

Academic Senate Minutes

10/30/03

3:00 – 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Chair's report deferred to end. Agenda amended and approved. Minutes approved. Appointment of Elaine McHugh and Barbara Lesch-McCaffry to Disability Services Advisory Committee approved. Report from Senate Budget Committee. Reports from President, Provost and Vice President of Administration and Finance. Lecturer's Resolution on Enterprises Surplus postponed until next meeting. Resolution regarding sympathy for our colleagues in Southern California unanimously passed. Reports from Associated Students President, Chair-Elect, APC, EPC and Chair.

Present: Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Phil McGough, Susan McKillop, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Birch Moonwomon, Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, Mary Dingle, Derek Girman, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Steve Winter, Myrna Goodman, Peter Phillips, Robert McNamara, Jan Beaulyn, Sandra Shand, Bruce Peterson, Ruben Arminana, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Jason Spencer, Greg Tichava, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Brigitte Lahme

Absent: Victor Garlin, Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Steve Cuellar, Raye Lynn Thomas, Ephriam Freed, Amy Wingfield, Meri Storino

Proxies: GeriAnn Olson for Meri Storino

Guests: Katie Pierce, Judith Hunt, Steve Orlick, Rose Bruce,

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

Report deferred to end of meeting.

Correspondences: None

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda – S. Wilson moved to take from the table the Lecturer's Resolution on Enterprises Surplus and add to today's agenda. Second S. Brannen. No objection. Request from Statewide Senators to add a brief resolution to the agenda regarding the Senate expressing it's sympathy for the victims of the Southern California fires. Some people on sister campuses have lost their homes. No objection. *MSP*

Approval of Minutes - *MSP*

One Year Appointment of Elaine McHugh and Barbara Lesch-McCaffry to Disability Services Advisory Committee – *Approved.*

Senate Budget Committee report – A. Merrifield

A. Merrifield passed out an interim budget report to the Academic Senate from the Academic Senate's budget committee. He highlighted points in the report. The report was approved unanimously by the Senate Budget committee and may need some modification after the recent Vice President's Budget Advisory Committee (VPBAC) meeting. He stated the purpose of the report was to demonstrate our concern of the relationship between the budgetary process and the planning process at Sonoma State because of the nature of a university and because of the fact that virtually everything done at the university in all major programs are budget driven as opposed to goal driven. Thus the VPBAC has been used in the past as the core committee for discussing all kinds of planning, programs, and issues at Sonoma State. The last time we had a budget crisis similar to this the university created the Academic Redesign Coordinating Committee. This group was made up as a committee that came out of the VPBAC because that's where so much of the expertise was for planning. One of our major concerns of the SBC is that the VPBAC is not being used to its optimum. We do not want to see the VPBAC which is established under the university to become either an organization whose sole function is to cut and slash in the name of efficiency nor do we want to see it as a rubber stamp too late in the process of advising the Provost to have any real impact and take full advantage of faculty expertise on budgetary and planning issues. We recommend that the VPBAC do what it has done so effectively over these years, to not only talk about issues dealing directly with any expected or unexpected expense that any organization has, but that's one of the things the VPBAC has always done. For example, he knows of no year there hasn't been some kind of unexpected expense some point during the semester or year because of the something that comes from the Chancellor's office, etc. And the VPBAC has always been the organization that deals with those issues. In addition, because there is this push for planning, the ad hoc committee being put together, when we talked to Provost Ochoa a couple of weeks ago he assured us that the VPBAC and the planning committee would go on parallel. There are certain issues we feel the VPBAC should be meeting on, should be discussing on an on-going basis partially because of this external budget crunch. Issues like funding for general education reform, grant funding for the planning process, fiscal models for integrating the budgets and GE and EMT program, a university wide fiscal model for GE funding that could support university wide academic planning models, these are the kinds of things that could be going on whether we have Governor Schwarzenegger's proposed budget cuts or budget enhancements, probably not enhancements, whether we have those or not, these issues are real issues that could be going on in the VPBAC. Another obvious important issue that we need to be looking at in budget hard times are ways to generate more funds for curriculum through grants and donations that are directly related to the academic planning process. Other issues that could be taken up in the VPBAC that we think are important in the current situation are support for essential local enrollment in liberal arts and sciences majors, support of maintenance of (*basic pedagogy? – loud sounds on tape made this hard to make out*) impacted majors, the continuation of seminars as capstone courses. So there are lots of different things. These were ideas generated by the SBC that the VPBAC should and could be talking about whether we have new information out of Long Beach and Sacramento or not. That's what compelled the committee to bring this interim report as that is our single greatest concern. We understand and applaud that any dynamic organization has to constantly be talking, discussing, dealing with options, etc. and thus the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning committee makes a great deal of sense. But not as a replacement for the vital function and institutionalization of faculty governance which is not after all we do out of tradition, but out of necessity since the faculty must both deliver the service and

design it faculty governance is fundamental. That is the report, plus the written document that the committee asked me to bring to the Senate.

B. Peterson asked as Chair of the Senate budget committee did he feel it was appropriate for the SSP's to have a role in this? Because the document here definitely doesn't include us as we're not part of the VPBAC and we're not represented in the Schools, is there any place we could have input as well? A. Merrifield responded that his understanding was that the SBC primarily has dealt with faculty based issues, he would not suggest they are rejecting or ignoring information from any source and since you are members of the Senate information could come through the Senate. The SBC is really an organization that is trying to observe all the various budget committees on campus, all the budget issues on campus seeking information because there was this feeling in the past that you had the Campus Reengineering committee, the PBAC, VPBAC, and the communication wasn't always clear to the Senate. So our role was to try to bring that information together. Simultaneously we are always open to information from anybody in the jurisdiction of the Senate that wants to bring us information. B. Peterson stated that it seemed discussions in the Senate we are starting to look at what exactly is the role of ESAS and Academic Affairs and since the majority of SSP's are housed in ESAS, again we don't seem to have a particular vehicle for input unless it's the Senate. A. Merrifield responded that if the SSP's wanted to get membership on the VPBAC, that's something that would work through the Senate.

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

R. Armiñana said he was supposed to be in Southern California and was there yesterday and wanted to report that if you fly to LA in the evening there's this red glow because of the smoke and all the lights and it looks very Hallowe'en-ish, but very eerie. If you have a respiratory ailment it is not a good place now, even at LAX you can feel and smell the smoke. The reason he was here was that the meeting that he was to attend tomorrow, the Board of Trustees to consider the budget, was cancelled. The budget will now be taken under consideration at the next meeting of the Board which he thinks is Nov. 18 or 19, one day after the new Governor takes office. In the note we got it says in preliminary discussions with the new administration it is clear Governor-Elect Schwarzenegger is attempting to address the state's budget deficit immediately upon taking office. While the staff in Finance have been working toward preparation of a budget for the new Governor to present to the Legislature, the changing leaderships quite naturally has resulted in the assessment and reevaluation of priorities for the incoming Governor. The Governor-Elect is proposing a special session of the legislature that could immediately begin addressing the State's financial crisis. Given the uncertainty of any CSU mid year budget issues as a result of this special session, we have decided to postpone the adoption and submittal of the Trustees budget. This additional time will allow more information about the State's fiscal situation to be available. Considering of the 2004-2005 budget which was scheduled for October 31st will be taken up at November 18 and 19 meeting. So you know as much as I do. On Tuesday there was a special meeting of the Board of Directors for Enterprises, and at that meeting the Board unanimously approved that the President of the Board, which happens to be me, is allowed to be engaged in negotiations up to \$5 million for the acquisition for some land that fits the category specified by the faculty housing committee. He was delighted with that, but it does talk about commitments of the foundation which might be related to another item.

N. Byrne stated that he understood the amount of land that might be purchased was anywhere from 40 to 100 acres, was that a correct amount? R. Armiñana responded it was within those numbers. We're in negotiations, therefore he would not be specific. B. Moonwomon asked if there is \$5 million and how does this fit in your mind with compliance to the Supplemental Language Report that calls on campuses to reallocate, or find outside funding for instruction. R. Armiñana stated he believed they are in total compliance with the report language. He wanted to make it very clear that what we have is a report, it is not a directive, with that aside, he believed the institution has complied and will comply with the Supplemental Report Language and that's how we've committed all our funds. These are not in that category. These are funds that are designated to meet one of the highest priorities that this institution has put forth, that is to provide an affordable opportunity for housing for recently hired and to be hired faculty.

P. Phillips stated that at the beginning of the semester it was reported to this body that the \$700,000 in surplus from Enterprises was needed to have equity to build a student center. Has there been re-prioritization of this money? R. Armiñana responded that the University Center remains an important priority but the higher priority has always been the potential acquisition of land for faculty housing. Enterprise must play and can play a very significant role in making that possible. It is not a reallocation, it's that the first priority has always been the acquisition of suitable lands. P. Phillips said does that mean the Student Center will be delayed significantly or is there another pot of money that's been saved up. R. Armiñana responded no, there is not another pot of money. He cannot answer if the Center will be delayed significantly because there has never been a timeline for it. G. Tichava stated that what bothers him about this is that the talk of priorities, it seems to him the highest priority is students, classes and instruction. R. Armiñana responded we believe that under the present allocation that priority is being met adequately. G. Tichava said he submitted that if you ask a student that has had their classes cut they will not agree with that. R. Armiñana said he believed given what we have, those priorities have been met adequately. At a university you have a number of priorities and sometime you have to plan for the future rather than commit everything to the present and also take advantage of windows of opportunity and faculty housing has been a major priority, it's in many of the documents that planning has created. There is a window of opportunity at this time. G. Tichava said that since we are in this crisis, why \$5 million, why not a couple million? R. Armiñana said because the land available would cost approximately that amount.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated he could understand part of the frustration being expressed and he thought it was captured by the pronoun "we", "we have decided" or "we have these priorities." The only plan that he knows of that all sectors of the university have shared in common is the plan that was produced in 1991. There is a fundamental difference between a planning objective and a priority. So the question becomes who has done the prioritizing. Who is the "we" that has prioritized? R. Armiñana said he would say ultimately it is the President's job to do that. But he has taken into consideration lots of other inputs, most recently the planning document from the committee R. Coleman-Senghor head has shared with us, clearly said faculty housing was one of the priorities. R. Coleman-Senghor stated he differed. What was in the document is that these are one of our main objectives. He did concede that there has been a pressing need that has been announced in this body of the need for housing for incoming faculty. But we are standing at a very important point here where we are seeing that some of our planning options have not been formulated collectively as planning priorities. Given the fact that we have options, is there a way we can adjust those options so we may be able to maximize it. Your

conclusion as he hears it is that the press of the bargaining going on right now forecloses us moving from one to another. Is that correct? R. Armiñana responded that he did not understand the statement. R. Coleman-Senghor re-stated that the press of your negotiations around the property which ties up a certain amount of money forecloses other options that we may have. R. Armiñana responded absolutely. R. Coleman-Senghor said so that structures us in a set of priorities that we may collectively not have agreed with but the circumstances require us to respond to it. R. Armiñana said timing is everything.

S. Brannen stated he was personally in favor of the university acquiring land for faculty housing. Also, you're going to borrow \$5 million dollars, it's not that you have \$5 million that you can use otherwise, such as to fund classes. Presumably, you'll pay the mortgage with some of the money the faculty pay and the subsidize the rest with Enterprises or something? R. Armiñana responded the cost of the house is manageable, it's the cost of the land. In order to make it affordable you have to subsidize, therefore somebody has to buy the land and provide the land to you as a potential homeowner basically free to allow you to pay for the improvements of the land, the house, at a cost that meets your ability to pay. S. Brannen asked what is this going to cost the School to pay off this loan and what is Enterprises going to be faced with every year? R. Armiñana responded that somebody will probably buy the land from the Enterprises at some point. You need the Enterprises to create the transaction especially in a short period of time. There will be some cost in determining of the land is suitable, in terms of no hazardous materials there, our friend the salamander (unintelligible), there will be a set of costs to do the due diligence and probably a set up cost for infrastructure.

Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs - (E. Ochoa)

E. Ochoa updated the body on the Strategic Planning meeting for Academic Affairs. We've received RSVP's from 175 people. He passed around the membership of the committee as it stands now. These are the 35 people and 3 resource people that constitute the Strategic Planning Committee for Academic Affairs. They are going to be following up on the two community meetings we are having tomorrow and the following Friday, Nov. 7th. The second handout shows the agenda for the remainder of the semester for the Strategic Planning exercise. In the first meeting we will set the stage for the whole process, the facilitator will review the model we will use with all attendees. Then there will be open conversation about culture and values in Academic Affairs and then there will be an exercise known as SWOT – strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats, which is a standard exercise in strategic planning, taking stock of your own internal strengths and weaknesses and then looking externally and looking at threats and opportunities to our organization. He discussed how the first meeting would be organized. At the second meeting we'll start a conversation on mission and vision that will be fairly unstructured, not geared toward crafting language, but would just get the ideas out there. The afternoon of the 7th, the committee itself will convene and start taking all that information in that has been generated from the two community meetings and try to boil it down to some language that captures the essence of what we discussed. The committee will continue meeting and elaborate a strategy and if all goes swimmingly, we will have a first draft available for distribution to the Division and the entire university for review and comment after the last meeting on Dec. 5th. The committee will convene again in the Spring to digest all of the feedback from the community and make adjustments where appropriate to the first draft. From there on, it depends on how its going.

R. Karlsrud said he had a quibble about the designations on the committee membership. He was confused as to the people who were MPP's but listed as staff. One of the points made last time was that the VPBAC couldn't do this because there were too many managers. He was worried this was over-managed as well. Are there others on this list that are not properly designated as staff? He suggested that managers be listed as such if not as administrators. E. Ochoa responded that they have been scanning the list, the small committee of six. This didn't come up. R. Karlsrud said he was bringing it up and that some people might be offended at being excluded as managers on this campus.

R. McNamara asked how were the School reps decided upon? E. Ochoa responded that the group of six had a conversation about it, people had some suggestions. He did ask for recommendations from the Deans as he does not know people yet very well so any recommendations he asked why that recommendation and brought those to the group. Other names came up that were not from him at all. So the list came out as a consensus of that group of six. R. McNamara asked if there would be an interim report on what happens tomorrow for those who cannot be there the first week so they'll know what happened. E. Ochoa responded typically what is going to happen during the Strategic Planning process is that the facilitator at the end of each meeting will summarize the outcome of that meeting and he will bring that back for the committee to approve. Once approved we can post it and people can see a running log of what's being developed. For the community meeting that is also the way we would normally proceed. The first and second meetings are going to generate a lot of text. Then probably what will happen is the first meeting of the entire committee will try to boil it down and find some common threads in all those ideas. The facilitator will take that and make it more concise. So in terms of actual product, nothing until the second meeting of the committee. If you are talking about just what happened, we have not talked about that yet. With 175 people there there will be a lot of word of mouth accounts. R. McNamara asked C. Nelson as co-chair if there could at least be some guide for people who can't go to the first meeting. It doesn't need to be definitive. C. Nelson responded that is exactly what she planned to do.

(<http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate/spnlsrpt1.html>) She will run it by the Provost as he is co-chair. It will not be an official record, it will not be commentary on what happened, but she will do her best to convey not only what happened but to give a sense of kinds of things. She planned to do this for the next community meeting as well. R. Coleman-Senghor responded to the question of individuals designated as staff and faculty or whatever. The committee believed what our task was to get interesting and engaged people who had been working on areas in the university onto the committee. The first thing that came up was how can we be talking about changes on the academic side without taking a look at what's going to happen at the level of Academic Coordinators. It always comes down to the Academic Coordinators having to do what we want to be done. The same with a manager who is working with what the Academic Coordinators need. When we looked at the question of which faculty there was a discussion of how representative we might be and looking toward the future, there was a discussion of looking at faculty who have been here for a short period of time, newer faculty who could bring new perspectives and look toward the future with vision, etc. Those individual would be chosen from their schools within this time frame, we went after people who were working in specific areas and had experience among a range of different programs, from Graduate programs to EMT to General Education. Finally as for a report that was one of the first things we talked about, how we were going to get back to our faculty with a report. He sees two ways this can happen. As Chair of the Academic Planning committee he felt obliged to report back any planning on this campus. And the Chair would be obliged in the same way. E. Ochoa

stated we are developing a website (<http://www.sonoma.edu/provost/planning/index.html>) for this strategic planning process and for the members of the committee we have developed a very large binder of information. It contains sort of a survey of the internal resources the university has, structure and so forth and an environmental scan on the potential restraints we have on our own actions. It's a common knowledge base that committee members will have. A copy will be available in his office and in the Senate office. The website will post as much of the contents of the binder that are available electronically. The on-going summaries will be posted on the website too. G. Tichava stated he emailed the Provost about the issue of calling managers staff. He thought that they should be called what they are. After you tally the numbers there are 15 administrators on the committee, the least is staff, closely followed by students. He saw that as the value put on staff and students in the planning process is not very high. The length of the meetings are three hours which makes it impossible for staff to participate, unless cleared by a manager, to miss three hours out of a day. He realized that the make up of the committee was up to the Provost, but he did want to mention that there was only one staff person and staff will be the ones to implement all these changes and all the plans will eventually come down to staff and he thought it was important that staff have input. He thought the students were in the same boat. It's going to effect them quite a bit and having only two students seems to be short too. He asked again to reconsider get actual working staff who have to implement plans onto the committee.

E. McDonald asked what role the resource individuals play in the process and are they going to be attending committee meetings. E. Ochoa expected that they would and they would be available for clearing up informational questions that come up and anytime we start delving in to areas where they have knowledge and expertise, we might want to query them about those. One big reason to have them there is so they are aware of the emerging strategy because they have areas of responsibility that they can fulfill better if they understand the thinking behind the strategy. E. McDonald asked how exactly are they different than the regular committee members. E. Ochoa responded they are not going to have the responsibility for actually developing the strategy.

S. Shand stated she appreciate the effort gone into trying to get input from a representative group and she brings a concern voiced to her by Student Services Professional's (SSP) earlier today. Their concern was that although we do have managers from ESAS where the bulk of SSP's reside, there are no rank and file, front line people on the committee. While SSP's are and their managers are often in concert, there are other areas where you might get a difference of opinion that might be helpful in looking at all sides of an issue. S. McKillop stated her count for faculty is 14, administrators 16 and 4 of them are from ESAS. The balance is strange from her perspective. Not about who is particularly in the roles, she was regretful that the faculty does not play a larger role since we are a big part of this institution. E. Stanny asked how the School reps were selected and whether they are representing the school and whether you would consider having them elected by the Schools. She was addressing anyone in on the decision. C. Nelson responded that the represented by the Schools were chosen as the Provost has indicated by consensus by the gang of six. There was a full discussion among members of the committee of all the names that came forward. The Provost did not hand pick the committee. It was just a discussion among us, who the Deans had recommended, who we knew, who we knew in other Schools. She was surprised how many people on the committee knew people outside their own School. There was no time to do an election, if one considers the time frame we had to

move on this. Maybe that would have been preferable. Her original idea was to have the VPBAC faculty representing the Schools on the committee and she was out-voted. R. McNamara stated that since there's been some concern expressed about faculty representation on this, should the Chair of the Faculty give some kind of report from a faculty perspective to the Senate and is there going to be an official minority report? C. Nelson responded that if the Senate wants a report from the Chair to the Senate on an on-going basis, the Chair of the Senate would be more than happy to provide that for the Senate. E. Ochoa stated the question came up in the group of six of how the committee was really going to work and his response is that it is a working committee and it is a partnership with the Academic Senate and Academic Affairs. He fully anticipates they will move forward by consensus. He doesn't see the need for a minority report. If a minority perspective starting arising that required a report, we'd have to go back to the drawing board and try to come up with an alternative framework that can generate consensus. C. Nelson stated her sense was that if a minority wanted to talk they should be able to talk. If the minority wanted to make a report, they should be able to do so. She and the Provost have a disagreement on this.

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth thanked the Senate for the opportunity to bring them up to date on the campus' faculty/staff housing initiative. He provided a bit of context. The faculty/staff housing committee was formed five years ago. At that time Dr. Armiñana came to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and was very concerned about the pressure the campus was facing attracting and retaining new professors largely because of the high cost of living in Sonoma County. He spoke in the Executive Committee at that time of the need to address this issue. He asked the Executive Committee to create a committee, which they were gracious enough to do and he asked the Provost and L. Furukawa-Schlereth to co-chair the committee. We identified professors through the normal process the Executive Committee does to study this issue and there is an elected member from every School on the faculty/staff housing committee who have been studying this project and initiative for some five years. He co-chaired the committee with Professor Sue Hayes from Business and Economics and on at least three occasions Dr. Hayes has come to this body to bring everyone up to date as to where we stand with the initiative. We discussed this project every month in the Campus Reengineering Committee, where the project remains a priority agreed to by that committee on which many professors sit. So it's not something that should be real new to the Senate. He has asked on each occasion if the priority for this has remained high for the Senate and the answer has always been yes. So speaking on behalf of our committee, they really see it as a priority for the campus. There are other partners in this project. It is not just faculty housing. There are at least four other partners that have been engaged to work with us. First, the staff employees. He was not sure how many were aware, it's becoming equally difficult recruit new library assistants, police officers, financial aid technicians and admissions and records workers, so forth because they can't live here either. We're increasing importing literally people from Cloverdale and Vallejo, who drive many miles to get here. It's just simply too expensive. So the staff have vested interest in this project as well and we sometimes overlook them. It's probably time to incorporate a staff person on the committee for the planning for this initiative. Another important priority are the students. Students sit with me on the Campus Reengineering where there are four students and they have consistently expressed a need for two types of housing for student body that we have been unable to address. The first group is affinity or Greek housing, housing for fraternities and sororities which we don't

have, all types of affinities, international and such that have been expressed interest in. And the other thing has to do with family housing for students, married student housing which does not exist at Sonoma State at all. It is very difficult to do with the land that we have. So student housing becomes increasing important as we look ahead. So the students are clearly partners in this engagement. And then finally colleagues in the surrounding educational community, specifically two areas, the Cotati-Rohnert Park school district, while they are not currently facing a big recruitment surge in their teachers due to shrinking enrollments, they do think that will turn in the years ahead and they will also be in the situation where they will have to recruit teachers and they would very much like to partner with us. We've had discussions also with Santa Rosa Junior College who has campuses in Petaluma and Santa Rosa and they have expressed interest in working with us to create affordable housing opportunities for their people. It is the case that we did go forward, the faculty/staff housing committee members to the Sonoma State Enterprises Board to ask them on behalf of the university Board of Trustees permitting the Enterprises to negotiate for certain parcels of land which we think might be available. The reason we are using the Enterprises is because in real estate transactions sometimes time is of the essence and you have to be able to make an offer quickly, negotiate the offer, otherwise you might lose it to another buyer. Within the CSU, because we are a state university it is somewhat difficult to get to our Board of Trustees quickly. Normally, there's a sixty day lead time before we can get to them, so frequently it is necessary in a real estate transaction to use an auxiliary organization to make the offer, then proceed through the process to the Board of Trustees. So in effect what will happen here, the Enterprises, if the land deal is accepted, will hold the land for a short period of time and ultimately sell it to the CSU. But he did want to be clear that it does tie up the finances of Enterprises for this period of time while we're in the process of due diligence. He knew the Senators wanted to know - is this project economically feasible for our university at this point? There are all sorts of issues we need to study about the land, such as are there cultural significances there, is it a sacred burial site, are there environmental hazards, the salamander issue the President raised, what about issues of sewage and water and all these technical issues. All these need to be addressed during our due diligence period which we will do, but probably the most important thing we have to do over the next few months is understand whether the project is economically viable. Do faculty really want affordable housing, is it an important project for students, what do the staff think, how will we afford it, what impact does that have on our difficult budget situations that we face now and for probably the next two years, and where does this fit in the long term vision of this institution. The committee is absolutely committed to exploring those issues within the context of shared governance. There is no doubt that a project of this magnitude, when an institution embarks upon it, there will be sacrifices we will make if we want to be successful. So we really need to understand what those sacrifices are in real terms and we need to make sure the entire campus wants to move forward. He remains committed to do that and he know Dr. Armiñana does as well. It was R. Armiñana idea to start this initiative. That's where we stand. The financial implications for the campus will become clear once the land is negotiated and we go through this due diligence period and we have chance to back away from the deal during the due diligence period. So all we're really doing at this point is putting forward an opportunity, exploring that opportunity and now it's getting real. If the offer is accepted and we decide to proceed, we really do have a project to play with. It's coming at the worst possible moment, but partly that's why it's coming because the economy is not good and real estate values are not strong and that's why the price that's out there is (*unintelligible due to cough*). It could be happening at the best of times and worst of times. The Chair of the

committee, Sue Hayes will be glad to come as we get more into this as would the whole committee if the Senate wishes. He will provide regular reports to the Senate.

N. Byrne thanked L. Furukawa-Schlereth and thought that he offered some useful detail and a clear statement. He said that he knows that Enterprises has taken on debt previous to this point, the \$6 million for Salazar expense, how much debt has Enterprises taken on at this point? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded it's about \$5,800,000 at this point because we paid down the \$6 million a bit. For them it's a pretty big amount of debt. N. Byrne asked about the long term debt the university has taken on, for example, the parking lot construction and acquisition of land. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded we have debt in the following places: Student Union Corporation for the Recreation Center, \$15 million; University Housing Program is most leveraged, \$60 million; Parking, \$12 million; Enterprises \$6 million. We are well within the normal leverage of an organization our size.

R. McNamara stated he believed this was an important project and it would be hypocritical to say we have not brought this up as an issue in the Senate and as someone who was on our hiring committee last year, it was clearly the number one issue for faculty out of the area was how much does it cost to live here. For the record he wanted to say this is in the forefront of our concerns. Having said that, he believes the number one concern that we have is instruction dollars. There aren't going to be enough faculty here to fill the houses if we keep canceling classes. He asked L. Furukawa-Schlereth to consider carefully and for the committee to do their homework because he's very concerned about the crisis we're in. S. Wilson asked what does affordable mean? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded with a personal opinion that affordable housing means that if a faculty member gets an offer from Sonoma and a Midwest university, housing would not be a factor in the decision. The more subsidy from the campus the lower the price to the professor or staff member. That is the equation we are going to be playing with over the next few months. Just how much subsidy is the institution willing to put into it during these difficult times. M. Dreisbach stated she was one of the faculty members on the faculty / staff housing advisory committee, we meet fairly regularly and we've considered various projects in depth over five years and we are aware of passing opportunity and as difficult as it was for us to support a position to submit an offer at this time given our current budget situation, we are a committee that who has been preparing for the future and we also recognize that in the future we are going to be losing a great portion of our senior faculty and have faculty coming in that won't be able to afford to live here. This timing seemed good as the land is affordable to us and it's also within distance of the campus and it will take time to get this project to fruition. There's three years involved in preparation for the first house. We came to an agreement to opt for this land, but it wasn't an easy decision.

G. Olson asked if there was a formula for designating a certain number of units to each interested partner. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that a lot of it depends on where the student enrollment growth will be, we figure about 1300 additional beds for students housing over the years to come. We think from our survey of faculty that there are about 150 faculty, we haven't done the staff yet. The junior college said to me informally that they are in the market for maybe 80 homes. To be a partner you have to pay. If we get the land, we'll start a master planning process in which we will engage the whole campus community in dialog about what do we do with this now. How do we best allocate the space.

R. Coleman-Senghor directed his question to President Armiñana. He asked for a report about the Green Music Center and its cost to our campus. C. Nelson stated that she has requested the President, the Provost, the VP for Administration and Finance, the Director of Development, Professor Langley and Professor Ross that they present a comprehensive report to the Senate either the end of the semester or beginning of the next semester on the Green Music Center. It will literally take a meeting and a half to get all the details out on the table.

Lecturer's Resolution on Enterprises Surplus

S. Wilson passed around an amended version of the resolution that R. Karlsrud supplied and identified the major changes. He hoped these amendments would find favor with the Senate. The resolution was determined to be a second reading. S. Wilson proposed R. Karlsrud's amendments be amended to the resolution. M. Dudley-Flores second. C. Nelson asked if there was any objection to considering the amended resolution as the resolution we are considering. No objection. L. Furukawa-Schlereth noted that some of the language was incorrect. Instead of "unexpended reserve" the correct term is "added to the fund balance." He also said the corporation is not expected to post another unexpended reserve in the current year. That is not a correct statement. S. Brannen noted that in the last Whereas the "a" needs to be stricken and in the Resolved augment should be spelled correctly. He stated he did not think the body had a good definition of what "unexpended funds" meant. J. Spencer stated to his knowledge there will be no addition to the fund balance this year. He agrees with the intent of the conversation to use any sort of excess money generated by Enterprises for instruction. He suggested a Whereas clause that spoke to this issue in the future. P. Phillips stated the resolution presented to us was an opportunity for the body to affirm that our number one priority at this university is instructing students and that we would expect surplus monies from auxiliaries to be used for instructing students in times of crisis. He noted the cuts to lecturers and more cuts to come. Operating budgets are half of what they were ten years ago. The student/faculty ratio in the Sociology Department is 29:1. At the CFA hearing yesterday, faculty spoke about the various impacts to instruction the cuts have had and they are extensive. We've been dealing with this resolution for six weeks. We were originally told there were no plans for the President to make any recommendations towards instruction for this money. Two weeks later we were told \$100,000 was coming to the Library. But we were told the balance of the money was needed for equity funds to build a student center. Now a new opportunity has emerged where all this money has to be committed to housing for faculty, which will clearly split some of us. He argued that still the number one priority of the university is instruction and when there are surplus funds in times of a crisis this resolution clearly addresses that fact that we believe this is where the priority should go.

R. Whitkus agreed with P. Phillips that we're facing a serious problem in terms of our ability to provide instruction. His concern was whether the current resolution is going to accomplish what we want to do because it is saying things that cannot be carried out. We are posturing without getting anything done. He thought the resolution should say something that can be acted upon rather than say something that can be easily ignored. **R. Luttmann moved that the third whereas read: the SSU Enterprises added approximately \$700,000 to its fund balance last year and to delete the rest of that Whereas clause. Second.** E. Stanny noted "unexpended funds" was still in the resolved clause. J. Spencer suggested it would make sense to change the language in both places. **S. Brannen moved to amend the amendment to include the Resolved clause changed to Enterprises make a**

good faith effort to make funding instruction its number one priority. Second. L. Furukawa-Schlereth noted that is it not possible for the university or Enterprises to make funding instruction their first priority under the law. Their first priority is support the activities for which the corporation is established and that is to run retail, dining and commercial services for the university. They will just say, no, we can't, as much as we'd like to, it's not possible. **P. Phillips called the question. Second. Vote on calling the question Yes = 6, No = 17, failed. R. McNamara moved to postpone to our next meeting. Second. Vote on postponing to next meeting – voice vote, ayes majority, passed.**

Resolution regarding sympathy for our colleagues in Southern California

S. McKillop stated the resolution is one sentence. *Be it resolved that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University extends it's sympathy and concern to all the victims of the fires of Southern California and in particular to those who are students, faculty and staff at sister CSU campuses.* She suggested the Chair send a letter with this message to the Senates of the affected campuses. **S. McKillop moved that the Chair write a letter with that language in it to the Chairs of the Senates in that geographic area where the fires are occurring. Second. Vote = unanimously passed.**

Chair asked to extend meeting to 5:10. No objection.

President of the Associated Students - (J. Spencer)

J. Spencer reported this Monday the Associated Students passed two resolutions. The first one asks that the President of the University, the Academic Senate and the University Affairs division to work with the Associated Students Vice President of University Affairs to put together a comprehensive list of all the committees with all the basic information needed to appoint students to the committees in one central location. Once we have that our VP of University Affairs will keep it updated and posted on our website. We're asking the help of this body, Laurel is already helping with that, and the University Affairs as well by November 30th because registration begins December 1, so that way students can actually consider what committees they want to serve on and when they meet while they are making their schedules. The second one is supporting a sustainability policy in the CSU. That has to do with building sustainable buildings with certified standards. We know we've already made that commitment on this campus with Salazar and our Environmental Technology Center. The student's have made that commitment with the Recreation Center which is just a smidge off platinum-league standards and will definitely be gold. We would like to build to the solar ratings. We see that they don't cost anymore than silver league standards, but we are not asking that the CSU or specific universities incur the cost of actually being certified by the organization which is between \$20,000 and \$50,000. We don't feel that spending that kind of cash for certification is important, but still build buildings to these standards looking toward the future. We have already done this on this campus and the resolution asks that this message be conveyed to the faculty via the Academic Senate that students are interested in moving toward this kind of sustainable design and build policy throughout the CSU. We will taking this as a statement as a Statewide organization to the Trustees as well. R. Coleman-Senghor asked if they had looked at the Academic Senate website. J. Spencer said yes, he had talked to Laurel and they have about 70% of what they want. *(AS resolution's are attached to these minutes.)*

Chair-Elect of the Senate - (M. Dreisbach)

M. Dreisbach reported that a call for nominations has gone out for the Campus Planning Committee. Structure and Functions will be selecting two faculty members to sit on that committee at our next meeting.

Statewide Senators - (S. McKillop, P. McGough)

P. McGough – No report

Chairs, Standing Committee - (Coleman-Senghor, McDonald, Stanny, SAC rep)

APC

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that APC had reviewed with the School of Education their joint Doctorate with the University of California, Davis and Sacramento State. There are some interesting elements within that proposal which he will present at the next meeting.

EPC

E. McDonald reported that today at EPC Rose Bruce came to talk about a survey she would like to administer to faculty called Faculty Survey of Student Engagement. It's a parallel survey that we gave to our students two years ago. This is being done by Indiana University Center for Secondary Research and it is designed to measure faculty expectations for student engagement in educational practices. We will be finding out more about it, but we gave it our unanimous support as an important way to get our voice heard and how we compare to institutions around the country. Further the General Education subcommittee has been working very hard on developing a path to GE reform. This year one of the their main goals will be to gather as much input and feedback from the Schools, the various relevant committees, as possible. This is a very deliberate process and not rushed in anyway. It's a faculty initiated process and she asked the body to be aware that they will be creating a formal process to gain that input from the Schools and committees throughout this year.

FSAC

E. Stanny – No report.

SAC

B. Lahme – No report.

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

C. Nelson reported that she had a meeting with Associate Vice President of Development, Tony Apolloni and Dr. Ilene Warren, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs regarding the work they are doing with the Sponsored Programs subcommittee and FSAC on a variety of policies, including an intellectual property policy, a lobbying policy, a misconduct in research policy, and a conflict of interest policy. It is her understanding that these policies will be coming before the Sponsored Programs subcommittee and FSAC between now and the end of this academic year. FSAC is working closely with the

Associate Vice President and Director on these policies. She informed the body that this is one of the ways we are trying to develop working relationships with the administration on those things we can work together on leaving plenty of opportunity for faculty review and dissent in the process. She made that very clear in the meeting. The CSU commission on the Extended University is issuing a request for project proposals for the 03-04 academic year. They are seeking projects that will advance the CSU's principle extended education objectives which include outreach to underserved populations, development of regional and statewide instructional programs, the development of distance education programs and the development of international programs. Finally project proposals are due on March 26, 2004. If anyone is interested, she has the information. Included in the last Trustees agenda was a timeline of the budget process the CSU goes through with the state legislature between now and next June. Very briefly, in November and December CSU meets with the Governor's office and the Department of Finance staff, in January the Governor is required to submit his or her budget to the legislature, in February the budget is reviewed by the Legislative Analyst's office, in March and April budget subcommittee meetings happen in the Legislature, in May the Governor's revise to the January budget comes out, and theoretically in June there are two house conference committees and the official deadline for the budget adoption occurs.

Adjourned 5:04

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom