

Academic Senate Minutes

March 18, 2004

3:00 – 5:00

Commons

Abstract

Chair's Report. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes of 2/5/04 and 2/19/04 approved. Faculty Emeritus eligible for Emeritus for Spring 2004 – Approved. Changes in the Psychology Major approved. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3.10 of By-Laws; Replacement of Lecturer Senators approved. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3 of By-Laws regarding election of Lecturer Senators approved. President's report. Budget Report from R. Armiñana, E. Ochoa, and L. Furukawa-Schlereth. Moment of silence for Tom Wagner. Resolution to Assess Faculty Confidence in SSU Academic Senate and Administration - Second Reading - tabled.

Present: Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Susan McKillop, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Victor Garlin, Birch Moonwomon, Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Martinez, Erick McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Liz Thach, 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, Ephriam Freed, Amy Wingfield, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Brigitte Lahme

Absent: Phil McGough, Elizabeth Burch, Robert Train, Derek Girman, Greg Tichava,

Guests: Rose Bruce, Art Warmoth, Elaine Sundberg, Judith Hunt,

Chair's Report

C. Nelson reported that the Provost had decided to give the Senate its full 54 units of assigned time for next year as the Senate requested. (applause) There are two conditions. One that the Senate review its structure and two, if the Lecturer Senators do not use their three units, those units remain in the pot. She will post her report on the recent Budget Summit in Long Beach on the Senate website.

Consent items

Approval of the Agenda – P. Phillips representing the School of Social Sciences Curriculum and Chairs Council moved that the Draft Vision and Mission Statement for Academic Affairs be removed from the agenda until the entire Strategic Plan is available. Second. Approved. Agenda as amended *approved*.

Faculty Emeritus eligible for Emeritus for Spring 2004 – *Approved*.

Minutes of 2/5/04 & 2/19/04 – *Approved*.

Changes in the Psychology Major – E. McDonald

E. McDonald reported to the body that the changes in the Psychology major streamline their advising process. Unit requirements for the major remains unchanged. They added a recommended research methods menu that replaces their optional advisory plans. *Approved.*

Resolutions regarding Lecturers:

a. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3.10 of By-Laws; Replacement of Lecturer Senators – Second Reading –M. Dreisbach – attachment – T. C. 3:10

M. Dreisbach reviewed the by-law change.

Discussion points:

- It was asked if a Lecturer Senator is not eligible for two consecutive semesters, would they lose the seat completely? The answer was yes, there would be an election.

Vote on Amendment to Article III, Section 3.10 of By-Laws; Replacement of Lecturer Senators – *Approved.*

b. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3 of By-Laws regarding election of Lecturer Senators –First Reading - M. Dreisbach – attachment – T. C. 3:25

M. Dreisbach said that when Lecturer Senator seats were added to the constitution, the bylaws were never amended. This became known to Structure and Functions and we have worked to amend the by-laws to show the election and nomination of Lecturer Senators. She noted the details of the amendment.

Discussion points:

- It to was asked whether the Lecturer Senators were voted on by the entire faculty. The answer was yes.

S. Wilson moved to waive the first reading in order to expedite the sentence business. Second. There was pro and con discussion about waving the first reading.

Vote on waving the first reading. Yes = 23, No =7. *Approved.*

S. Wilson called the question. No objection. Amendment to Article III, Section 3 of By-Laws regarding election of Lecturer Senators - *Approved.*

President's Report

R. Armiñana reported that three items that impact Sonoma State were approved by

the Board of Trustees at their last meeting. One was the acceptance of the Fred Galbraith Wildlife Preserve which is 3500 acres in Mendocino County – that land comes with a million-dollar endowment that supports the maintenance of the preserve. Secondly the Board approved the Bachelors of Engineering Science. Thirdly, they approved the State Capital programs for years 2005- 2006 which represents \$330 million coming from Proposition 55. In that approval we are in a very good spot for the Music/Faculty offices building that is part of the Green Music Center. There was a great deal of discussion at the meeting about access and transfer, particularly the difficulties we have with transfer from community colleges. But the community colleges have been highly reluctant to support a clear established transfer pattern because there are no incentives for the community colleges to do so. He would not be surprised to soon see legislative action forcing the hand of the community colleges.

Questions for the President

It was noted that there was a heated conversation about the issue of access between Lieutenant Governor Bustmante and Chancellor Reed. The president was asked for his assessment of the meaning of that exchange in the context of the shifting of political alliances in the Legislature and the Governors office with respect to funding CSU operations. The President answered that he would not characterize the discussion as heated, but engaging. The Trustees who met with the Governor said that there was a strong commitment within the limitation of significant state budget deficits and no new revenues, especially through the taxing mechanism. The Trustees asked if the Lieutenant Governor had any ideas about how to accomplish the significantly negative turning away of between 20,000 to 23,000 students. The Lieutenant Governor said if the voters had elected me I would have had more than good ideas to move forward. The idea he proposed was to increase the cigarette tax by an additional \$.25 and allocate that increase towards access. He was reminded because of Proposition 98 none of those taxes would go to higher education. It was a bit political and a bit philosophical.

It was asked what the President thoughts were on the consciousness of the Trustees of the impact on quality that come from the current budget cuts.

The President said he thought the Trustees had a clear understanding that next year this campus will really be impacted in terms of access, quality and affordability. The Trustees are also aware that there are no other resources coming to higher education and that there is a significant danger that by Legislative action we could lose further funding. The Governor has promised not to initiate such action. However, at the last minute the Governor may find it hard to veto a budget that includes more cuts to higher education.

It was asked who will decide which 20,000 student that will apply to the CSU will be turned down. What criteria will be used?

The President said every campus does that differently. He noted that Long Beach State sent 13,000 letters of rejection to qualified students, SSU has sent 1500 similar letters. Some of the students, by the Governor's policy, are being redirected to the

community colleges. He was not sure how this would be done, but the intention is to redirect 10,000.

It was asked how the 1500 from SSU were chosen to receive rejection letters.

The President did not know. He directed the Senate to Katharyn Crabbe for that information. He said 800 –1000 were not admitted because they were not qualified.

Budget Report from R. Armiñana, E. Ochoa, and L. Furukawa-Schlereth

R. Armiñana began. He passed out a handout. He noted that he always thought the cuts to Sonoma State would be \$5 million and it is getting close at \$4.9 million. The numbers will fluctuate a bit based on the mandatory costs. The \$2.2 million is tied to the 5% enrollment reduction. Therefore the target for next year is 6612 FTES which is 348 less FTE than we have this year. That will translate roughly in 550 to 600 students. He noted this was the first time in sixteen years in the CSU he had seen an actual enrollment reduction. This counts for a very significant amount of the budget reduction. We will have less students next year and thus less to teach. Mid-year reductions have already been absorbed. What were thought to be one time reductions mid-year have become permanent, but we have already absorbed it. As a system we have decided to ask for unallocated cuts instead of the line item cuts proposed by the Governor. The enrollment reduction and the unallocated cuts amount to about \$3.3 million out of the \$5 million. This is the first time in his sixteen years that there is not enrollment growth money. In the past, enrollment growth money was used to offset cuts. To help Academic Affairs, enrollment growth monies from Administration and Finance were used to subsidize Academic Affairs. That is not available this year. There are also mandatory increases. In most other years, the state has covered mandatory increases. Again, this year there is no additional funding coming from the state. The mandatory costs shown on the handout are estimates. So we have a \$5 million dollar cut with no new resources coming in. There are two ways to handle this kind of budget cut. One way is to do across the board reductions, which is what he has proposed. Or there could be narrow and deep reductions which means departments and functions are eliminated. He argued that across the board cuts were preferable as eliminating departments takes a minimum of three years and the changes need to happen now. He said he believed that there would be some enrollment growth two years from now. He thought it will not be politically, economically or socially feasible for the state to be turning down 23,000 eligible students in the CSU for a sustained period of time. He stated that he did not believe that the University should layoff permanent employees. He noted that such a case means that temporary employees are unfortunately the next place to look and a significant number of temporary employees are in Academic Affairs. The problem is that the number of temporary employees is not even among departments and divisions. How to balance that out will be difficult. There will be less students and less people to serve them all across the university next year. He affirmed his belief that the enrollment growth will come back in two years. He has not heard from anyone that the CSU will received any more funding in the next fiscal year. He is concerned that the budget could get worse before the final budget is negotiated.

L. Furukawa – Schlereth said that the loss of 348 FTES translates in about 500

students headcount. All those students pay an Associated Students fee, a Student Health fee, a Student Union fee, an IRA fee, parking fees, buys textbooks, etc. All these funds are going to have problems of their own. The Student Union, the Housing Program and the Parking Program are leveraged. We have to watch them closely that they don't get in danger of default on a debt service. Nearly all the support funds are assessed a charge for the services the state provides them. Because the state agencies are losing revenue as well they are increasing their pro-rata charges to the self support funds. The same increases in benefits are affecting the self-support funds. In Administration and Finance the cut is about \$1,100,000. Given the policy not to affect permanent employees that creates a real challenge to this particular division because it doesn't have very many temporary employees, except students. The first cuts in Administration and Finance will come from those temporary student categories. Then we will proceed through vacant positions. This will only work to the extent that not filling vacant positions doesn't compromise the function. Taking solace in what the President says and thinking we will get back those 348 FTES within the next 24 months, we can look at what can we let go of now that we could bring back when the money returns. In the Campus Reengineering Committee there will be extensive consultation on what we can really be curtailed and brought back when we rebound.

E. Ochoa passed out a handout that showed the breakdown for Academic Affairs by Schools and other departments. He pointed out to the body that there were three sets of figures – the 5% enrollment reduction, the unallocated cuts and the mandatory costs for Academic Affairs. Each affects the division differently. He described the figures on the handout. It showed how the budget reductions were hitting all the units. This is now a single scenario they are developing. These figures are relatively stable. There will be smaller and smaller changes with each iteration. The overall magnitude in terms of reductions to the Schools equals the entire part-time faculty budget plus most of the FERP budget. As the President mentioned earlier the part-time and FERP faculty are not equal among departments. If that were the case we would only be seeing a 20% increase in SFR. His office is now working on “hot spots” – departments that could not withstand a mechanical approach to reductions in part-time faculty. There is a deadline of April 15th to mount a schedule for the fall.

R. Armiñana finalized by saying we only have cruel choices and cruel decisions in front of us because these choices affect people's live and careers, both students and other employees. It is a compromise of quality, and of access. Some students will have difficulty getting classes, graduating on time and will have larger classes. 500 deserving students will not be here. There will be a number of people how have been here and should be here, who will not be here. He is fully cognizant of that. But this is where we are as a university, as a system and as a state.

R. Armiñana announced that he was informed earlier this afternoon that Tom Wagner who worked in Student Affairs passed away at 11:30 this morning.

C. Nelson requested a moment of silence for Tom Wagner.

Questions for the budget presentation

The first question was addressed to R. Armiñana. Will EOP be preserved on this campus? R. Armiñana responded that is the intention of the Trustees and the system. It is still in the Governor's budget to eliminate EOP. The system has asked that the reduction be unallocated rather than targeted at EOP.

For Provost Ochoa – A discrepancy was noted between two of the handouts. The total budget impact for the whole university is \$4.9 million of which \$2.6 million is due to decreased enrollment. For Academic Affairs, the total budget impact is \$3.6 million of which almost \$2 million is enrollment reduction. Both of the figures at the top of the pages are over 50% of the figures at the bottom. But on the Academic Affairs handout and looking at the Schools, it appears that the reductions due to enrollment are approximately 1/3 in each case of the total. One would have guessed that the total change would be somewhat less than double, but in most cases are triple. Clarification was requested. E. Ochoa responded there is a difference between the direct instructional cost and the total dollar allocation associated with enrollment that goes to Academic Affairs. The marginal cost formula includes not only direct instruction, but instructional support dollars. When we gave the reduction allocations to the Schools we only used the direct instruction figure. The decrease in target drives the decrease in dollars.

A comment was made that there seemed to be a trend in increasing reductions to Academic Affairs. It was also noted that the Trustees have been talking about restricting access for years and have not been able to pull it off. The administration should be lobbying for more money instead of restricting access. It was questioned that faculty step increases be included in the mandatory costs as CFA believes those SSI increases are self-funding by people at the top step being replaced by people at the lower step. Laying off all the lecturers and the FERPs would seriously compromise the instructional program and then where is the university?

R. Armiñana responded that the numbers keep changing because they are estimates. He affirmed that the budget was also an estimate and said he hasn't found anyone who believes it will get better. We have to plan in what we think is the best scenario which is a lousy scenario. He disagreed that there will be more money. We are compromising quality as he stated before.

Support was voiced for R. Armiñana's decision to not lay off permanent employees. It was noted that most of the temporary employees are on the faculty side of the house and could the other side of the house hire more temporary employees, so the next time this happens that could not be used as a rationale for gutting the faculty?

R. Armiñana responded he would love to see us in a position to have a substantial number of people in any category.

It was asked what underlying principle governs the Presidents division of the funds available to Academic Affairs and Administration and Finance.

R. Armiñana said the marginal cost formula.

It was argued that the marginal cost formula is a formula and not a principle. The President was asked what values he uses in determining the ultimate distribution.

R. Armiñana said the university has a number of administrative mandates that it is required to meet. Therefore an administrative system has to be funded to meet those mandates. He finds that the marginal cost distribution is a fair, easily understood way to distribute funds as they come and go. There are a number of audits yearly to determine that he is delivering on the integrity of the administrative system.

The Provost was asked if he could give the number of faculty positions lost from the dollars known will be lost.

E. Ochoa did not know the number off the top of his head.

The questioner said that in a VPBAC meeting the loss of faculty positions was stated as 54. Where are we now in that respect? He said that in the School of Social Sciences the number of positions lost according to the numbers given from the Provost's office came to 56 positions. His calculation of the SFR in this case was higher than the Provost's numbers.

R. Armiñana said the support for a student by the state in a period of two years will drop by \$1500. E. Ochoa said if we take the dollar figure for the Schools and divide it by the \$63,000 cost per FTEF, we get approximately 50 positions.

Resolution to Assess Faculty Confidence in SSU Academic Senate and Administration - Second Reading - P. Phillips – attachment

The floor was opened for debate and discussion.

Discussion points:

- It was noted that it is a good idea to assess oneself. However, the workload the resolution will create for some people and the lack of consequence from the results obtained argued against the resolution.
- Concern was noted regarding the timelines in the resolution. Would the instruments created be brought back to the Senate to be approved?
- The presenter of the resolution stated that people who are experts in creating instruments have already volunteered to help. It doesn't need to be complicated and he thought it could be done within the timelines in the resolution.
- It was argued that it would be better to put more time into the assessment and better to do it at a different time. There would be a clearer purpose and better outcome if the Senate waits.

- It was argued that if we want to assess confidence in the President, why don't we just say that. It was asked why only the faculty were to be asked regarding this assessment of confidence.
- It was argued that neither the Senate or the Administration is subject to a review worthy of being called a review. The resolution is a good first start in a process. The Senate should support the principle of the resolution and not get bogged down in technical issues. It was suggested that people with technical questions propose amendments that can be voted on by the body.

R. Coleman-Senghor moved the resolution be referred to Structure and Functions to create a committee to do ongoing assessment of the Senate and Administration. Motion failed for lack of second.

E. McDonald moved to amend the resolution by deleting phrase "by April 30, 2004" in second to last resolve clause and delete the last resolve clause. Second.

E. McDonald amended her amendment to change the phrase "by April 30, 2004" to " by November 1, 2004 and to change the last resolve clause "have the first survey done in the final two weeks of the Fall semester." Second.

Discussion Points:

- The presenter of the resolution said he felt the amendment was unnecessary and that there was plenty of time to create the instrument and test it. He argued that this is a critical time for the university. Major policy changes are being made by this body and the administration. An assessment of that process, those decision makings and the transparencies of those seems very important to do as soon as possible.
- It was noted that evaluating the administration is very complicated and would take a very detailed instrument.
- The presenter of the resolution said the resolution is about the confidence the faculty has in the decision-making processes, not individual things - the transparencies in the democratic process that are going on at the university. It would be a broad, more general assessment.
- It was asked who brought the resolution to the Senate besides Senator Phillips. It was argued that it needed to be sent to Structure and Functions to determine the principle and point of the resolution.
- It was reiterated that the amendment does not address the concern that the instrument be brought to the Senate for approval.

Meeting was extended 15 minutes

- By supporting the change of date, we would be supporting the instrument and that is what we should be challenging.
- It was argued that the assessment should be done in a spring, even if not this spring. The underlying principle is, as the speaker regarded it, consent of the governed. Assessment of the Senate and administration has more to do with issues of leadership than with effectiveness. Assessment of leadership of the Senate should occur in the spring before the turnover in Senate chair. The voice of the governed is important. This argument was against the amendment as it stands. If changed to spring that would be another matter.

V. Garlin moved a substitute motion for the main motion. The substitute motion is that the Academic Senate endorse the principle of periodic review of the campus administration and the Academic Senate.

There was no second.

V. Garlin moved to table the resolution until the next meeting. Second. Vote to table resolution – Yes = 17, No = 4. *Approved.*

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom