funding; and

Whereas, an increase in enrollment, to which the University is already committed, increases the need for classroom instructors; and

Whereas, a significant proportion of presently employed lecturer faculty may suffer underemployment or loss of employment because of budget reductions and allocations in this crisis, thereby decreasing the instructional faculty of the University; and

Whereas a decrease in lecturer faculty will effect the quality of education here by depriving students of instructors experienced with the University's curricula and familiar with its student body and by burdening retained faculty with larger class sections than would otherwise be the case; and

Whereas the Sonoma State University Community Solidarity Fund provides an account within the University Foundation for contributions to the salaries of lecturer faculty in the academic years 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, to supplement money allocated to the instructional portion of the campus budget from other sources;

Be it resolved that the Academic Senate endorses the Sonoma State University Community Solidarity Fund and the campaign for donations to it; and

Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate will distribute this resolution and the Provost's documentation for the Fund to the Deans and department Chairs.

B. S. in Engineering Science –Second Reading – A. Warmoth - attachment — T. C. 3:45

A. Warmoth introduced the second reading for the B.S. in Engineering Science. He yielded the floor to the School of Science and Technology to answer questions.

N. Byrne noted that Peter Phillips and Bob Coleman-Senghor were on a previous speaker's list.

P. Phillips stated he did not want to speak against the B. S. in Engineering Science, but recalled that when the Master's went forward the question was asked in the Senate whether this School

would be pushing through a B.A. and the answer was no at that time. The claim that it is sort of an affirmative action program is hard to accept. He suggested that it won't have a big impact on students of color coming to university and would be pleased to be proven wrong. He argued that overall the body should proceed to approve

J. Beauly noted that this program will draw a kind of diversity to campus that we're not used to talking about – International, if the MSCS is any indication. On a lighter note we'll get more males. W. Boda don't see any negative about the program and suggested it will bring a lot of prestige to campus and bring outside industries. She urged the body to support it. Brian Jersky, representing the curriculum committee of the School of Science and Technology expressed appreciation to all in process, proposal has been improved as it has moved along, and particularly thanked Bob Karlsrud for his questions which he hoped were responded to everyone's satisfaction. He offered an update in terms of minority issues. Admissions & Records has been meeting with MESA representatives who are eager to get SSU designated as a MESA campus. M. St. Germain who is a recruiter for the university whose specialty is transfer population stated she has spent three years working with MESA directors. MESA stands for Math Engineering Science Achievement, and was originally organized to represent Hispanic and underrepresented students in these areas. Four out of five of our local schools have these programs. Having a MESA program on campus requires having minimally an engineering undergraduate degree here. We have the support of all our local directors who, once the Engineering piece is in place, to start a program here to advocate on the state level. This attracts underrepresented students, not only in the Sciences, but all other parts of campus. R. Coleman-Senghor point out to P. Phillips that a number of programs used engineering to gather students of color. The Junior College has been promoting finding points of continuation between the JC and SSU. One of the outstanding problems we have is to bring students from local area. This program exemplifies what we have been asking for in terms of a culture of planning on this campus, that is for initiatives to take place is for them to be thoroughly vetted at all levels and in terms of all aspects from budget to curriculum to impact to outreach - this program has done that. Numerous questions and numerous challenges have increased its health and strength. R. Coleman-Senghor urged support. H. Wautischer spoke regarding programs heavily financed by industry need to address issues of academic integrity and asked what precautions are in place that industry will not dictate the direction of research, but that decisions will remain in the purview of Sciences. He also asked about the content in the related GE package. Do you have one mandatory course that addresses medical ethics or industrial ethics for critical theory as the program is at the forefront of interface between humans and technology?

B. Jersky responded that the development of the program was entirely faculty and School directed and there has been no attempt to direct the faculty curriculum. He expressed interest in the GE question, but noted that the GE component was not on the table and is being looked at by other bodies. He said he was open to innovative and new kinds of GE, but the program has to work with what is currently being used.

V. Garlin offered his support. He stated on one hand the program is presented as just a new major and on the other the major has a special relationship to our campus. The way the major was initiated and partly financially supported is a relative new phenomenon on campus. If it were a new major in Social Psychology or Urban Sociology the major would not come with same degree of muscle behind it. The body needs to be aware we are walking on new ground. He concurred with H. Wautischer's point about the success of the connection between liberal arts and engineering - that there be an interpenetration between the two subjects. He stated he would appreciate someone from the committee addressing Peter's concern regarding statements made that the MS was not a precursor to an undergraduate program.

J. Agrawal reported that the School of Science and Technology has begun to develop GE courses with other Schools that address the concerns brought up regarding the interface of science, technology, ethics, etc. R. Karlsrud commended the faculty and the Dean of the School of Science and Technology for accepting his questions and responding in a very professional collegially way. He remarked this approach has not always been the same at SSU. He was very satisfied with responses and offered support for the program. R. Coleman-Senghor spoke to V. Garlin's remarks arguing that any muscle from the community shows support from the community. He pointed out that in the Long Range Planning, Long Range Assumptions and Cooperative Relations documents it clearly states we have an obligation to serve and be in concert with the business and industrial community in Sonoma County and beyond. He also noted that within the School of Science and Technology GE course on ethics are already under development. In his experience on EPC when the MSCS proposal came through, at no time did Dean Rahimi say that we would not, he said there were not plans at this time. In the minutes of EPC Dean Rahimi stated we do not have the resources at this time to mount such a program. A. Warmoth stated he thought a lot of the muscle behind this program proposal comes from the integrity of the planning process we've been able to implement. He suggested that probably the next test case of our ability to do integrative planning will be general education and appreciates the enthusiasm of the proposers of this program to participate in that effort. S. Rahimi appreciated all the support. He stated the B.S. in Engineering Science is an exciting program and will change the way the School of Science and Technology provides for many things ordinarily the state budget cannot do. He recalled an Executive Committee meeting where the President was asked if he intended to create a School of Engineering and the answer was absolutely not. Then the question was asked, do you intend to create a department of engineering and the answer was maybe, if the conditions are right. He thanked everyone for their help creating the document and what we learned was that even a program that was not initially popular, after dialogue, discussion and the right kind of interaction we were able to bring it to a stage that is acceptable to this body.

The question was called.

Vote on program proposal for a B.S. In Engineering Science at SSU - Approved with one abstention.

The Senate applauded.

Proposed Grade Appeal update from SAC – *First reading*- K. Thompson – attachment – T. C. 4:15

K. Thompson introduced the item. She passed out proposed modifications to the Grade Appeal Procedure policy. She gave an overview of the proposal. There is a new Executive order we need to comply with to establish a clause that allows for protest of improper procedures; and changing the student contact person's name. Rather than approaching the Student Grievance Coordinator, it is proposed they contact Grade Appeal Coordinator.

S. Winter asked if new Executive Order is stating that to if there are any allegations of improper procedures there is an additional step for them, it is not the final say. K. Thompson responded it is sort of an appeal process. S. Winter noted that when they when they amended four years ago, it was the final step. K. Thompson confirmed that the executive order requires the policy to contain procedures for appeal based on improper procedures. S. Winter noted that the policy now states that the Chair of the Grade Appeal committee in a member of Structure and Functions. They are the ones that are supposed to be making sure proper procedures are followed in the Grade Appeal Jury. Did the committee looked at potential conflict of interest

issues? K. Thompson responded that the particular issues was not discussed in SAC, but deferred question to FSAC Chair. E. Stanny's remarked that it seemed the logically place to send it back to. S. Winter suggested the only other alternative of where to send appeals would be the Senate chair. C. Nelson noted that she had, as Chair of Structure and Functions, been in a situation recently where a conflict of interest arose and she recused herself, the committee goes ahead, and that to her is the appropriate way to do this. R. Luttmann asked if there had been any progress on adding to the policy how the Grade Appeal Coordinator is selective.

K. Thompson requested a waiver of a first reading in order to bring forth an amendment on this topic. Motion to waive first reading seconded. Vote on waiving first reading for Grade Appeal Procedures Policy update = 1 No, All others Yes – Approved

B. Goldstein reported that the contact person would be in academic affairs. Currently we have two people, Katie Pierce and Rose Bruce. The lines of communication need to be as clear as possible for students. This is a neutral position and they are not advocates. K. Thompson passed around a proposed amendment regarding who would appoint the Grade Appeal Coordinator.

Time certain reached.

Constitutional Amendment: Voting and Service Restrictions - *First Reading* – C. Nelson – attachment T.C. 4:25

C. Nelson introduced this constitutional amendment brought to Structure and Functions by FASC. It would add the category of "Students Services Professionals – Academic Related" to be part to of the group under our constitution that can both vote for and participate in RTP committees. Structure and Functions initially turned this down with the belief that these Student Service Professionals are not to related to RTP. The chair of FSAC came back to the committee with documentation that indeed they are and Structure and Functions reconsidered the amendment and with a three – two vote agreed to bring it forward to the Senate for consideration as we will have a constitutional vote at convocation in the fall. We would like to have this included on that ballot. For the body's information she presented the arguments of people who voted against it. They argued that Student Service Professionals – Academic Related may not have the experience teaching to evaluate people whose primary responsibility is teaching.

H. Wautischer moved to waive the first reading. Second. Vote on waiving the first reading – 1 no, all rest Yes, Approved.

R. Coleman-Senghor confirmed that this class of people currently consists of one and asked if there is a alternative to a constitutional amendment to resolve the issue. E. Stanny responded the constitution needs to be brought in compliance with that collective bargaining agreement.

Vote on Constitutional Amendment: Voting and Service Restrictions – Yes = 23, No = 1, Abstentions = 4

This constitutional amendment will appear on the Fall Convocation Constitutional Vote ballot.

Return to Grade Appeal update

R. Coleman-Senghor spoke to S. Winter's concern. He supported moving forward to bring the document into compliance. He suggested changing or suspending the proposal of where the person will be. He argued that the issue of someone recusing themselves is not to ultimately remove them from the sphere of influence and he would vote against this if that section remains as is.

Vote on amendment to the policy – Approved with two abstentions

Vote on amended Grade Appeal Procedures policy update – Yes = 17, No = 3; Abstentions = 3

Constitutional Amendment: Lecturer Eligibility for Voting and Service – *First Reading* – C. Nelson – attachment – T. C. 4:35

C. Nelson introduced the item introduced on recommendation of Structure and Functions. The amendment specifies the definition of half time faculty in the Constitution. It removes language of "half-time faculty" and replaces it with "6 WTU's". Structure and Functions did not discuss the pros and cons of the resolution only whether the documents was ready for the Senate's consideration, whether there was anything in the Constitution or By-Laws that would prohibit the Senate from doing this. We could not find any and it appears appropriate for the Senate.

H. Wautischer moved to waive the first reading. Second.

S. McKillop distributed a document to give context to her views about why this should not be handled today and put over to the next Senate meeting. She argued it needed to be put over for further study because there is need to evaluate what portion of faculty governance should be assigned for part time faculty numbers and by extension part time votes to person who don't go through an RTP process. What will happen if the balance of part time faculty exceeds that of tenure-track faculty? She asked the body to read the extrapolations in her documents from outside SSU sources on their own time. She argued that the Senate needs to establish a framework before the amendment is submitted to electorate. What is the appropriate voting proportionality and what compensation will be made to part time employees who serve on faculty governance? She suggested that the faculty electorate needs time to familiarize themselves with the issues before a vote. She stated she was not saying it was necessarily the wrong decision, but that further study of the implications is indicated. R. Coleman-Senghor concurred that a number of question have not been asked and a time of making constitutional change requires deliberation.

H. Wautischer spoke in favor of waiving the first reading. While understanding and agreeing somewhat with S. McKillop and R. Coleman-Senghor's remarks, he noted that often the Senate has waived the first reading for immediate need. Whether part time faculty would be qualified to serve on various committees can be deliberated. In terms of whether part time faculty should get reimbursed, he noted the service part time faculty give now with no reimbursement and that could be discussed through proper channels. Using the School of Arts & Humanities election, he argued that since all the positions were not filled by tenure-track faculty, and there are not enough tenure/tenure-track faculty to do governance, two of the seats are now held by lecturers. S. Wilson supported waiving the first reading and argued that due to the constitutional vote upcoming at Fall convocation, there is a timeliness issue that needs to be considered. B. Moonwoman supported waiving the first reading. She argued that the amendment is about voting rights, not about anything else. If not approved today, it may be a

long time before another vote can be held. She underscored lecturer's participation in faculty governance committees. She noted that two of the now sitting lecturer Senators may lose their seats due to falling under the current constitution's eligibility rules. R. Coleman-Senghor asked why the constitutional vote needs to be held at convocation. C. Nelson responded that the turnout is higher then and we need a minimum turnout of 50%.

Vote on waiving the first reading on Constitutional Amendment: Lecturer Eligibility for Voting and Service – Yes = 12, No = 13, Failed

R. McNamara asked S. McKillop what her handout was referring in regards to the potential for part time faculty to exceed tenure/tenure-track faculty in future – is this overall or on committees? S. McKillop stated her fear is that one day the institution is run by part time faculty. She explained SFSU's proportional voting system. She argued the core of the institution needs to be run by tenure/tenure-track faculty and this has implications for tenure down the line as well. M. Dudley-Flores asked could a provision be employed for those at 6 units to be able to retain their Senate seats through mid-September. R. Luttmann as parliamentarian stated M. Dudley-Flores was correct that Senators would lose seats if they fell below eligibility. R. Coleman-Senghor said that this is a new item for the Senate in the fall, there will be lecturer Senators sitting on the body because of the way the Senate has chosen to arrange itself. R. Karlsrud said the last thing to do is to ask people to work without compensation. We need to deliberate on this, to look at the budgetary implications.

First reading concluded. This item will be a second reading on 9/4/03.

N. Byrne announced that the last two business items can be deferred to next Senate meeting. These are: By-laws change to SSP rep for APC from S&F – *First reading* - C. Nelson – attachment; Procedures for emergency Senate action from S&F – *First reading* - C. Nelson – attachment

Return to Reports

Vice-President/Admin. and Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)

L. Furukawa-Schlereth reported a budget plan is in place. The new \$69.5 million CSU reduction represents about \$1.6 million to SSU if passed. He hopes this will be offset by action of the Board of Trustees either for a further increase in state university fee above 25%, which is in the Governor's budget, or a reduction in the expectation for target enrollment for next year or a combination of the two. After Trustees meeting in mid July, we will reconvene budget committees to see where that takes us. Second, two other resolutions passed at the President's budgetary Advisory Committee this morning – they reaffirmed the desire to carefully maintain a detailed and comprehensive inventory of the types of reductions the Governor's budget creates for next year in order to make a strong argument for the return of funds when the economy improves. Student assistants – many lost due to budget cuts and a motion was made and unanimously approved for campus to do everything in its power to mitigate the loss of student employment by use of part time funds, self-support activities, auxiliaries, contract/grants, enterprises and such to ensure as many student employment opportunities as possible. The Budget committees are on hiatus until more direction comes from the Board of Trustees.

G. Tichava asked about possibility of student fees raised beyond 25%? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that there are three proposals in Sacramento ranging from a \$70 million to a \$200 million additional reduction to the CSU. People in state government leaderships

have contacted the CSU and asked what would be the impact of the \$70 million cut to student fees and enrollment. The answer was tuition would go up another additional 12% above the 25%. If \$200 million is cut, the tuition would go up approximately 37% on top of 25%. That's the debate. The Trustees did not take action last week.

EPC

A. Warmoth reported that Elaine McDonald was elected to serve as Chair for upcoming year.

N. Byrne passed out two reports – A Report to the Faculty from N. Byrne and a report that concerns faculty governance processes at the Academic Senate. The focus and nature of report is explained in first report. We will have an opportunity at the beginning of the meeting of the next Senate to discuss them.

APC

R. Coleman-Senghor reported APC had a productive meeting with L. Furukawa-Schlereth regarding the demographic of the dorms. There will be continued deliberation and discussion of the impact of the dorms on SSU's curriculum. He stated he was very pleased that L. Furukawa-Schlereth brought this to APC as it also shows a disconnect between the needs of his planning to respond to the need for students who are presently housed here to have housing in the future and housing for a larger population incoming freshman. The VP is receptive to the critical distinction between housing students and having a residential community. APC will be exploring how to bring student learning into the dorms. R. Coleman-Senghor will be chair of APC in the upcoming year.

N. Byrne noted that the report to the faculty that he handed out is a first draft.

Structure & Functions

C. Nelson reported that Christine Renaudin has been appointed to fill out the last year of Elizabeth Martinez' term as ACIP rep. Structure and Functions approved the Grade Appeal Panel and Student Grievance Board for '03 - '04.

Good of the Order

E. Martinez said that after the EOP Awards ceremony, herself, Richard Rodriguez and Elisa Velasquez created a creative project she would read to the body.

TRIBUTE TO BERNIE GOLDSTEIN

From the days we launched a search for you
Sonoma needed the best fit for vice-president
SSU had never bestowed that honor on a (rhymes with "you")
And we need to set a precedent.

We were lucky.

Our first Jewish Vice President
was a genuine
caring
courageous
human and
witty provost
committed to diversity,
beyond lip service
and a distinguished birdwatcher.

Thank you, Provost Bernie Goldstein
for the past five years
supporting us
and taking care of us
and changing Sonoma State

que viva Bernie!

All Senators - Que Viva Bernie!

The Senate applauded.

Installation of New Officers

N. Byrne welcomed the new Chair of the Faculty, Catherine Nelson and passed the gavel.

C. Nelson presented L. Holmstrom a gift of N. Byrne and C. Nelson's appreciated for her hard work, high level of professionalism and dedication to her job. *The Senate applauded.*

C. Nelson presented a resolution to N. Byrne and read it to the body.

Resolution Commending Noel Byrne Chair of the Faculty, 2002-2003

WHEREAS Noel Byrne has served the Faculty and university community with dignity and civility in difficult, trying, and even interesting times; and

WHEREAS he has shown an unfailing and passionate commitment to the principles of shared governance and academic freedom;

WHEREAS he has been a strong advocate for transparency and accountability in university decision making; and

WHEREAS he has demonstrated, despite the occasional perplexed look on his face, good humor and wisdom when the voices of 47 Senators are raised in glorious

parliamentary debate; and bemusement and beneficence in moderating exchanges between those close friends and mutually esteemed colleagues Victor Garlin and Bob Coleman-Senghor;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT

RESOVLED that the Sonoma State University Academic Senate and faculty commend Noel Byrne for his open mindedness, passionate convictions, commitment to elevating principle over politics, and his unshakeable belief in the fundamental good intentions of all members the Sonoma State University community;

BE IT FURTHER

RESOLVED that the Sonoma State University Academic Senate and faculty express their deep appreciation for his conscientious leadership, personal integrity, and devotion to the university.

The Senate applauded.

N. Byrne was momentarily speechless. He stated he valued the opportunity to try to do his best to pursue the best for the faculty, the university, and shared governance. It has been one of the most cherished experiences of his service at Sonoma State. He stated he was tremendously gratified and impressed by the Senate processes. He knows the democratic process is messy, but nevertheless enjoyed it. He thanked the Senate.

R. Coleman-Senghor thanked R. Luttmann for serving admirably as the parliamentarian and also suggest we welcome Melanie Dreisbach as incoming Chair. *Applause.*

C. Nelson presented in recognition of past service and excellent parliamentarianship and absolutely most gorgeous wardrobe on the campus, to Rick Luttmann, the past Chair's chair. *Applause.*

Meeting adjourned 5:10

Submitted by Laurel Holmstrom