

**Senate Minutes**  
2/19/04  
3:00 – 5:00 Commons

**Abstract**

Chair's Report. Agenda amended and approve. Minutes deferred. Change in MS-CES program approved. Reports from President and Provost. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3.10 of By-Laws; Replacement of Lecturer Senators – First Reading. Resolution to Assess Faculty Confidence in the SSU Academic Senate and the SSU Administration – First Reading. Grants and Contracts Policy – First Reading. Draft Vision and Mission Statement from the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning committee – First Reading. Joint Doctoral Program in Education – First Reading. Senate Budget committee report. Chair-Elect report. Announcement from Student Senator.

**Present:** Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Phil McGough, Susan McKillop, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Eric McGuckin, Steve Cuellar, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Steve Winter, Charlene Tung, Myrna Goodman, Peter Phillips, Robert McNamara, Jan Beaulyn, Sandra Shand, Scott Miller, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Jason Spencer, Ephraim Freed, Amy Wingfield, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Brigitte Lahme

**Absent:** Birch Moonwomon, Heidi LaMoreaux, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Elizabeth Martinez, Greg Tichava

**Guests:** Katie Pierce, Tony Apolloni, Judith Hunt, Phyllis Fernlund, Carl Wong, Paul Tichinin, Paul Porter, Eileen Warren, Mark Fermanich, Johanna Filp-Hanke

**Proxies:** Michael Pinkston for Marilyn Dudley-Flores and Dan Crocker for Derek Girman, Art Warmoth for Victor Garlin

The Chair reminded the body that the meeting starts at 3:00 and said it would be appreciated if everyone could make a regular attempt to be at the meeting on time. She noted that the Green Music Center was deferred again. She reminded the body of the Senate election currently ongoing. If not only vote yourselves, but get out the vote and if you are getting kicked out of the system three or four times, just keep trying. Laurel has sent out an alternative way to get in. Please make that available to your colleagues.

**Chair's Report**

Nominations for the Excellence in Teaching Awards are open and are due by March 12<sup>th</sup>. A report from the campus Chair's meeting in Sacramento last Thursday was passed out. A couple of items from that the body might be interested in. The Academic Affairs committee of the Statewide Senate is considering a proposal that would require transfer students to complete 60 units before transferring. The proposal is called the 45/15 Plan. Student would have to complete 45 units that would apply to either general education or their major and an additional 15 units

specified by the campus to which they are accepted. The intriguing thing about this proposal is that all majors across the system would have to set a common set of standards for transfer students. There is more detail in the report. (unintelligible due to room noise) too many students take too many units before they graduate. The Academic Affairs committee thinks that defining what excess units is means a curricular matter. They want to define it and the idea is that in the Governor's budget there is a proposal to penalize students who take over 10% of the number of units they need to graduate. The CSU is apparently not going to penalize students, but might put some pressure on campuses to get their students to graduate sooner. Excess units would be defined and that would be turned over to a committee of largely administrators to implement the penalty. With regard to budget issues, the CSU's response to the Governor's budget according to Bob Cherny who is Chair of the Statewide Senate is to suggest a change in the recommended fee increases that the Governor suggested – 11% for undergraduates, 25% for post baccalaureate students (unintelligible due to room noise), other graduate fees increase by 40% and non-resident fees increase by 20%. In terms of how budget's are being handled at other campuses, she thought the body might be interested to know that it's very similar to what's going on here. All campuses report there has been reduced support for instruction, typically in the 7%-15% range from campus to campus and that range is based on what the Chair's told the meeting they were modeling. Several campuses reported that they have protected permanent employees as a primary budget strategy or principle and there's also agreement among the Chair's with respect to their campuses, as it is here, that there may not be enough classroom space to accommodate the increase class size that will be necessary if we increase SFR, reduce adjunct faculty and have to end up teaching more students. There is also administrative union concern throughout the system to follow proper lay off procedures. In terms of shared governance, the pattern seems to be that academic schedules for next year are being suggested by departments to Deans or Provosts and cuts are being recommended either by Deans to Provosts or the Provosts are making the final recommendations themselves. Campus budgetary advisory committees that have faculty representation are in most cases being consulted but frequently being presented with something to react to rather than helping develop the budget in the first place.

## **Consent items**

**Approval of Agenda – P. Phillips moved that the body include the faculty confidence resolution on the agenda for a first reading at a time certain that the Chair selects. No objection. Given a time certain of 3:35 – Agenda approved as amended.**

**Minutes of 2/5/04 – deferred.**

## **From EPC: Change in MS-CES program**

E. McDonald stated that the proposal replaces a comprehensive exam with a new Lab and Technical Report Experience course in the MS-CES program. Right now they have three culminating experience choices – they can do a thesis, they can do a design project and up to this point they've been able to take an exam. This proposal replaces the exam with this new Lab and Technical Report Experience. The program

feels that this would be excellent experience for the student to have. Quite a few of their students are very interested in having this particular choice to make. The increase in units is actually similar to what other programs like it have as part of their non-thesis unit requirement, so it would raise their units for that plan, 33 units, which is similar to what other programs have. She thought that their rationale that they laid out in the document is very concise and very well organized. EPC passed it unanimously and it passed unanimously through the Graduate Studies committee. No objection.

## **Reports**

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

R. Armiñana said despite the headlines in the STAR we're not getting three billion dollars from Proposition 55. That's just wishful thinking. If we get three billion dollars we'll build a home for everyone of you. He is not asking the body how to vote, but in the words of Mayor Daley, vote, vote right and vote often. Proposition 55 includes for us about \$19 million which includes a boiler machine which makes for more efficient use of energy. Monies for equipment for the renovation of Darwin hall and a new building that has been named by the Chancellor's office Music/Faculty offices. That all will account over a two year period. It has not been fully confirmed because it requires a vote by the Trustees in March, but he expects that is the order of business we will have. That Proposition is running statewide extremely, extremely tight and some major newspapers, like the LA Times, have opposed it because of the other bond issues including in the LA area a three billion dollar bond for the LA Unified School District. So it will be tight and then you have the other propositions 56 and 57 and 58. Therefore, it is an important proposition for this campus.

### **Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs (E. Ochoa)**

E. Ochoa said he thinks in a variety of forums we have heard from the CSU that we expect that in all likelihood we will be moving toward a slight revision of the fee increases proposed by the Governor. Instead of 10% (?) for undergraduate and 40% for all post-baccalaureate programs, we're now looking at 11% for undergraduates, 25% for teacher credential programs and 40% for other graduate programs.

### **Remainder of report deferred for time certain**

### **Resolutions regarding Lecturers:**

#### **a. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3.10 of By-Laws; Replacement of Lecturer Senators – First Reading – attachment – M. Dreisbach**

M. Dreisbach said that Structure and Functions is proposing an amendment to our by-laws, Article III, Section 3.10 because it became apparent that we did not have a process in place for replacement of Lecturer Senators who are not able to serve. So you see in your packet dated November 5, 2003, we have 3.10 on Replacement and

we are recommending the addition of the italicized language in the paragraph below that when it is necessary to replace a lecturer senator that if the replacement is for less than two consecutive semesters, then the replacement is made by Structure and Functions becoming effective upon appointment. If the replacement is for more than two consecutive semesters, then there would be a replacement made for the remainder of the three year term by using our spring elections. So the replacement person who serves until the elections and then the elected person would assume the position starting in the fall. We labored over this because everything has become so much more complicated by the fact that we have three year terms for lecturer seats, but then we need to have 7.5 units concurrently to sit on the Senate and be a voting member, so if someone falls below that it could be fairly last minute that they are not able to serve. We spent a lot time with this and wanted to remain true to the three year seat and we wanted to remain true to the election process of utilizing the spring election. We didn't want to add on an election.

R. McNamara asked if when you say Lecturer Senator we are referring to those senators specifically elected to a lecturer seat, correct? M. Dreisbach said that is correct and we took the term Lecturer Senator from the Constitution because when this body made the decision to add those seats the Constitution was changed and the term Lecturer Senator was utilized. R. McNamara said so when we have a lecturer elected to the Senate, but not specifically to a lecturer senator seat. . . .M. Dreisbach said then we would follow the normal process, so if it is a representative of school there are already procedures in place for the other positions, but there were no procedures for Lecturer Senators. S. Winter asked in the previous paragraphs we've used the terms less than one academic year, is there any reason in the new paragraph we used less than two consecutive semesters, the different terminology rather than keeping a consistent terminology through the by-laws? M. Dreisbach said that change came about in the Executive Committee where it was recommended that we utilize the term less than two consecutive semesters to remain consistent with other parts of the by-laws in relation other offices. S. Winter said in the second paragraph on the line below the bottom wouldn't it say replacement for two or more consecutive semesters. M. Dreisbach said that was also discussed and that was considered that it was already implied. S. Wilson asked if the underlining philosophy here was to keep the procedures for the Lecturer seats the same as the procedures for the other seats? M. Dreisbach said yes. S. Wilson said he thought it was a very inclusive move and he was very supportive of it. **S. Wilson moved to waive the first reading. Second E. McDonald.** S. McKillop asked for the reason for the waiver. S. Wilson said to speed up the Senate's business. N. Byrne said it seems to him there is a reason why we have a first and second reading and that is so that Senators can reflect on the merits over time of a given proposal. This was no criticism of this particular proposal, but didn't see the urgency that would warrant that kind of adjustment. **Vote on waiving the first reading – Yes = 9, No = 20. Failed.** This item will be a second reading on the next agenda.

E. Mendez suggested that since the item seemed non-controversial perhaps it could be put on the consent calendar. C. Nelson said that question could be asked of the Executive committee, but she believed since it is on the agenda of the Senate that doing so would require a motion to suspend the rules which requires a 2/3 vote to take it off the agenda. E. Mendez said she took it back.

## Return to Provost Ochoa report

E. Ochoa gave an update on where we are as far as planning for next year. Our normal timelines would be requiring us to be mounting a schedule now for Fall 2004 and some sort of schedule will be put up on the system, but we have no idea what we will be able to actually deliver come Fall because the budget situation is so unsettled. Independently of that we are exploring certain scenarios. A couple of scenarios that are fairly different and that are all within the context of the Governor's proposed budget. We know that if that's the budget that ends up prevailing, we will have to come up with something that falls within those two end points that we're distributing. The two end points, the upper and lower limits that we distributed to schools and the Deans are sharing with the Department Chairs – one assumes that the full \$3.4 million cut to Academic Affairs which is our share of the \$5 million cut to the campus under the Governor's budget, the worst scenario would be that it's entirely absorbed within the Schools and primarily in instruction. The other scenario is that it is distributed on a pro-rated basis across the entire division, so that the full cut is not only going to the Schools, but also his office, ESAS and the Library. Given that we are operating under the assumption that there will be no layoffs of permanent employees, we know that the pro-rated cut across the division is not feasible for those other divisions, because there are not enough temporary slots there. But some cuts will be identified. So somewhere between those two end points, the final solution, if the Governor's budget is the one that we face, will be developed. As a way of getting to that point, we're also constructing what you might call the core or base line scheduling, which is the one that Schools can mount with only permanent faculty, just to see what that baseline is that we can definitely count on. Then identify where the gaps are and how we could address those within the constraints of the budget, so a lot of these things are floating around in the departments and he understands that this causes anguish to actually envision these scenarios, but he is urging people to somehow bracket their reaction to this and put it aside and defer it until such a time when we know for sure what we're actually facing and look at it as an intellectual exercise. In consultation with the Dean's he has developed a set of guidelines to guide scheduling and the planning of these scenarios as sort of a series of bullet points. The Deans, he understands, are going to be distributing these to the departments to provide a little bit of context for what we should be baring in mind as to constructing schedules and working with these scenarios. So you may run across that in your departments. The Business Dean search is proceeding very well. We have a very strong pool of candidates. The first one is coming on Monday to visit campus and the others will come over the next couple of weeks, so we're very excited about the prospect of having a top quality finalist for that position. Strategic Planning has been proceeding very well. We had our first meeting for the Spring semester last Friday and he felt they were making good progress, substantive contributions with fresh thinking are coming forward and he's very please with how it is going. He thinks the members of the committee are also pleased. Perhaps the Chair would share her perspective on this as well. The GE subcommittee – you may recall they developed a document that was released towards the end of Spring semester of '03 and that really only started circulating in earnest last semester. It provides the basis for the next phase of GE reform. To get ready to do that the Chair of the committee is going to the different Schools and

talking to the Chair's councils and Deans and presenting the thinking and soliciting input and reactions and issues of concern. We've visited a couple of Schools already. We plan to go to all of them. He's joining Paul to his meetings in case any questions come up about resources, that sort of thing, to try to facilitate that kind of conversation.

Questions for Provost Ochoa deferred for time certain item.

### **Resolution to Assess Faculty Confidence in the SSU Academic Senate and the SSU Administration – First Reading – P. Phillips**

P. Phillips said we are presenting this resolution for a first reading. It sets the Senate up on a three year cycle to assess ourselves and the administration in terms of how faculty are viewing our actions in hopes of measuring the things we can improve on and do better. It seems very appropriate in any large bureaucracy, any large institution and this resolution is being presented in the tradition of shared governance, reasoned decision making, academic pedagogy and administrative procedure, so we can look at what we're doing and how the faculty perceive this body and the administration. We ask for an ad hoc committee to be set up this semester to create instruments and that we do the first evaluation scheduled in May.

R. Whitkus said say the review comes back extremely positive, what's the result? Say the review comes back extremely negative, what's the result? Is there any certain way in which changes could be done if needed or if something could be rewarded (?) (unintelligible) or would this just be an exercise of looking at how we're doing this. P. Phillips responded he certainly hoped that institutions would take a look at concerns that faculty (unintelligible) certain idea that there would be an evaluation. The important thing is to periodically take a look at ourselves and how the faculty is perceiving what is going on at the university and if there's areas of concern, he hoped there would be some corrective actions or steps taken to make some adjustments and it may come out that the faculty is pretty satisfied with how things are working. But whatever the results they would need to be published and clear and that's just part of open transparency in a public institution. S. McKillop said she heard him say "we" and since there was no signature on here as to who it is coming from, she asked if he was representing a group of faculty or just yourself. Who is doing this? P. Phillips said there's a bit of a history. Several faculty have been consulted on this, it's come up in several different places, including the Social Sciences retreat in January. It's been discussed in different departments. S. McKillop said but you're representing as yourself not as a group of people. P. Phillips said correct. S. Miller said he was curious about the history. Was there anything we should know about (unintelligible). P. Phillips said other than meeting with several people around this table, it's been jointly written and looked at over a period of several weeks. He's just presenting the resolution as an open process (unintelligible) to put on the floor. L. Furukawa-Schlereth asked P. Phillips to help him understand what he means by the word administration. P. Phillips said he didn't know if he had an exact meaning, he thinks L. Furukawa-Schlereth is clearly part of the administration as is the President and the Provost. The committee that designs the instrument will have to look at the different categories they want to assess and areas that faculty would want to have some input into. He would envision there would be

an open narrative to the instrument as well so that specific things could be looked at and considered. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said the reason he asked the question is that in his area of the administration it is composed of many, many different aspects, many of which are comprised with other administrators and staff employees who are evaluated in terms of their operations and performance in accordance with various human resource practices. It's an interesting question that when another entity begins to make comments on the performance and operations of other individuals who may be represented in other bargaining units, that could have implications for their particular employment, how would that be addressed? P. Phillips said he didn't have a specific answer. He said perhaps L. Furukawa-Schlereth would like to be on the committee to help design the instrument. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he thinks it needs to be analyzed by someone because there are other implications for instruments like this (unintelligible) to evaluate employees and other administrators in their work. M. Dreisbach said she had a question about the choice of the word "confidence" and that a lot of time when evaluation occurs, it's evaluating the effectiveness and she wondered why he chose confidence. P. Phillips said an evaluating is a degree of feeling of support and how somebody has confidence in the procedures and operations and decision-making processes, it's a common English term. M. Dreisbach said whereas normally what you think of is a confidence or no confidence vote, but you envision an instrument that would be multi-faceted of all components that would evaluate various degrees of confidence. P. Phillips said in certain area he thought that would be how it would be designed. M. Dreisbach asked if he's given any thought to what kind of instrument it would be. P. Phillips said not specifically. M. Dreisbach asked would it be one instrument that would evaluate both the administration. . .P. Phillips said the resolution clearly states they would be separate ones. We could take into consideration Vice President's Schlereth's concerns in terms of staff. He said he didn't think we were trying to evaluate staff at a micro level at all, we looking at overall confidence and how things are working. Any institution on a periodic basis should do this. It's just a normal management procedure. M. Dreisbach said your choice of the first two weeks of May 2004 and you wanted to set it up as a regular periodic survey, but is there a necessity have it complete this semester? P. Phillips said it seemed to him that if we're going to do it, we should just ahead proceed with it, have the first year happen and then do it three years hence. R. McNamara said the resolution is about assessing the Senate and the administration. How does that set the Senate assessing the Senate? P. Phillips said the Senate is going to survey the faculty to see how the faculty perceives the operations of the Senate. It's perfectly normal thing to do. R. McNamara asked about the ad hoc committee. Would that be made up of members of the Senate? P. Phillips said the ad hoc committee would be appointed by the Chair. C. Nelson added that with confirmation of the appointments by the Executive committee. R. McNamara said what he's getting at is that because it's the ad hoc committee that's going to put together, so he see that that is body that is doing the assessing then? P. Phillips said no, the Chair of the Senate would appoint probably Structure and Functions to actually hold the election and probably like we're doing the election now. It's a survey. But that's to be determined. He's not trying to lay out a road map of how we're going to do something here, he's setting out principles of what he thinks we should do. S. Brannen asked why the word "periodic" is omitted in the second resolved. P. Phillips said he's not married to any of the language in the resolution. He just wants

to have this done. If there are friendly corrections, that's fine. R. Coleman-Senghor made the observation that any kind of action may be brought by an individual or a group. The question of whether the group is more legitimate than the individual (unintelligible). There has recently been an evaluation of the President that's posted, was carried through by officials and that was the reading of the Chancellor's office. There does continue to be a gap between the on campus evaluation of efficiency. This is a proposition that is in place because there has been an on-going series of questions especially around about how much confidence does the faculty have in the administration. And there have been faculty who say we have a lot of confidence in the administration and other faculty members how say we have very little. He thought a way of getting to that question and getting a sense of the faculty pulse is a very important moment. There are faculty who basically say we're not interested in the Senate, we feel that it's an ineffective body and there are those feel that it's quite effective. He thought an instrument that is going to identify areas of effectiveness and areas of ineffectiveness is an instrument that he's interested in. He believes the body should move toward the realizing principle rather than dealing with the details. The ad hoc committee would deal with the detail. R. Luttmann said that it appears that the design of the survey would be left up to the ad hoc committee, but he would hope that they would come out something gives us an opportunity to express a range of choices the way we do when we grade students rather than something that is just yes or no. He also asked why we wouldn't want to do it annually instead of every three years.

Time certain reached.

### **Grants and Contracts Policy – E. Stanny**

E. Stanny welcomed Tony Apolloni and Eileen Warren from the Office of Sponsored Programs. She hoped that if the body had any specific questions about the Grants and Contracts policy, they could be directed to T. Apolloni and E. Warren. She gave an overview. The policy lays out the importance of grants and contracts in pursuing research and creative activities. It also puts Sonoma State in compliance with Executive Order, Federal and State laws and lays out the role that different entities play in pre-award accepting of grants and contracts and the post award activities. This policy went through FSAC and we discussed it in depth and that took about two hours. It also went through the subcommittee on Sponsored Programs. R. Luttmann offered a clarification for the body. There is already in place an interim Grants and Contracts policy which is very similar to this. The difference are really very minor. We're talking here about approving a permanent policy. R. Whitkus said since this deals with us in interaction with Federal, State and other agencies has this been vetted through them in terms that we are not going against any rules or regulations they impose upon us in terms of carrying out grants and contracts? T. Apolloni said it hasn't been vetted because there isn't a process on their part to do that. It was certainly developed with close attention to the requirements of those agencies as well as the requirements of the CSU. R. Whitkus said one reason he asks is that on page 7, paragraph 3 on the top it says "In the case of the incumbent Principal Investigator's resignation, incapacitation, or failure or refusal to perform the duties adequately, the Dean or appropriate administrator shall reassign the PI's responsibilities." He knows for a fact you can't do that for some Federal agencies.



The Federal agency gives the grant to the university, but it is the PI's responsibility to actually carry out the duties of that grant. (Answer lost due to having to turn over the tape.) M. Goodman asked if the implementation of this policy requires hiring any additional employees. T. Apolloni responded no. R. Coleman-Senghor noted his concern of small grants and the way in which Humanities grants are usually of a smaller nature in terms of the amount. His concern is the we have a benign administrator that says look at our past practices, we've been very supportive of small grants. If we do not have that, how will we make the determination that the cost of running the grant outweighs the expense to the institution. He gave the example of getting a \$60,000 grant with very little indirect, but those \$60,000 are being utilized in the classroom and benefiting my students, benefiting my colleagues, but there's not enough return from your point of view. At what point is the determination made that this is not of benefit for us. T. Apolloni said he would back up to answer the question and talk about how we determine indirect. We determine the indirect rate we will charge on a grant by- if the Federal rate is applicable, we apply the full rate. If the Federal rate indirect which is 42% of salaries, wages and benefits it usually works out to be half of the total grant. If that rate is not applicable, then we negotiate a rate, but we start by negotiating what is the highest rate this funder will provide. We want the highest rate the funder will allow. One of the reasons we want the highest rate is we want to be able to support a compliment of grants and contracts that when there are cases such as you are mentioning, where return is low or there is no indirect cost. it costs us about 9% to administer the grant. So our goal overall is to get a mix of indirect on all projects that lifts us above that. First that covers that cost and then has enough overlap to return some to the Academic Programs. He has delegated authority from the President to approve grants on the pre-award basis. Steve Wilson has delegated authority from Administration and Finance from L. Schlereth to approve and we look at those issues. First this mix overall, he looks on a monthly basis, how we are doing in terms of having our indirect. It would not be prudent or appropriate for the university to take grants that we couldn't afford to administer those grants, in terms of the question Senator Goodman asked does this require more staff. Another way of looking at that is there enough money in there to support the project we are going to get. There's a specific requirement of the CSU, EO 753, that says grants and contracts cannot be supported by general funds, they have to be self-supporting. So that's what we're looking at. We are in the fortunate position on this campus where we are in pretty good shape and have yet (unintelligible) in terms of benign self supportive and as long as we're self supportive and the project has academic relevance for programs and students, they will be approved. He doesn't think that's just because he's a benign administrator, we've been told by the President and Provost to bring in programs that support faculty to bring in projects that support the academic mission of the university. R. Coleman-Senghor said the reason he used the term benign because at that crucial moment when one makes a decision about how these dollars are that are there and available, that you husband from other grants, how they will be used in terms of a small grant. He was not sure about what factors would go in making a decision that a small grant is really not going to benefit the university when in fact in dollars terms in may not benefit the university very much, but in terms of a very public event that will lead to something like a museum exhibition, a number of people being involved, that kind of thing can have a long range benefit. Who makes the decision, what criteria do you use to make the

decision that that one is perhaps more important than let's say a million dollar grant that very few people would see. T. Apolloni said there's review process that includes a recommendation from the Department Chair, from the Dean, from Faculty Affairs and IT looks at from service standpoint, but there's a body within the academic side of the house that recommends to us that this should be approved. He said it's usually pretty clear that something has a relationship to an academic program. If somebody was bringing something forward that had to do with something totally outside the university, and he hadn't seen that occur yet, we have to look at that as there are costs and risks associated with administering grants and contracts. We have never, to his knowledge, turn down a grant or stopped a grant from moving forward unless there was some (unintelligible), not on the basis of content. E. McGuckin said that when a number of people in a department are getting contracts and grants very often there is rather severe impact on the workload of other faculty who are continuing their full load, particularly in department work and advising students and even the number of students you have to teach. He doesn't see anywhere any mention of workload issues or department role. It seems to him when a department has a number of people doing this it becomes a serious issue in the department. He didn't know if that should be reflected somewhere in this statement. T. Apolloni said it has issues for the department both pro and con. Sometimes there is (unintelligible) but sometimes the negative ones are very real. That's why he receives a recommendation from the Department Chair and from the Dean and from Faculty Affairs before he signs off in it. One would assume those issues would be raised (unintelligible). E. McGuckin said shouldn't that be reflected in the policy itself, that there's a role for department input. T. Apolloni said it is in the policy. He said he would never approve a grant that the Department Chair or Dean (unintelligible).

First reading of the Grants and Contract Policy completed.

#### **Draft Vision and Mission Statement from the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning committee – first reading**

C. Nelson noted the copy of the draft vision and mission statement for the division of Academic Affairs in the Senate packet that was created by the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning committee. These are drafts and as promised are being brought back to the Senate for the Senate's review. This is technically a first reading. If the Senate wants to make a formal recommendation or wants to formally approve. . .the idea is the Strategic Planning committee is the body that ultimately fashions the mission and vision statements. The Senate can ratify, the Senate can approved, the Senate can request, we can take into consideration certain concerns. There are a variety of ways to go with this. S. McKillop said she thought the vision looks wonderful, but she was concerned on the mission that it seemed to have been pretty heavily written by social science type minds and there are the arts which could be squeezed in here. Her idea of a liberal arts and sciences would be that some of the subject we teach have merits in their own which is not only to get a social goal, but rather. . .she didn't know exactly how to put it, but that is was a very social science oriented statement. She thinks the arts and some of the other areas don't always need the goals that are set here. She thinks it needs to be a little wider. Over all it's pretty nice. C. Nelson said her sense of the committee is that the idea of diversity

through undergraduate programs grounded in the liberal arts and science, part of what diversity means has to do with the kinds of ways of looking at things we've been talking about, the arts, dance. . .S. McKillop said it might be good if that were a little clearer in your statement that's that what you mean. Diversity tends to take a certain kind of meaning now. C. Nelson said thank you.

## Return to Reports

### Questions for Provost Ochoa

L. Burch said rumors abound among the faculty about the process of salary increases for tenure-track faculty and faculty up for promotion. There's a rumor that there's not going to be some increase. She wondered if that could be addressed and also she's been hearing that if the bond measure doesn't pass perhaps tenure-track faculty could be let go. There's a lot of fear out there about these issues. E. Ochoa answered as far as he knows there is no truth to the rumor that salaries. . .the budget includes mandated cost increases that in fact include the SSI increases. As far as layoffs, if the March bond measure doesn't pass, that's speculation. There's no way of knowing what would happen if the March bond measure doesn't pass. The crystal ball is totally cloudy. He thinks the President can confirm this, the commitment to retain (unintelligible) permanent employees is one that is based on the Governor's proposed budget and we don't know what other (unintelligible) we might face. R. Armiñana said we do have a signed agreement with two unions, primarily unit 3 and he thought the other was the Trades union which do have a pay increase as of June the 30th. That we consider part of mandatory costs and it is expected and there has not been discussion to do otherwise. Therefore, for those who are eligible, there will be a pay increase for one day in this budget year, but then that becomes part of their base. We are still committed under the proposed Governor's budget to not layoff permanent employees. What happens if the bond does not pass, nobody can predict at this moment what that will mean. Therefore he cannot give an answer to that. One day the Mayor of New Orleans in the middle of a hurricane went on television and said "do not believe any rumors unless they come directly from me." He encouraged the body to do the same. S. Wilson asked Provost Ochoa that he was talking about the cuts for instruction being \$3.4 million out of the total of \$5 million. That's a 68% of the cuts coming from instruction and the instructional budget is less than 50% and isn't that a bit heavy on instruction when this has always been a priority to preserve instruction? E. Ochoa said the \$3.4 million figure was calculated based on the fact that the cuts we we're facing are a combination of cuts that are driven by the 5% enrollment reduction and cuts that are unallocated. So the part that is due to the 5% enrollment decrease is being allocated at the marginal cost so we take on a higher percentage for that portion of the cuts and then the remainder we get at the average rate. So the 68% is sort of a blend of the marginal and the average rate. S. Wilson said we've noticed there are plans for hiring twenty-one new people on campus. Couldn't some of the pressure from instruction be alleviated by observing a hiring freeze? E. Ochoa said for himself he is scrutinizing very closely any requests for new position or filling vacant positions. As far as he's aware the same sort of scrutiny is being given across the university. He's confident that if there are that many positions are out there, a strong argument can be made for why these are essential for the functioning of the university. S. Wilson

said he realized the Provost was concerned about increase workloads, but faculty might have some concerns about why are we only ones that have to experience an increased workload. E. Ochoa said that's not correct. There will be increased workload for everybody. There are position that are not being re-filled and there's an attrition reduction going on and that's resulting in an increase in workload. He's personally aware that is going on in Academic Affairs units other than Schools, so it is happening. J. Spencer asked for clarification on what permanent employees are and it seems when generally when we talk about people who are not permanent employees for the faculty that's lecturers and non-tenured faculty. But where do the non-permanent employees lie in terms of staff and throughout the rest of the university, that is a concern. All people hear about leaving are lecturers. E. Ochoa said there is a category for temporary appointments for staff. J. Spencer asked if there are many of them or are most staff permanent. E. Ochoa said unfortunately, a lot of them were cut in earlier rounds of cuts. But there's still some. J. Spencer said so pretty much everyone is permanent. E. Ochoa said the majority. J. Spencer said with 5% less students to teach that mean 5% less students to administer as well and that's an important thing to keep in mind from our perspective. J. Spencer asked for clarification on the marginal cost formula for the 5% enrollment decrease. Again, with 5% less students to teach means 5% less students to administer but why is the marginal cost formula weighted toward Academic Affairs when the rest of the cuts aren't? E. Ochoa said because there are some support functions that are don't vary directly with the level of instruction, but some do and that's why we don't get 100% of the reduction in Academic Affairs because there's some percentage of support that's dependent on enrollment that is going on in other divisions of the university and even in Academic Affairs, even if we were to get 100% of it, not all of it would be linked to direct instruction, there would also be support functions within Academic Affairs, so those would be done by staff in the Schools, by staff in his office, etc. That is factored in. When you are varying enrollment, you are directly varying the amount of instruction that is going on and that then represents a larger percentage of the cuts. R. Whitkus said he keeps hearing the idea of increasing workload, why do we have to increase workload? Aren't we contractually obligated to deliver a certain amount of workload, not just say, we don't have the money, so the workload doesn't get delivered, is that not an option? He didn't understand the assumption that we have to increase workload. Why? E. Ochoa said that's a big question. On one level the answer would be we got a proposed budget from the Governor and initially the Governor expected us to deliver the same amount of instruction minus 10% of the freshman class being redirected to the community colleges. The CSU countered that with the position that, with that cut we could not deliver that, but we could and would have to reduce enrollment by 5%. The 5% figure is not a minutely calculated figure. It was more of a political decision on the part of the system that they needed to go that route to a substantial enough extent to send a clear message that the cuts are directly affecting access in a significant way. Without going to such rates as creating a situation where it would seem as a revolt or insubordination on the part of the Chancellor vis-à-vis the Governor and the Legislature. So he thinks ultimately it was a political decision. The only way to answer the other part of your question is to start looking at the contract and figure out what can and can't be done. That's pretty technical and arcane. He wouldn't want to do that off the cuff at this time.

## **Joint Doctoral Program in Education – first reading**

E. McDonald said she would quickly turned the proposal over to Bob Vieth from the School of Education, but wanted to say a few words first. This did pass through EPC unanimously, so technically it would be a consent item, but the proposal is so complicated she was sure that the Senate would appreciate a nice presentation on the proposal. She asked the group to come today to give the presentation they gave to EPC for it's first reading. This proposal is incredibly detailed and very thorough. In particular in the first and second readings for EPC the group was very responsive to all our questions. Some of the items in the agenda packets today, the executive summary and the last two items which were the MOU between IT and the Provost deal specifically with questions we raised in the second reading. They were very quick to respond to those questions. She thanked them for doing that. She turned the presentation over to B. Vieth.

B. Vieth said joining us today are Paul Tichinin, County Superintendent of Mendocino County, Dr. Carl Wong is here who will actually be part of the presentation. The main goal of this program is to produce exemplary educational leaders for schools and community colleges capable of envisioning and managing educational environments that promote learning, equity and achievement for all students. We've been working on this for a considerable time with UC Davis and we feel like we have put together a high quality program. The first person we would like to have help present our total program is Carl Wong, the County Superintendent here in Sonoma County talking about the need for this kind of program.

C. Wong sent around a concise handout to capture what he perceives to be the local needs and perhaps the regional benefits of having a joint doctoral program available to educational leaders here in Sonoma County. He said this morning it was his privilege to open the annual Education Day for the 20<sup>th</sup> cohort group of Leadership Santa Rosa which is sponsored by the Chamber designed to cultivate, promote and building the capacity of future leaders and their entire day was dedicated to the impact on the quality of life, economic vitality of public education here in the county. Toward the middle of the day, most of these are aspiring CEO's that are going to be future elected officials, Board of Supervisor members and the like, they stepped back and said they did not realize the complexity of attempting to provide quality K-12 education for the students of the county and that it was much easier running a for profit business, where you have greater control over some of the variables. So in that context it was quite amazing that those issues that they identified align very closely with the overarching four statements identified by the Joint Doctoral Program. So this is a real short synopsis of why it is important, not only for educational reasons, if for nothing else for public policy and economic policy. We have an investment on an annual basis of over \$600 million a year coming into Sonoma County and we ought to make sure that those leaders, superintendents have the necessary skills to appropriately make sure of this resource especially in the challenging times that we have. Those were his key remarks relative to demonstrated need and local benefits. He took the liberty of attaching to the back of the handout a list of those superintendents in Sonoma County that hold Doctoral degrees. For those who would like to have more

excitement in their lives, he urged the body to someday pursue that of a district superintendent. It is an extremely complex and challenging position which truly would benefit from having the staff development and training, frankly, provided by the university. He thanked the body again for their consideration.

B. Vieth said the next thing they wanted to address was how the program fits with the Sonoma State Mission and the Long Range Plan. Dean Phyllis Fernlund will address those issues.

P. Fernlund offered to P. Tichinin to give a Mendocino perspective.

P. Tichinin said the amen corner of the region that Sonoma State University serves, Mendocino County, doesn't measure at the same level of volume that Sonoma County does, although the Russian River does start with us and flow down this way. But what Dr. Wong has described prevails within Mendocino County as well. With an added disadvantage and increase need for this type of professional development. K-12 education only represents \$175 million that goes into Mendocino County. We have eleven Superintendents, only one of whom has their doctorate and the remoteness we've experienced has already been answered successfully by Sonoma State University with the branch campus that they've put at Mendocino College, with the efforts for the credentialing program with a Master's in Literature and Reading, so he wanted to commend and thank the Senate and the university for that effort. This partnership with the UC is another effort in that direction and he thinks will represent the university extremely well and fit with the K-16 Master Plan, that he had the opportunity to work on over the last two and a half years. The need is out there and he thinks that it represents the leadership of this university that you're moving forward with it.

P. Fernlund talked about the fit between this program and the mission of Sonoma State University. We have about two years of work in which twenty-five faculty, two Deans and one Provost spent quite a bit of time together developing this program, both the curriculum, structure and financing of the program. We think this is an important direction to go for Sonoma State University because part of the mission of this campus is to provide a foundation for life long learning. We'll be educating students in the advanced phases of their careers, superintendents and assistant superintendents. But it is an important function since these are the people who are the leaders of our public education system, K-12 and community college. The doctoral program is proposed to serve both those groups, both K-12 and community college systems. Our mission wants our students to be active citizens and leaders in society. We think this program definitely moves in that direction, because the leaders at this level, with Doctorates in Education will be people who can improve the workplace for faculty and definitely improve the work environments for K-12 students and the community colleges. Our mission statement speaks to graduating students who are capable of pursuing fulfilling careers in a changing world. And change is a major curricular element of this proposed doctoral program. Remember that we talk about our liberal arts mission, but we also talk about offering selected graduate and professional programs and these programs are to respond to regional need. We have met several times with APC and one of the elements of the Long Range Plan developed is to talk about graduate programs that are created only in

response to demonstrable regional and society needs. We believe that this program definitely responds to the kinds of needs that our Superintendents have mentioned today. And the APC Long Range Plan talks about graduate programs that exist without compromising the integrity and quality of any existing undergraduate programs. This program is funded with the enhanced fee structure of the UC system as well as the marginal cost formula that goes to the UC system, so it will be self-supporting and will be functioning at a graduate level far higher than what most of the CSU has been able to offer in the past. Recently the Academic Affairs mission and vision statement have been drafted and the vision statement that applies to this program is excellence in public liberal arts and sciences education while acting as a catalyst for the social and cultural transformation of the North Bay Region. We believe that well educated leaders in the community college system and in the K-12 system will make a true difference in the transformation of our region. She turned over the next part of the presentation to Paul Porter to talk about the structure of the program.

P. Porter said he was a faculty member in the Department of Educational Leadership and Special Education, so he's the detail person and will quickly go over a few details of the program, many of which are in your packet. It is designed to be a three year joint doctoral program and as Dr. Fernlund said it is both pre-school through grade 12 and community college in emphasis. It will have twenty four students admitted per year. That's among all three of the campuses. So that means that on the average there would be about eight students in our general area who will be admitted in the SSU region. The program format is for working professionals and will be largely all day Friday and all day Saturday format with substantial distance learning components also involved in the program. We would also like to emphasize that having this kind of format will really maximize the use of facilities here on campus. The admissions requirement for the program are again close to the UC admissions requirements at the doctoral level. A student must have a 3.0 GPA in the undergraduate, a 3.5 at the graduate level and they must take the GRE, there's not a specific cut off score, but that's factored in with admissions criteria. The program is governed by all three campuses with equal representation from each of the campuses. He said in the formation of the program so the Senate doesn't feel we got underrepresented, there were more SSU people in attendance at these meetings than any of the other groups. We feel that we really had a chance to have good input and be heard. We do have an MOU and we have thick packets here if the members wanted to read over the details of the MOU or any other details. UC Davis will be the center where students are enrolled and matriculated. The payment of all fees will be through UC Davis. The advising, cohort study groups, research will be held at the individual campuses. Not all, but most of the courses will be at UC Davis campus because it is the central location of the three. There have been some questions and we want to be very clear about faculty workload. The systemwide Academic Senate made a very clear statement a number of years ago that they would not be interested in pursuing the joint doctoral program unless it was very clear that the CSU campuses had the same workload as the UC campus, so it's very clear that the workload will be the same for each group. The workload is here in the packet. Essentially it is 24 units a year as it is here at our SSU campus. Part of that workload will be giving units of credit for serving as a Chair or on doctoral dissertation committees. Each Chair will earn .75 of a unit and we've also made a

provision for members of the committees that they will receive .25 of a unit. We felt this was very important because that is a large part of the workload in a doctoral program and that is what happens at the UC campuses, an equivalent amount. We wanted to be specific about that so that if other faculty members here at this university join doctoral dissertation committees we think it very valuable that they will be able to receive the exact same unit credit or if they like they can take a stipend also. All funds will come from the program itself, from the fees paid by students. There is a student fee what they call a marginal cost fee of approximately \$9000 that UC students pay. In addition, UC students pay \$2766 currently for what we call student fees. It's probably going to be a bit higher than this, but right now it's about \$11,766 per student. All costs of the program will be funded by the program. No cost whatsoever to the SSU campus. Since there's a lag as the three cohorts come on board before we have a full number of students, we've applied for an implementation grant from the State. The implementation grant will cover all costs for the first two years as we implement before we have enough students to generate enough money. If we do not get the implementation grant, which we anticipate we will, we would not implement the program. There will be no impact on FTES, all will go to UC Davis. None will count toward SSU enrollment requirements. We've also tried to respond to the request for agreements with other groups on campus. We have an IT agreement. We have agreement with the Provost's office. We have agreement with the Library. For instance with the Library we will be purchasing some databases to enhance the Library to better provide for our doctoral students there. We really feel as we are doing a good job making sure this does not cost the campus anything as we know this is a very sensitive issue. Once the program is rolling there will be two FTE tenure track positions for this campus and for each of the other campuses, plus funds for supplies, travel, clerical support, etc. There are more details in the packet and we are happy to answer questions as we go.

B. Vieth followed up with the course of study. It's important to reiterate the fact that this is a program for working professionals. We don't expect somebody to stop their work and come back to graduate school. No one takes more than two courses at a time. So nine courses are spread out over eleven months. So we have in a sense our own calendar, but they really are full time students in terms of paying tuition and so they take three classes in the fall, three in the winter and three in the spring. We have in the second year a seminar. We expect in that second year for students to take a content class like curriculum, finance, human resources, etc to interact with the problem based learning (unintelligible) and use that to start to develop their research strategies and really getting their arms around the educational issues that are out there. At the end of that year we anticipate that they will be ready to take their qualifying exams at the beginning of the third year as well as having individual dissertation topic that they can work on. It is a three year program because the joint agreement between the CSU and the UC requires it to be a three year program. They also have a requirement that they have a masters, so it's intended to be those three years past the masters. The four curriculum themes are visionary leadership and management, policy and practice, data for decision making and building community in a diverse society. These four strands are woven through the curriculum of every single course and that keeps it as a cohort structure. Just to finish up, we've gone through a number of different committees, starting with the



School of Education curriculum committee, School of Education Graduate committee. We put in an additional group that we think it was a valuable thing to do. We asked faculty from Schools across the campus that would probably have people sitting on dissertation committees for example Business, Psychology, Mathematics and chatted with them a lot about how they felt about the program. He thought there was significant interest from that group in having faculty across the campus sit on dissertations and one of the recommendations coming from that group was that not only could you get unit credits but could also get a \$500 stipend instead to serve because maybe it would be an occasional situation and it would be hard to build up to one unit for some people. So we tried to respond to the needs across the university. He handed out a frequently asked questions about the program.

P. McGough said it sounded like a wonderful program. He's always believed that doctoral programs were extremely expensive and he was trying to follow the numbers that it's self-supporting. In the budget notes, it says in the second year there will be three cohorts, but he only figures out there will be 44 students by the second year. And you list the UC fees at \$2766, is that per year? (not sure who answered) These are per year and you're right by the second year there would only be two cohorts. P. McGough said UC undergraduate fees are \$4500 now. Why would they only be \$2766 for a Ph.D. program. (not sure who answered) He thought the total was \$2766 in terms of the *fees* beyond the tuition. So you have tuition and you have fees and the fees alone are \$2677. P. McGough asked what the tuition would be. (same unidentified person) That's comes in around \$9000 graduate tuition at UC. P. McGough said so the student will be paying around \$12,000 a year. (same unidentified person) responded probably. P. Fernlund said some of the fees stay on the campus, such as health and other kinds of things would stay at UC Davis and not be distributed to the other campuses. J. Kornfeld added that the Joint Doctoral Program has a lot of support among the faculty in the School of Education. Bob mentioned it went through the curriculum and graduate studies committees and was passed unanimously in both of those. It also went to the University Graduate committee. All of those committees had multiple suggestions all of which are incorporated. R. Whitkus asked B. Vieth about hearing about all the benefits that accrue to Sac State and Sonoma State, he agreed, it was great. But if he was looking at it from a different perspective, from the UC, most of the courses are occurring here, most of the fees are staying here, most of everything is happening here at UC. What does UC need Sonoma State and Sac State for then? B. Vieth said that part of the issue is that they run a relatively small Ph.D. program at UC Davis. They have very few people who actually have experience in the field. It's a very theoretical faculty and the reality is that there is a disconnect from that faculty and what people need in terms of the educational program moving forward into a practitioner based program. That's why it's an Ed.D. program, not a Ph.D. program. They are actually looking for faculty in the search that are much more school based than the rest of their faculty. So he thinks what UC Davis needs is the faculty that's at Sac State and Sonoma State to broaden out what's going on. P. Tichinin (?) said he was actually involved in the beginning when some of the first ideas for this were put out and UC Davis has a new department basically and he thinks they are really gaining from both Sacramento and here from Sonoma your experience and expertise in how to reach out. They are the most northern UC campus and they really were looking for

the experience and expertise you have in being more of a regional service provider. He knows that was some of the extensive conversations that went on in how to design a program and how to bring on partners. So from a UC Davis standpoint they were really looking to Sonoma State University as a partner that could lend them expertise that they didn't have. R. Armiñana said he would give a political answer. What the UC gets is the preservation of the sole authority of the UC to grant the Ph.D. in public institutions. If they would have not agreed to do that the Legislature was coming down their throat faster than a locomotive train to force them to do it. Therefore, that's why they did. And that's why the President of the UC has had a great interest and has made it clear to the campuses involved is what they get to do is the preservation for the UC sole authority to grant doctoral degrees. E. Stanny asked about student demand for the program given that it costs \$12,000 a year. Is the expectation that the employers will pay for the education or will students be reimbursed? B. Vieth said certainly in the application people are expected to submit their respective organizations to sign off approximately 14 days, as we said there is teaching all day Friday and Saturday. We figured out there are about 14 of those Fridays in a year. We expect that educational organization in a sense to allow people to go to that, so there is that in-kind service or however you want view it from the school districts or community colleges. While this seems expensive, if you were to go to the private institutions that are doing this kind of work those people are paying \$30,000 a year for this kind of education. We are still at approximately half of that even with a tuition increase. C. Wong (?) said since the County Superintendent is responsible to audit school district expenditures he could ensure that no general funds or tax payers funds will be spent to support the cost of an individual who selects to be part of this program. So the answer to your question is there cannot be and will not be public funds directed through districts. P. Fernlund said students in the program are probably at least principals earning a principals salary and they will be eligible for UC Davis financial aid for doctoral students. (unidentified person) And we feel pretty good that we're asking the districts to make a commitment, because we're emphasizing field based research that benefits back to the district, so that could be a real positive for getting districts and community colleges to buy in. B. Vieth said we have a fairly large advisory group of superintendents, community colleges and other educational leaders that are in a partnership with this three university group and he thought as a group they were very supportive of this kind of development for their advanced administrators.

S. McKillop said the Joint Doctoral program represents an entrance into an area for the CSU where we've been denied, while it's not at all the way to us to granting the degree it's the opening shot that perhaps we could. We do now more Masters in our system than UC gives. Since they didn't want to do Education doctorates, Chancellor Reed said no, we need to do it, we're the teaching folks that are supposed to turn out teachers mostly, so it was a great opportunity.

R. Luttmann said he assumed that most or all of the faculty who will be teaching in the program will themselves have Doctorates in Education. B. Vieth said that's correct. P. Fernlund said it was required in the MOU part. R. Coleman-Senghor said he was struck in the presentation by the committee of individuals that came before APC and also EPC. The fact is this is something new to our region. He said there was a vital program at Fresno and that's what sold the program for him. As the

question is does it serve the region? And since this is one of our main areas of concern, it seems what we're doing in replicating a model, we asked in the various committees to make sure it is economically viable. The reason we've asked for all those MOU's is to make sure the fiscal nature of the program is distanced from our own general funds. He thinks we have that assurance and protection. He suggested to the body to take a look at the Fresno program as a way of looking at how this program might operate. P. McGough said it seems like the UC faculty will have the four quarter unit course which will be equivalent to the CSU's faculty four semester unit course. Is that right? If it is true, they are not equivalent, but a semester is equivalent is 6 units a quarter. Who wanted that – the UC or the CSU? P. Fernlund said the CSU wanted that because of the (unintelligible due to coughing) for a four semester course, 4 WTU's in our system, picking up the 4 quarter course in their system, the enhanced workload for faculty would mean that the time to do research, publish and be an active scholar would be built into an enriched load. So even though the 4 quarter hours is less than a 4 semester course, we wanted to go with the 4 semester course as part of the CSU faculty so that we could build in some time which the UC faculty already have for an active research (unintelligible). P. McGough said but you could have built in more time if you did the real equivalent of 4 units which would be three semester units. (unidentified speaker) You're right that it's enriched, but the workload would be the same for each faculty member. So that if he were to teach a four quarter course through UCD, he would be getting 4 semester units of credit here. P. McGough said, oh, you'll be teaching the courses at UC Davis. P. Fernlund said it's very confusing, but Sac State and SSU worked hard on the this equivalency because the Statewide Academic Senate was emphatic that the workload of the CSU faculty in the Joint Doctoral Program would match the UC faculty workload because in the old days there was sort of second class citizenship for the CSU faculty and the UC had a different workload and the CSU faculty had a much heavier workload. B. Vieth said the UC-Fresno State model doesn't have that absolute workload guarantee and they are very much wanting to join this model because they don't have and they know they need it. R. Karlsrud said he wondered about the selection process, the extent to which certain areas, those maybe adjacent to Sonoma State, might have opportunities to meet the faculty or to actually get an advantage in the selection process as opposed to somebody coming out of Laytonville. He didn't see the selection process in the document. P. Porter said what they are going to do is have representatives from all the campuses on the selection committee. We talked for awhile that maybe we should have exactly 8 from each area. Well, we want to take the best students too, so we backed off on that. R. Karlsrud said he was struck by the Superintendent of Mendocino County explaining the great need there and the access to this campus even from outlying places, even in Ukiah, what access are they going to have to the people running the programs. Long distance learning – to expect those people to drive 300 or 200 miles to UC Davis for all their classes? He's curious why they all have to be there. But he's also curious how much technology will help you and help them access this program. C. Nelson asked for that answer to be given by email. She thanked the presenters for the presentation.

## Return to Questions for Provost Ochoa

R. Karlsrud said his question was a sore subject. It's back to managers again. He knows that the President and most of Sonoma State do not want to see permanent people go. But still in K-12 they are trying to do something with the time base of administrators because it means they will get to stay in a School district. They'd be serving 11 months instead of 12. While visibly raising the workload of faculty, which we all know is going to happen, the workload is adjusted by doing that to the administrators. It doesn't basically eliminate them. As soon as the crisis is over they can return to their 100% time base. He is curious why that can't be looked at, but maybe you are looking at it. He thought people would feel better if we knew everybody was going to suffer a little bit. E. Ochoa said it was a question he would have to refer to the President. R. Armiñana said there are serious questions when you do that about the effects it has on the individual's retirement program. In our system, we have been told, it has a very significant impact. For administrators their service is based on 12 month approach. Therefore there are some real technical problems on that. Aside from other issues. R. Karlsrud said part of the reason he brought it up is he is looking at K-12 and he has a consultant at home who is telling him the reason they are doing that is that the benefits are not affected or the pension. Now you're telling me. . .R. Armiñana said it has been discussed with us and that was the answer we got.

## Senate Budget Committee report

R. Karlsrud said Andy Merrifield discovered on his own that his term was up and we needed a new Chair and he drew the short straw. The second part of the report he read to the body what the committee has recommended to this body. The committee respectfully requests that the Academic Senate provide an extended period at it's meeting on March 18<sup>th</sup> for the President to report on the university's budget for 2004-05 focusing on the planned reductions for the various university divisions. The committee will be providing specific questions regarding the budget to the President and the Senate well in advance of the March 18 meeting.

## Chair-Elect report

M. Dreisbach asked the Senators to go back to their Schools and encourage their faculty members to vote. As of today at 1:40 we had less than 25% voting. We are electing our new officers. This is a crucial time for us. We all clamor about faculty governance and shared governance, well then we have to have our faculty step up to the plate. Everyone around this table must vote. And please encourage your faculty, send out an email, have your AC send out another email. Laurel has been really on top of this, but if you stop in the hall and say hey did you vote, don't forget to vote, because the deadline barring the continuation of any technological problems, is Sunday at midnight. N. Byrne said he believed a broad based participation is absolutely essential in a democratic process. **He requested the deadline for the election process be extended. Second by S. Brannen.** R. McNamara spoke against

the motion. It's the principle when the students want to extension on their paper, he said you're not going to write a better paper than you've had three months to work on with another three days. He could not believe that we're even having to discuss this. A week to vote and he doesn't see the purpose of it. He thought we were pandering ourselves. N. Byrne said he deeply respected the position R. McNamara took and he is in large agreement with it. The one consideration that he found relevant to this particular instance is that unlike the previous efforts at electronic balloting, this one seems to have been characterized by widespread experience of difficulty. He himself when he tried to vote was kicked off his system several times and he went down to the Senate office to vote. He understood this was an extremely common experience this time around and it's only because of those difficulties. He believed that there are many people who have simply failed in their real effort to vote. E. McDonald asked to what date it would be extended. N. Byrne said he would recommend next Thursday. E. McDonald asked why one week? N. Byrne said because he believed there was limited time to even inform the university community that there is even an extension. Many people won't get that information until next week. R. Coleman-Senghor supported the extension because he was surprised at his colleagues when he asked have you voted yet and they said how and he said you got instructions from Laurel. And then one said can you show me how to do this Bob? Let's deal with the reality of it. He spoke to 6 or 7 colleagues, only one said to me - done. The other 6 came to me and said they went online, how do you do it. He swore to God. Now you might assume people could do it but that's the reality right now. M. Dreisbach said there were some problems with the platform particularly from PCs and have been addressed and to our knowledge fixed. We did hear some initial complaints and in talking to people now using PCs it seems everything is working fine. She was certainly open to extending the deadline if there was a continuation of technological glitches. She was a bit hesitant to extend on the basis on the fact that not enough people are voting. Laurel put out envelopes in bright colors in everybody's box, very explicit. We had a number of emails going out. Anyone on this campus that does know this is the week to vote and have the directions on how to do it or not be able to find that brightly colored envelope on their desk, there's something wrong. P. McGough said he would support the extension because of the technology glitches and requested that if the Senate approves it the Chair of Structure and Function send out an email on Monday telling us all of our disgraceful voting record as of midnight Sunday night. **Vote on extending the election deadline to midnight Thursday – passed on voice vote.**

### **Announcement from Student Senator**

E. Freed said next Wednesday February 25<sup>th</sup> from 6pm – 8pm in the Cooperage the Associated Student Productions along with the Student Coalition for Global Justice and College Republicans are putting on a voter information night. He requested that the Senators tell their students about it.

### **Adjourned**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*