

Academic Senate Minutes

April 22, 2004

3:00 – 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 3/4/04 and 3/18/04 approved. From S&F: Staggered Membership proposal for APC and EPC approved. Chair's Report. Lobbying and Use of Appropriated Federal Funds policy approved. Policy on Copyright Ownership approved. Provost report. Vice President for Administration and Finance report. President's Report. An Assembly Budget Hearing report. 40th anniversary of the Senate noted. Winner of Excellence in Teaching Award announced.

Present: Catherine Nelson, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Phil McGough, Susan McKillop, Robert Karlsrud, Victor Garlin, Birch Moonwomon, Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Steve Cuellar, Bob Vieth, John Kornfeld, Raye Lynn Thomas, Derek Girman, Sam Brannen, Steve Winter, Charlene Tung, Robert McNamara, Sandra Shand, Scott Miller, Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Jason Spencer, Ephriam Freed, Amy Wingfield, Greg Tichava, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Brigitte Lahme

Absent: Melanie Dreisbach, Rick Luttmann, Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Myrna Goodman, Peter Phillips, Jan Beauly

Proxies: Tia Watts for Edith Mendez, Murali Pillai for Richard Whitkus

Guests: Cynthia Tasker, Katie Pierce, Rose Bruce, Lynn McIntyre, Tony Apolloni, Susan Kashack, Judith Hunt, Art Warmoth, Melinda Barnard, Stuart Jones

Approval of the Agenda – one item added - a time certain of 4:00 for President's Armiñana's report. S. Shand offered to give her impression of a Assembly Budget Hearing she attended in Sacramento. *Approved.*

Minutes 3/4/04 and 3/18/04 – Minutes of 3/18/04 were noted to be in a new abbreviated format. *Approved.*

Consent item:

From S&F: Staggered Membership proposal for APC and EPC

C. Nelson gave a brief history of the issue. Both APC and EPC were being faced with losing half their committees in the next election and requested from Structure and Functions a plan to resolve that to maintain institutional memory in the committees. *Approved.*

Chair's Report

C. Nelson reported that the Vice Mayor of Cotati will be a guest of the Senate at the next meeting. The Associated Students have passed a resolution opposing Governor Schwarzenegger's proposed budget cuts in higher education. The resolution asks the Governor to make higher education a priority and argues that the proposed cuts diminish accessibility, affordability and quality of education called for in the Master Plan for higher education. There will be a New Student Convocation in the Fall on Tuesday, August 24th from 11-12. Faculty who wish to join the celebration will meet at the loading dock of Stevenson Hall about 10:45 and walk to the courtyard of the Schulz Information Center in regalia, if available, a few speeches will be made and then there will be a pizza lunch. Elaine Leeder is one of the sponsors of this and has asked it to be on people's calendars now, so we don't lose the date. She welcomed back Greg Tichava from his extended absence due to illness. The PowerPoint presentation made about the Green Music Center given to the Senate is now available online. The link is on the Academic Senate website.

(<http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate>) There was a systemwide meeting of campus Senate Chairs on April 1st in San Francisco. She highlighted a couple of things they discussed. The Statewide Academic Senate is organizing groups of faculty delegations to go to individual members of the State Senate and Assembly for each campus to talk about the budget. On May 6 & 7th the Statewide Academic Senate is going to be considering a series of resolutions having to do with access. The first is opposing a plan, SB 1785, for a common transfer pattern for students from community colleges to the CSU. The Statewide Senate is arguing that if this is going to happen it should be in the hands of the CSU, not the Legislature. The second resolution lays out the pattern that SB 1785 calls for and the third is about excess units. The resolution defines excess units as 20% over and above what the student needs to graduate. David Spence, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs indicated that the \$25 million dollar reduction in the CSU's Governor recommended budget is based on the assumption that this amount can be saved by reducing the number of units students take. The CSU plan is threefold. First, stiffen the requirements to repeat courses and withdraw from courses. Second, whether or not there should be any financial disincentive for taking excess units and third, a timetable for implementation.

Lobbying and Use of Appropriated Federal Funds policy – Second Reading – E. Stanny

E. Stanny explained the policy. It basically says that anyone receiving federal funds cannot use them to lobby. She introduced Tony Apolloni and Cynthia Tasker present to answer any questions about this or the next policy.

Vote on Lobbying and Use of Appropriated Federal Funds policy – Approved by voice vote.

Policy on Copyright Ownership – Second Reading – E. Stanny

E. Stanny said she asked that questions be directed to Tony Apolloni.

It was asked how the policy dovetailed with state law or regulations.

T. Apolloni answered that to his knowledge there is no state law regarding what we should have in place on copyright. There is Executive Order 654 of the CSU that authorizes the campuses to create such a policy. It is important practice to have such a policy.

It was asked who drafted the policy and what the character was of the discussion of the policy at the FSAC meetings.

T. Apolloni answered that the policy has been gestating for about two and a half years. The first policy we had he discussed with the Sponsored Programs subcommittee and the Deans and everyone said it was too restrictive. At that time the Statewide Academic Senate had set up a committee to look at this issue. It's work was released in January '03 and that provided a good deal of guidance about this policy to us. The policy mirrors very much what the Statewide Academic Senate recommends. Then it went to FSAC.

E. Stanny said FSAC compared it with what the Statewide Academic Senate had suggested and we made explicit in item five anything that a faculty member (unintelligible) shall not be considered works for hire.

It was question under item four that it is the general policy that the work belongs to the creator unless. . . it results in extraordinary use of university resources or facilities – who decides what is extraordinary?

T. Apolloni said that would have to be argued out. If it's academic and scholarly work it's very clear that it would belong to the creator.

It was asked if there was an example of extraordinary use of university resources.

T. Apolloni answered that no he did not have an example. What the policy spells out are four categories of work. It takes the issue away from the creator to the product that has been created. One type of work would be administrative work. If someone creates a spreadsheet, that does not belong to the creator, it belongs to the university. If someone creates an academic or scholarly work, that belongs to the creator. If someone produces work under a grant or contract, usually the grant or contract will spell out who owns the work. Some derivative, a journal article, of that would belong to the creator of the work. Then there is commissioned work when the university pays someone to develop a product specifically.

It was clarified that any work done under contract is subject to the contract.

It was asked how the policy protects faculty who participate on a regular basis in distance learning and produce work for a one time instance that then is used continually, such as a lecture.

C. Tasker answered that one would have to break down the different components of what was created. It would depend on what is the original work that is fixed in a

permanent medium. That is where the rights exist. It is up to the owner of the copyright to protect their copyrights.

It was asked what if the university video taped a faculty member's lecture, laid them off and played the video in a distance learning class with the same content as the class in which the lecture was given, would the faculty member be authorized to forbid the taping of his lecture? Would the faculty member be able to prevent the playing of the video tape of the lecture in a subsequent class that was a distance learning class?

T. Apolloni answered that those kinds of agreements should be made at the front end. The policy does give guidance on these types of situations by noting that these types of scenarios start going into the gray area and so it's best to get agreement ahead of time.

It was asked what rights the faculty member would have to object to taping the faculty's lecture and playing it to a distance learning class.

C. Tasker said this policy does not speak at all to video taping anything. It's talking about once an original work is created and fixed in a permanent medium, then who owns the copyrights. If the faculty member felt copyrighted material was violated it would be up to the faculty member to pursue it. If working in distance learning, it is important to familiarize oneself with the Teach Act. That is discussed at length in the report from the CSU Task Force on Intellectual Property. It is a recent federal law. It makes the Fair Use Doctrine even more important in an academic setting.

It was noted that there are web tutorials on the Teach Act. Senator Thomas offered to find the URLs for the body.

Other scenarios were offered for comment. C. Tasker said that it was not possible to write a policy that will remove the necessity of applying logic and judgment and subjectivity to the application of that policy. That will always be true.

It was noted that the university does not have a "sign off sheet" for faculty to use when they invite people to lecture in their classes and according to the policy being considered, the university needs one.

Motion to approve. Second. Vote on Copyright Ownership Policy – Yes = 24, No = 0, Abstentions = 3, Approved.

Provost report

E. Ochoa reported that Academic Affairs has completed the painful process of developing the schedule for the Fall. We came up with a schedule that on paper will achieve target and will be capable of being delivered in existing university space. But in doing so we have clearly adversely and severely impacted the quality of instruction as witnessed by the class sizes that will be used with that schedule. Alterations in pedagogy will have to be implemented by a number of departments. That provides some context for the President's report later. There are two

community meetings coming up where we will present the Strategic Plan developed by the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning committee and take comments and feedback for possible inclusion or revision of the plan. The dates are Tuesday, April 27th from 11:40-1:00 in Darwin 2 and Friday, April 30, from 1:30-3:00 in ST 1002.

A Statewide Senator noted that a copy of the Long Range Plan, the Strategic Plan and a copy of her analysis, right or wrong, is available discussing where they do mesh and what has been left out of the new plan that was in the Long Range Plan that affects primarily faculty and curriculum. She recommended that if people go to the meetings, to go prepared by looking at the Strategic Plan and Long Range Plan ahead of time and think about that as faculty members. She thinks it is a very important thing for all faculty to be players in this and take it very seriously.

The Provost was asked how many faculty who are currently here will not be here in Fall according to the current schedule.

The Provost answered he didn't have a precise answer, but that the magnitude of the cuts in value amounted to about all of the part-time faculty budget and about half of the FERP budget.

It was asked if the Governor's January cuts do not materialize how will that change the number of faculty.

The Provost answered that in the eventuality that more resources materialize to mount the schedule, we will be identifying those areas of the curriculum that are most severely impacted as to the quality of instruction and prioritize those for restoration of additional sections. Deans in consultation with Department Chairs who provide input from their departments will help make the decisions for prioritizing as is usually done with scheduling.

It was asked what types of steps are being planned to inform the general student body about the nature of the schedule and that nature of the changes they will be encountering.

The Provost answered that the schedule is mounted for students to review. He would like to consult with the Deans and Vice Provost for details about how communication will be carried out.

It was noted that many students do not understand the nature of what is happening and challenges they will be facing in enrolling in classes.

The Provost noted that after the May revise of the budget they will be able to communicate more with students. Currently, the budget information is only an estimate.

A Senator asked if there was support for instructional design and development for faculty facing course transitions to large classes and still make them interesting and stimulating for students.

The Provost answered that the Center for Teaching and Learning will be focusing on this area and providing workshops.

Vice President for Administration and Finance report

L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he had three items to report on. On the non-instructional side of the budget we are losing \$2.8 million. Thanks to the good advice of the folks on the Campus Reengineering Committee we have identified a plan to deal with all but about \$400,000 of that item. They are in a dilemma as they have no further positions to cut without moving to layoff. It will be continued to be evaluated in the coming months. He said he has not reported on the Excess Unit Task Force as it has not met since it's first meeting. The Statewide Academic Senate has defined excess units as being 20% over what the student needs to graduate. If this holds, it will be good for SSU as most of our students to don't exceed 20% of their requirements. It is not clear yet whether these are units earned or units attempted. That will be discussed in the task force. The annual Campus Expenditure Plan is now out and on Reserve in the Library and in the Senate office. He encourage the body to look at it and bring any questions to him.

A Senator noted that the manufacturer's website for the new furniture outside of Toast list the cost of those items as \$60,000 including taxes, but not including shipping. Even if less was spent, it still has to be in the 10's of thousands of dollars. He heard that the old furniture was unsafe. He sat in it everyday and did not feel unsafe. He thought the furniture should have been examined by a structural engineer before being determined unsafe and that some the "unsafe" furniture was being used elsewhere on campus. He said it was demoralizing to him that after the Senate made a plea for some of the surplus that the money is being used to beautify the campus. We are losing half our faculty in our department.

The Vice President said he noted the Senator's concern.

The Vice President was asked why he was heading up a task force on excess units when that seems to be explicitly an issue that should be headed by the Provost as it touches so much on the curriculum.

The Vice President answered that the task force is chaired by Vice Chancellor David Spence and is overwhelming represented by members of the Statewide Academic Senate and Provosts. The system wanted two business officers on the task force to advise how practical it would be to implement excess charges for excess units should such a policy emerge. He was appointed by happenstance and offered to provide the Senate with information that they may find interesting. He is not there in an academic capacity.

President's Report

R. Armiñana began by talking about the current state of the budget. The Governor is now beginning to focus on the budget. This administration is focusing on one issue at a time. There is a requirement that the Governor present a May revise. There is rumor that the May revise will be significantly different from the January budget.

Revenues are coming in at about what was expected. April is a major month because of tax revenues. There has been a request from all state agencies to submit a response to an additional 3% budget reduction. For the CSU that would mean \$72 million, for SSU \$1.6 million. The CSU's response was that a 3% reduction could simply not be achieved and if it were to be imposed it would have to be met with an additional decrease in enrollment of 2% and an increase in undergraduate fees another 10% over what is currently being proposed. The Governor's office has this information. The Fall semester is basically in. If there were to be greater enrollment reductions, they would have to occur in the Spring and could probably not be achieved uniformly and probably larger campuses would suffer the most. We don't know yet what is going to happen. He is assuming that somehow it will be managed without a further budget reduction. It is not a safe assumption, but is his assumption right now. There seems to be a strong interest in the administration to create a partnership or compact for higher education as was done in the Wilson administration and part of the Davis administration. It deals with some a priori agreements about access, the cost of instruction, compensation and some restoration of past losses. But it would not begin until '05-'06. At this moment we are not sure if the Board of Trustees will be able to act on a fee policy at their May meeting because as of April 30 the Board will no longer have a quorum. The Governor must name some Trustees between May 1 and May 13th in order for the Board to meet officially. There are seven vacancies. All this is in a great sense of flux. We have, based on the best scenario we have, which is lousy, but the best so far, this campus is facing a \$5 million budget reduction. It is very important to understand that there are two pieces to the budget reduction. The first piece is \$2.5 million which is related to the 5% reduction in enrollment. Nothing can be done to mitigate that. It is money not paid for students not here. That's 500 less students than we have to today which impacts in all areas of the university. That leaves another \$2.5 million dollars. This figure is composed of two areas. One is unallocated reductions. The other is a series of mandatory costs - energy costs, some compensation, health benefits, some workman's compensation. That's the \$2.5 million he's most concerned about. As the Provost said, meeting that real reduction of \$2.5 million it will change the nature of what this university is in terms of courses offered, class size, the ability of the student's relationship with faculty – all of those issues he thinks are highly important and characterize this institution. This year we were able to put in \$1.4 million. There is no such rabbit in the hat. There will be a little money from end of the year and we won't know that figure until the books are closed. He has been for the last few weeks ruminating about the consequences of the cuts and considering how to deal with it. He has meet with other CSU Presidents and had conversations with the Chancellor. He asked for consultation from the President's Budget Advisory Committee (PBAC) which the advice he received by no way unanimous. It is his intention to have a meeting scheduled for this coming Tuesday with the representatives of our labor unions and request from them their consideration to ask for a waiver from each union in order for us to put in place next year a furlough of all employees of the university for a period of a week per semester. It is all or none. He passed out a handout showing various budget reduction mitigation scenarios. He is concentrating on page four. He doesn't have the authority to impose a furlough on the non-represented employees. He will be required to have a resolution from the Trustees. All of this is contingent on the Trustees and every single union agreeing to this local way. His estimation is that a week per semester

furlough would save approximately \$1.8 million dollars. That \$1.8 million would be transferred to the instructional side of Academic Affairs in order for more classes to be presented, class sizes to be more manageable and the quality of instruction be of the consistency that the university can be proud of. His intention is that if this happens, to charge one day per month per individual. The ten days would be spread over 10 months. To be honest he hoped that this idea would be done by the entire system. It's too big for the system to handle. So he asked if he was prohibited from doing it locally and the answer was no, but he has no assurances at any level. He has informed the Chancellor of his intentions. The furlough would be for one year only and is a fairly drastic approach. He hopes that if the partnership with the Governor works out that there will be some level of stability to allow the institution to come back with some enrollment growth and some stability of it's revenue.

A student representative noted that faculty work ten months and the staff work 12 months. One day's pay is a larger percentage of a faculty members pay than a staff member.

The President answered that this was incorrect as people are paid a salary over time whether they work 10 or 12 months. That's why using a days pay would work. He noted that he forgot to say that is has to happen when the students are not here and it should not impact instruction. We have approximately 17 non-instructional days. There may be a longer holiday period between December and January for example. Basically close the university down totally to how the university looks on December 25th. We always have to have a couple of police officers and someone in the boiler plant, but most days the university would be totally closed. There would be some saving related to utilities.

The student representative asked if a progressive furlough structure had been considered.

The President said he did not favor a progressive structure, but it could be discussed. He felt the equity comes from the variation in the pay scale.

It was noted that any proposal to find money for instruction had support from one Senator who also thought CFA would support such a proposal. CFA and it's local representative will study carefully the proposal the President is making. The proposal was of interest as it spreads the burden across the university instead of falling disproportionately on instruction and particularly the lecturers. He was glad that the idea of a furlough was being considered when previously it had not been considered. He argued that since all pay the same proportion means that people with lower incomes have a much higher burden. CFA would be looking at a some type of provision were there would be a dollar exemption which certain low income would be exempted from this and the tax would kick in at a higher level of income. Otherwise it would be an unfair tax.

It was questioned whether the furlough would be voluntary or mandatory.

The President said it would be mandatory in the sense that everyone would have to participate. If a bargaining unit decides they cannot participate, that ends the

deliberation. It is voluntary in terms of the bargaining units, but they all have to participate.

It was asked if the President was saying we are going to take less students, so the budget is going down.

The President answered that we will take 348 less FTE. That 348 FTE has a monetary value equal to \$2.6 million. Therefore the mandated reduction, not voluntary, not decided by the campus, but mandatory, that means the campus will receive \$2.6 million less than it receives today. Most years we have talked about reduction on growth, this year time it is a reduction from the base.

It was asked that if we got the \$2.6 million, would we take the students.

The President answered if the state gave us the money for 348 FTE, yes we would take them. He was not sure when because obviously it would be very difficult to take them this fall, but we would try to get them in the Spring. In his estimation the probability of that happening are as high as the probability of him having dinner tonight in Beijing.

It was asked if all the unions could agree to a voluntary furlough and then people in those union could say they wanted to furlough or not, is that how voluntary works or is voluntary not even an option and it is possible that the unions would not agree to furlough, but you would still have mandatory furlough.

The President answered that it was legally required to have the bargaining unit approval of a waiver. We do not have the authority to imposed that on a bargaining unit.

It was asked if even though the unpaid days wouldn't count for PERS, could people still buy back those days.

The President answered that kind of question would have to be researched. He believed so, but couldn't give a definitive answer.

One Senator talked about using a pay cut instead of a furlough. (*very difficult to hear this speaker on the tape.*)

The President answered that the difference between a pay cut and a furlough is that the furlough does not affect base pay. Benefits are based on base pay, retirement is based on years of pay and the last three years of pay. So it is important not to affect the base pay. He noted that the handout passed out was created by the Chancellor's office and the pros and cons listed there are not his words.

One of the student representatives said this was the kind of innovation she expected around the budget problems. She noted that students are also burdened by not being able to come to the CSU and then, when here, by the quality of education. She hopes, if this does not pass, that the unions would look at other options. By doing this, would it be looked on favorably by the Legislature or the Governor?

The President answered that no matter what we do, it will be seen as a way to mitigate the budget difficulties. The only thing that is impressing the Legislature, the public, the administration is the reduction in enrollment. Yesterday in almost every newspaper in the state on the front page there was an article about 10,000 eligible UC students not being admitted to the UC. This plan does not in any way mitigate the 5% enrollment reduction. This plan would help the students here less the 348 FTE, have a better quality experience than they would have had otherwise. It's one time only as a bridge.

It was asked why we couldn't use sick leave. That strategy would allow people to donate the amounts they want to donate. He as an individual will ask both the CFA and the administration, if you are in a contractual relationship with the state, how can this be a local campus issue? He will resist any reduction in pay based on the contract with the state not with the local.

The President answered this is why it is not a reduction in pay. It is a furlough. The Vice-President of Administration said that there really is no money for sick leave. We don't approve sick leave in terms of cash, so there is no pot of money there to donate.

The President said the furlough plan requires the specific approval from a bargaining unit and in the case of the non-represented employees, it requires a specific resolution from the Trustees.

The President was commended for this flexible approach and the speaker noted the heavy burden on the lecturers and instruction due to the budget problems. Will the union representative have any authority to say that this is ok?

The President answered that he did not expect at the meeting to get a commitment from anybody. He will ask them to initiate any action within their union to consider this and request the waiver from their principle union.

It was noted that for all employees except faculty, it is a furlough. There is no decrease in faculty workload.

It was asked if there were two weeks currently where students are not on campus.

The President answered there is spring break and 99% of students leave the campus and the same thing happens around mid January before they come. He said he was not wedded to a particular schedule.

The Provost said that his understanding was that the President's intention was to close down the university for ten clearly identified days and reduce everyone's salary as a result of the furlough for the year by a fixed percentage. It may be because of the 9 month/12 month distinction between faculty and other employees, the actual dates that have to be identified may not all fall out of the work days of the faculty, so that in fact the percentages work out. He wanted to make it very clear that this is only one year of relief because we are talking about a reduction to our

base. Because we are talking about the unallocated reductions not tied to enrollment. All we can assume is that it is not coming back. The best way to look at this one year relief is breathing room, if it comes to pass, for moving in a orderly way for the kinds of long run structural adjustments that we have to make to our programs to deal with the new realities of the lower base. It's the current schedule that prompted this idea, because the current schedule on a long term basis is unacceptable in terms of academic quality. If this new strategy takes off, we won't have to make long term adjustments next year, but will still have to move toward that.

Meeting extended 10 minutes

It was noted how little money some faculty members make. If at the end of the month there is no money left, any request for a pay cut is huge because you are talking about taking away from zero. It's very important to not think that an equal percentage is fair because the burden is huge on those who are living hand to mouth. Sometimes things have to get really bad before they get better. If we are able to prop up the university through our own sacrifice, then no one sees the pain or how bad things have gotten. Let's let people see the pain. It's the taxpayers that have been unwilling to support education that has led to this, let them see this.

The President responded that he totally agreed with the first point. On the second part, he didn't think there would a stronger message coming from a campus than closing down campus for a period of time. That has never happened in this state. His main concern about how this might get shut down is that it is too loud a message. That's the message he wanted to carry systemwide. His suggestion was that this be done in conjunction with the University of California. He doesn't find at this moment the political will for that. Locally, this is going to be major news about how bad the situation is. He said he thought that not hiring back lecturers, large class sizes and diminished quality was not a loud enough message. He thought closing down campus was the loudest message.

It was asked if the savings from the salary cuts would be enough to completely offset the budget cuts that we've had and would that mean we would go back to our usual set of class offerings and course pedagogy or would there still be massive cuts, huge classes and no lecturers. Would we be able to hire our lecturers back?

The Provost answered that in terms of the lecturers, we are not going to have 348 FTES next year so the answer is no. There will still be a reduction in the number lecturers because we are going to serving 348 FTES fewer.

It was asked what percentage 348 FTES represents in terms of number of lecturers SSU normally hires.

The Provost answered that a rough estimate could be achieved by dividing FTES by SFR.

It was asked if the administration could provide the actual numbers, if we went with this scenario, what that would mean for layoffs for the coming year. If we all

sacrifice to this extent, what exactly does that mean in terms of sections, lecturers hired.

The Provost answered that it would be done in a very targeted way, focusing in the areas where we have the greatest impact and step back from things we've done that are unacceptable in terms of quality. Abnormally large classes, doubling up on lab stations, those are the kinds of things we would back away from first. If we have started some restructuring for the long run, we wouldn't back away from those.

The speaker reiterated the need to have a cut off at a certain salary point and asked for information about what kinds of savings that would provide.

It was noted that the current University Expenditure Plan was out and the Senator noted the salaries of many people on campus are very low for the area and are living hand to mouth. It is hard for these kinds of people to take any kind of pay cut or furlough. He argued that he thought all the options presented in the handout should be reviewed by the Senate, not just page 4 and he asked that the Senate Budget committee review the options. In the column called authority, there is nothing he knows of which permits the campus CFA to override or supersede the contract. He will consult with CFA counsel on this issue. He assured everyone that CFA will do the best it can. As far as he knows there are not precedents for this. The local CFA by-laws have no provisions for such an event. Anything we do would have to be approved by the statewide CFA. He assured the body and the President that the proposal will get a good faith hearing.

C. Nelson offered some comments to the body. She noted that the meeting often goes over 5:00 because we don't get started until 3:10 or 3:15, so she asked the body to come on time.

S. Shand gave a short report about her visit to an Assembly Budget Hearing in Sacramento. She said we do have allies on the Assembly Budget committee that was looking at outreach. She's concerned that they are uneducated about some realities and we haven't done a good enough job educating them. She is worried about EOP as she thinks they are blending it in with outreach. They don't recognize it is a retention program. Some of the people in the committee, while not talking directly about taxes, are arguing for more sources of revenue and noting that the Governor's priority will be turning away students from higher education rather than have the tax for the license plates. She argued that as citizens it would be good to have that debate in a larger context and that the bigger issue is the tax structure and why education is not being funded. There are Assembly people talking about it as dismantling the crown jewel that drives the economic engine of the state. The state Treasurer is very supportive and put that day together. She thinks we don't spend enough time in Sacramento as private citizens.

The Chair noted that it was brought to her attention that on April 30, 1964 the first meeting of the SSU Academic Senate took place. We are nearing the 40th anniversary of this institution. You are participating in a 40 year tradition.

The winners of the Excellence in Teaching Award for 2003-2004 are Susan Herring, Mathematics and Alexandra Von Meier, Environmental Studies and Planning.
(applause)

Adjourned

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom