

**Senate Minutes**  
12/18/03  
3:00 – 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Agenda and minutes approved. Chair's report. Consent items: Duties of S&F in the by-laws, Amendment to Grade Appeal Policy, Spanish Program 4 unit conversion all approved. Special Report on the financial status of the Green Music Center. Long Range Academic Plan and its relation to Strategic Plan discussion. Resolution regarding Grade Posting by PeopleSoft Software first reading waived, resolution failed. Reports from Provost, Vice President Administration and Finance, and Chair-Elect.

**Present:** Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Phil McGough, Rick Luttmann, Robert Karlsrud, Victor Garlin, Birch Moonwomon, Steve Wilson, Elizabeth Burch, Elizabeth Martinez, Eric McGuckin, Heidi LaMoreaux, Robert Train, Liz Thach, Mary Dingle, Raye Lynn Thomas, Derek Girman, Edith Mendez, Richard Whitkus, Sam Brannen, Steve Winter, Myrna Goodman, Peter Phillips, Robert McNamara, Jan Beaulyn, Sandra Shand, Bruce Peterson, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Jason Spencer, Ephriam Freed, Amy Wingfield, Greg Tichava, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Brigitte Lahme

**Absent:** Susan McKillop, Marilyn Dudley-Flores, Steve Cuellar, Bob Vieth, Ruben Armiñana

**Proxies:** Geri Ann Olson for Meri Storino

**Guests:** Floyd Ross, Rose Bruce, Jeff Langley

**Consent Items:**

**Approval of the Agenda** – C. Nelson explained why some items that were previously on the agenda did not appear on this agenda. *MSP*

**Approval of Minutes** - Minutes of 12/4/03 emailed. *MSP*; Peterson, Beaulyn and Shand abstentions

**Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson**

C. Nelson reported that Kathy Kaiser, the Faculty Trustee and the Statewide Senate chair Bob Cherny will be on campus Thursday, March 4<sup>th</sup>. They will be attending the Senate. We will have an opportunity to talk to them about what's going on statewide, give some input, ask questions, that kind of thing, more details are coming. The Faculty Retreat is Thursday January 22<sup>nd</sup> from 9-3. We are going to be talking about the definition of a liberal arts and sciences education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The first thing we are going to talk about is why we have chosen this profession, second thing is we will have a panel discussion of what a liberal arts and sciences education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century means. We'll have breakout groups in the afternoon on topics pertinent to Sonoma State – General Education, Diversity, Pedagogy, etc. Please RSVP to Laurel by January 15<sup>th</sup> if you're going to come so we can make appropriate plans for lunch. We also received a letter back from San Diego State University on the resolution we passed on extending our sympathy to our colleagues in

Southern California who may have been or knew victims of the fires. It says “On behalf of San Diego State University Senate I would like to thank you and your Senate for their kinds wishes and words. It’s in these times when one realizes how we must all unite and help each other. Signed Patrick Papin, Chair San Diego State University Senate.” There are the results of a survey done by a system wide Academic Senate task force on department chairs responsibilities and currently available on the local Academic Senate website. There has been a report issued on campus progress regarding the Integrated Technology Initiative which is the fourth report resulting from money they made available by Prop 1A to establish a new baseline regarding telecommunications on CSU campuses. There is a copy of this report on a CD in the Senate office.

**Consent Items continued:**

**From S&F: Duties of S&F in the by-laws** - M. Dreisbach noted that recently the body removed the duties of creating a Grade Appeal panel from the Chair-Elect to Structure and Functions, but did not add those duties in the by-laws for Structure and Functions. So we have added those duties in to that section of the by-laws and also reflected a change in the Grade Appeal policy whereby Structure and Functions has responsibility for overseeing allegations of improper procedures on the part of the Grade Appeal Hearing Jury.

**From S&F: Amendment to Grade Appeal Policy** – M. Dreisbach said that in reviewing the Grade Appeal policy they realized that the subcommittee was responsible for reviewing allegations of improper procedures and making a finding within ten academic days of receiving the written allegation. We felt that was not sufficient time to do justice to that work and so we are proposing that it be revised to 20 academic days.

**From EPC: Spanish Program 4 unit conversion** – E. McDonald said this was a proposal from Modern Languages that mirrors what passed through the Senate for French last year. This is their way of making their major more streamlined for students, preventing blockages of student on their path through their major. It passed unanimously through EPC two weeks ago.

**No objections to the consent items.**

**Special Report on the financial status of the Green Music Center. (*Curriculum report next meeting*) T. C. 3:15**

Handout presented to the Senate:

---

**THE GREEN MUSIC CENTER  
AT  
SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Financial Affairs**

- **Capital Budget**
- **Interim Financing**
- **Support Budget**

**Presentation to the Academic Senate  
December 18, 2003**

**CAPITAL BUDGET**

Estimated Construction Contract	\$26,061,000
Construction Contingency	\$ 1,400,000
Remaining Design Fees	\$ 1,687,000
Testing and Inspection	\$ 369,000
Project Management Costs	\$ 500,000
Cost to Re-Bid Project	\$ 100,000
Financing Costs \$20,003,000 @4.5% 6-1-05 thru 6-1-08	<u>\$ 4,693,000</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$34,810,000</b>

***FUNDED BY:***

Cash Raised and Available: June 2004	\$13,158,000
Interest Earned Through Project Period	\$ 987,000
Interim Financing – SSU Academic Foundation June 1, 2005	\$20,003,000
Remaining Fundraising	<u>\$ 662,000</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$34,810,000</b>

**INTERIM FINANCING PLAN**

- SSU Academic Foundation borrows approximately \$20,003,000 on or about June 1, 2005.
- Financing costs to be capitalized.
- Repayment due June 1, 2008
- Loan to be repaid from the following fund sources
- 

Collateralized pledges made before January 1, 2003:           \$ 3,003,000



Procurement and Contract Administration  
Artistic Administrative Support  
Human Resource Management  
Payroll Services  
Environmental Health and Safety  
Public Safety, Fire Services and Emergency Preparedness  
Risk Management and Legal Support  
Information Technology Services

The following additional resources are anticipated in the area of institutional support:

Police Services (2 FTE)  
Administrative Support Services  
Financial Services (1.0 FTE)  
Information Technology (.50 FTE)

The above items will be funded by institutional support dollars provided by the CSU as a result of the Green Music Center.

#### **PLANT OPERATIONS**

The Senior Director for Facilities Services is responsible for the plant operations aspects of the Green Music Center. The following additional resources are anticipated:

Custodians (5 FTE)  
Landscape Staff (3 FTE)  
Engineering Staff (3 FTE)  
Utilities  
Routine Facilities Operating Expense

The above items will be funded by dollars provided by the CSU as a result of new space generated by the Green Music Center plus a \$2.50 facilities service fee included in the price of each ticket sold for events at the Green Music Center.

#### **PARKING ADMINISTRATION**

The Senior Director for Police Services and Parking is responsible for the parking administration aspects of the Green Music Center. The following additional resources are anticipated:

Parking Officer (2 FTE)  
Parking Staff Hourly  
General Operating Expense  
Contribution to North Campus Parking Facility

These items will be funded by dollars generated by a \$2.50 parking fee included in the price of each ticket sold for events at the Green Music Center.

## RETAIL AND DINING SERVICES

Sonoma State Enterprises Incorporated will provide retail, dining, and commercial services required by activities held at the Green Music Center. Sonoma State Enterprises anticipates that it will be necessary to make certain capital investments as a result of the Green Music Center in equipment, facilities, and infrastructure. Sonoma State Enterprises will utilize net income generated from Green Music Center retail, dining and commercial activities to finance the cost of required investments.

---

L. Furukawa – Schlereth thanked the body in advance for giving him the opportunity to bring them up to date on the financial status of the Green Music Center project. He said he would speak of three unique categories of finance for the Music Center. The first being the capitol budget, what it costs to construct the facilities. Second, he wanted to make sure everyone understood a relatively unique form of financing that we hope to put in place through the Academic Foundation to support the construction of the project. And third to touch upon how the university anticipates funding the support costs or the on-going operational costs of the Green Music Center once it is built. On the capital budget, at the moment we are estimating the construction contract will be approximately \$26 million. We'll know the actual cost of the construction once we go through the bidding process. This will be a competitive, public works bid that will be put out into the street early February. We'll open the bid in late March and when we're able to understand that we'll know the actual price of the construction contract. That will be a big determining factor as to whether or not the project proceeds in the spring. But this is the estimate we've been able to calculate working with our architects, design team as well our estimators. We think the cost to construct the concert hall itself is \$26 million. The second thing is a construction contingency of about \$1.4 million which represents 5% of construction funds. Normally, you would expect to see between 5-10% for a construction contingency. So this might be a little low. He would prefer to see it in the 8% level. The design fees are the remaining design fees which are paid to architects, our theater consultants and our engineers and our own (unintelligible). We've paid the vast majority of \$5 million in design fees already so those dollars are out the door, but we have about \$1,687,000 that are due to be (unintelligible) and that will only be paid as we go through construction with the final payments being due at the end of construction. Testing and inspection are fees that we pay literally for that, to do soils tests, various inspections associated with heating, ventilation, electrical systems, the normal kinds of test and inspections you expect to see in a construction project and we estimate those to be about \$369,000. Project management fees are the cost to actually manage the construction contract. We're actively recruiting now for a project manager. These are the dollars to support that individual for two to three years of construction. Then we have costs to re-bid the project, \$100,000. This will be the second bid we've done. We did the first bid about two years ago now and it came in too high causing us to do some re-design work. The whole process of doing a public works bids has an expense associated with. Finally, financing fees. These are letter of credit fees, cost of debt issuance and interest cost over a four year term which he will explain in a minute. We project those to be about \$4.6 million. Total cost of the project at this point \$34.8 million which is what we need to identify before we go to the Board of Trustees for financing approval. Where will the money come from - as we sit here today we have in our foundation accounts approximately \$13 million in cash, cash that's been invested in short term securities, but cash that has been raised for the capital campaign. We expect that that \$13 million as well as financing that we'll do to earn interest over the construction period because clearly we won't spend all \$34 million on the first day

the project begins. Over the life of the project we will be earning interest which we estimate to be just under \$1 million so that can be available to apply to the project. We have pledges out there which will be due by the first of June 2008 totaling \$20 million. He'll talk more about those, but those are not cash today. So we have to go out and borrow against that to start the project, so that's what this financing is. It's a short term loan so that construction can begin and the loan being paid as the pledges are realized. Which leaves us as we stand here today, \$662,000 short of the project beginning. He just got off the phone with Stuart Jones and he said there are more pledges he doesn't know about, so the \$662 is a little bit high and probably he'd estimate we're about \$450,000 short of the total project cost all privately raised. The big things we want to watch are what will the construction contract actually be. If it comes in less, that's good, but not likely, it will probably come in a little higher. What will be the cost of interest rate? That will be a determining factor of the financing, we're projecting 4.5% at 18 months from now. Who knows what interest rates will look like 18 months from today.

On to the interim financing plan. He mentioned that we have \$20 million worth of pledges which are pretty firm pledges made by many people, but they are only due approximately four years from now because most people are unable to make good on their gift on the day they make it and they make a payment plan. They give by payroll deduction, or semi annually or quarterly, each one is a little different. But they all have a maturation date four years into the future. The proposal we've come up with is to say to our auxiliary organization the SSU Academic Foundation, go out into the short term financial markets and borrow this money including the interest associated with that borrowing and let's not have that loan repaid until the first of June 2008, because by that time the pledges will be here and everything will be fine. Except for one caveat. What happens if the pledge doesn't materialize because if that's the case, neither the University, the SSU Academic Foundation, nor the Board of Trustees can be at risk for that money. So in addition to making a pledge we're requiring each donor to come forward and collateralize the pledge which means they must go to their bank, it must a commercial, U.S. money center bank and obtain a letter of credit which assures that pledge will be made good. And if by some chance the donor cannot make good on the pledge, the bank will make good on the pledge. So you can be fairly certain that before the bank is going to issue a commercial letter of credit they are going to require collateral to support that letter of credit. It is the only way we will do the financing is if we have these letters of credit in place because otherwise we would place the Board of Trustees and the Academic Foundation at too much financial risk which is not acceptable. From the perspective of the Senate as faculty members, this should give you a level of comfort and as citizens of California, it should give you a level of comfort that the pledge made by these donors does not put you as professors or you as citizens at risk since the bank is securing the credit. The credit risk to it, of course, is whether or not the bank is solvent.

Moving on to the support budget. This is the annual operating budget once the Green Center is built. There are some pretty fundamental assumptions made in this support budget and more of this will get discussed in February when we talk about the program, but the support budget does first and foremost assume that the Green Music Center is an important, integral, instructional and co-curricular component of Sonoma State University and thus the California State University. If those assumptions are not met, the financial model that he is about to present becomes somewhat weakened. Several things we know are going to happen in the Green Music Center that have financial operating implications. The first is the Greenfarm program. These are the educational programs of the Green Music

Center sponsored through the School of Extended Education. The financial model assumes here because the School of Extended Education is a self-support entity of the university, it must raise all of its own revenue and receives no general fund support, that any revenue or expense associated with the Greenfarm program in the Green Music Center are the responsibility of the School of Extended Education. The second activity, a very important part of the Green Music Center, are those activities in our co-curricular program in the Center for the Performing Arts funded by the Instructionally Related Activities program. The CPA obtains their money from student fees that the students discuss and deliberate on as well as tickets sold to events put on by the instructionally related activities program within CPA. Again, a self-supporting program closely scrutinized by the students on the fee advisory committee. But this model assumes that any revenue, expense, profit or loss with the CPA /IRA activities are the responsibility of the CPA/IRA program. He can assure the body, having worked on the Fee Advisory Committee, the students observing the activities of CPA will not allow that program to work in a deficit position. Third, Associated Students Productions. It is assumed again a co-curricular program. This is the program that is on-going and it is anticipated the ASP will make full use of the Green Music Center. But again those activities, revenue, and expenses associates with ASP are the responsibility of ASP funded by the Associated Students as well as ticket sales to events. Instruction is the remaining component he did not place on the handout. Any instruction that is placed here is of course funded by the CSU Board of Trustees. It is assumed there will be direct instruction there. There are academic and technical support requirements associated with the Green Music Center. Fundamental to this model is the assumption that the Executive Director of the Center for Performing Arts, Floyd Ross and the Artistic Director of the Center for Performing Arts, Jeff Langley will be the two key managers who will oversee the artistic and educational program of the Green Music Center. Langley on behalf of Dean Babula and Provost Ochoa and Ross the financial and administrative aspects of the Center on my behalf. They just do that as part of their jobs, there's no additional expense associated with that. But we do anticipate it will be necessary to add positions and dollars into the CPA to support the new activities of the Green Music Center. You can see a rough estimate of what they will be. We anticipate that those funds will be provided to us by the CSU as a result of the Green Music Center being created. Because the Green Music Center is going to create instructional capacity, so in addition to providing the instruction, it will also provide the support for that. Then we have institutional support. It is assumed that we will integrate the Green Music Center into our campus, just as we did the Schulz Information Center, so the existing administrative structure we have on our campus in budget or audit or risk management or IT will simply absorb the Green Music Center as part of the on-going daily activity of the campus. However, it is a fact that the Music Center is going to require some additional positions. Largely in the area of our police department because of the large number of performances there and some issues of finance and information technology. There is technology in the Green Music Center that will have to be supported. Again those monies will come from the Board of Trustees of the CSU. Plant operations – custodians, landscapers, engineering staff are real costs. We do not get new money as a result of enrollment growth made possible by the Green Music Center for plant operations. But the CSU will provide money for us to operate the new building as generally is the case. We receive \$6.40 a square foot for facilities and utilities costs, so that will be reflected. But it's not quite enough to support it so we will impose a \$2.50 fee on every ticket that's sold for the Green Music Center whoever sponsors them to help maintain and operate the facility. The same issue with parking. Parking is a self-support activity and doesn't receive any general funds support there will be a \$2.50 fee on top of the facilities fee attached to each ticket sold at the Green Music Center to support the parking and administrative costs of this venue. An



important component of that, this honors a commitment we made to the students, Associated Student President Eric Carlson who insisted that money comes back to the student parking program to help offset the creation costs of parking lots, L, M, N & O across the creek. Finally, in the Green Music Center there are retail and dining opportunities. It requires an infrastructure to be built meaning champagne stands, glassware and various other types of activities needed to run a gift shop or a small concession stand. It's anticipated that SSU Enterprises will be the ones responsible for that. It's anticipated that they will make those investments once they determine that there is an appropriate return on that investment that it is worthwhile. That will be scrutinized by the Enterprises Board. If there's any money to be made on the Green Music Center it's here. So that could be a positive thing. Usually money is made on concessions. Over the long run this could be a money center. He said that he hasn't talked about a presenting season or a summer festival. Those things are still being explored and analyzed. But it is fair to say if there were to be a more formal presenting season, that will have to be supported by philanthropic activities. Because there's no way the university could afford to support a presenting season and all the institutions that we've talked to such as Mondavi and Berkeley that do these presenting seasons rely a tremendous amount on (unintelligible) and corporate underwriting. It will be necessary if the university chooses to proceed with a presenting season during the academic year or during summer to engage in significant philanthropic activity by external donors to support such a venue. But it is the case that the existing infrastructure that will be built will be able to support such a venue. He asked if there were any questions he might be able to answer.

N. Byrne thanked L. Furukawa-Schlereth for his report. Regarding the \$20 million in funds to be borrowed by the Academic Foundation, what is the collateral for that? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded the letters of credit provided by each donor. N. Byrne said as you say this could become a significant funding center for the campus, would any of these funds be provided to Academic Affairs and to direct instruction? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that it seemed fair to say that Dr. Armiñana always envisioned that if there were monies to be made on the ancillary activities of the Green Music Center that it would represent a significant source over time of funding to the academic program. Of course, that would be a Board decision.

E. Stanny asked what were the numbers associated with the budget items. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded in round figures academic and technical support is about \$800,000, institutional is about \$300,000, then Operations you can take 70,000 square feet times \$6.40 a square foot and add to that \$250,000, Parking is about \$300,000 and retail and dining we really don't know. E. Stanny said that he said the \$800,000 for academic and technical support would be funded by the CSU, is there really enough instruction to warrant this much support and what is the money that comes for support relative to instruction. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said this is a very important question and E. Ochoa will cover this in February, there has to be enough instruction happening in this building to warrant the CSU making that allocation. Either instruction or co-curricular stuff, things you can tie to the central academic mission of the institution which is what E. Ochoa, J. Langley will talk about in February. It really must be a very vibrant, happening academic space. If it isn't that's a problem to justify. E. Stanny asked about the positions under academic and technical support, are they really supporting instruction? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded they will fit the technical definition of that, yes, we have them now in Person Theater, similar positions that work within CPA and they're in the classification of academic support. Because they are going to be primarily the CPA which is an approved academic center of

Sonoma State University which encompasses our departments of theater and music. These questions will be important in February as they are part of the justification for the Board of Trustees. There is a worry that this is really a community building or a community relations building, this really must be an instructional, co-curricular and academic space, if we want public money to support it. That is very important for people to understand. If it isn't that it will be just more difficult to sell to the CSU. Instruction has got to happen there. ASP really has to use it. CPA needs to take an active role with it and if that's not happening this is weak. But it is his understanding that that will be the case.

E. Mendez asked about the \$5 service charge. That's a lot on a student ticket, would that be part of any student productions? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said the answer to the question is yes. He thinks when we get to the end of the day that's going to make difficult certain student productions cost prohibitive. But certain Associated Student Productions, not. For example, the very popular lecture we just did up at the Fairgrounds, you could probably get away with the surcharge. But a more modest production or less well know event, not. So his sense is that if the Associated Student President is wise, he will attempt to negotiate some deal which will provide a way to encourage Student Productions because that really is the intent. He expects a dialogue with the current Associated Students President along those lines. They will probably get an exemptions. E. Mendez said she noticed there was no mention of Santa Rosa Symphony. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said yes, they are really not part of our program, but they are here. They are fully responsible for their costs. We provide no subsidy to them. They get to use the hall free because they contributed \$10 million, but any profit they make or losses are theirs. E. Mendez asked then we won't get the \$5 surcharge. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said oh, yes. That's important because they have some fairly big numbers.

B. Peterson was also concerned about the \$5 surcharge. He said it would discourage students from attending and may well discourage faculty and staff from attending also. He would hope that L. Furukawa-Schlereth would think through the long term consequence of that. Is the Music Center being built for the community, is being built for the campus, is it being built to share and if the majority of people coming are not from the campus, that's going to give a very interesting flavor to it. The other piece it that is doesn't make a lot of sense to him to charge a student \$2.50 for parking if they're walking over from the Residence Halls. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he forgot to mention that the surcharge only applies to any paid ticket and there is a deal that has already been negotiated with the students through the IRA process that says that any event sponsored by the Center for the Performing Arts in the Green Music Center is free to students. So therefore the students would never pay the surcharge. That is not the case with ASP yet, but he imagines that J. Spencer is going to cut that deal before the end of the year. That doesn't cover the faculty issue, which is something we would want to look at, maybe a discount for university employees in general to be able to take full advantage of the great events that will be held in the Center. We really haven't played with that. He will commit to taking that into consideration. B. Peterson said he appreciated that. F. Ross said we already do have reduced rates for SSU faculty, staff and alumni.

M. Goodman addressed the use of the Center by instructionally related programs. She is the Director of the Holocaust Studies Center and we have a lecture series. And we have had increasingly need to use the Cooperage for our lectures because Person Theater is unavailable to us. And we are charged to use the Cooperage. Will we be charged to use the Green Center? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded no. No entity of the university or it's

auxiliary organizations will be charged a rental charge for the use of the Green Music Center because it's being privately supported and gifted to the Trustees. If there is some direct expense that gets incurred because of that event, that event may be asked to pay for that direct incremental cost, but a rental fee, no. M. Goodman asked what a direct cost might be. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that if the event needed some extraordinary production feature like a trapeze or something that would have to be rented.

J. Spencer asked if the \$10 million from the Santa Rosa Symphony is part of the \$13 million already raised or part of the \$20 million. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said their money is in the total budget which is actually around \$40 million as he didn't show the expenses already paid on the handout. J. Spencer said that at one of his brown bag lunches the President said that students would not be charged. But he thinks the cost of the Cooperage that M. Goodman is referring to has to do with cost of having someone there. Will those costs be in the Music Center? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded no, because unlike the Cooperage, the people of California will provide those people when we get the building, a sound engineer, a police officer, these people come with the building, so to speak. So it would not be appropriate to re-charge. Now if you're an external customer, we will charge. J. Spencer (*was turned toward L. Furukawa-Schlereth and not toward microphone, so could not hear what he said.*) L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded it would be premature at this point. The analysis would have to take into account one of two things, if it were determined we did not need or anticipate additional parking facilities in the future, you could talk about changing fee structure. But the money as it is being currently collected is to expand the campus parking facilities so that fee increases are not necessary for our faculty and staff in the future. It's either going to be used to mitigate the current price structure or set aside money for new parking lots that will likely be needed as the campus reaches its enrollment target of 10,000 FTE. Hopefully, we're through with parking fee increases on this campus.

V. Garlin thanked L. Furukawa-Schlereth for the presentation. One of the on-going concerns of people on the campus is the issue of the possibility of operating losses in the first few years of the Green Music Center. Many cultural facilities of this sort have operating losses in the first five years and he wondered if there existed a business plan that dealt with both the entrepreneurial aspect of revenues and costs as well as the academic side on revenues and costs and what assurances the campus community can receive that provision is being made for the possibility of operating losses. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded Extended Education must submit a budget to him and it's a program that must be balanced. We've never had an operating loss in Extended Education since he's been here. Same is true for ASP and CPA, and instruction. Where you get into a problem is in the presenting season, there is no business plan yet, but there is active discussion over the last fourteen days as many people are very interested to have something like Cal Performances or Mondavi presents, but those are very costly. They require significant corporate underwriting and on-going philanthropic activity. Before they are even implemented they will have to be a very firm, solid business plan behind it. But at the moment that is very much up in the air. It is a concern he would encourage the faculty to play close attention to. V. Garlin asked if the operations budget is going to be folded completely into Extended Education? Will we be able to determine at any point in the year how the Green Center is doing financially independently of the other programs of Extended Education. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said Greenfarm will be a separate cost center, just like the Lifelong Learning Institute. A presenting season would not be in the School of Extended Education. A presenting season would probably be housed in the Center for Performing Arts would be his instinct, but even

then it would be within a trust account which would have to be a self-sustaining entity and yes you could see it.

G. Olson said at one time we were asked to give ideas about how to we might use instructional space, even designs of what kind of rooms we would find most useable and most desirable and have a passion for that they might share with other Schools and so forth. She was curious where those ideas went, who screens them, when they'll be some feedback on them, is that being entertained still? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded yes, and you are probably referring to the what some might call the second phase of the Green Music Center, which has a new name called the multi-disciplinary academic building. Those ideas are very valuable and if we are able to obtain through the bond measure, Prop. 55, the resources to support that a very active and engaged planning process will begin within Academic Affairs led by the Provost about how to take those imaginations and creativity and bring them to life. G. Olson asked will a committee be formed from different departments to work with that? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that would be traditionally the case. G. Olson said some people got really excited about the potential of hooking into the Green Music Center and seeing it as connected to the campus through that invitation. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said it's a very important part as it has to be a true integral part of our academic program.

S. Brannen said he was still confused about the rationale for charging \$2.50 parking fee on every ticket since presumably a lot of student and faculty have parked here for the day might want to walk over and see an event. We've already paid to park here and some of us think we should and then to go over there and pay for parking again seems like extortion. Why can't you sell two types of tickets, one with parking and one without for those who choose to walk over. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he thought it was a legitimate point and they would have to work that through.

P. McGough said when a building is used for instructional purposes, how does the CSU give us money and how much. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said whenever we open a building we have to tell the Trustees what it will be used for. That's why this discussion is so important. We could say the Green Music Center is just a presenting facility for co-curricular activities and they will just give us the funds to operate the space. But we can also say we also plan to use this building for direct instruction which serves the purposes of increasing our instructional capacity and then when instructional capacity increases not only do you get dollars for professors to accommodate that instruction, but dollars to support that instruction in a variety of different ways. P. McGough said so at this point that is only the marginal cost, so that marginal cost is going to go the Green Center. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said, if the campus builds the Green Center otherwise we won't receive those dollars, so the dollars that come because the Green Music Center is built would be allocated to support the activities there. P. McGough said we're making a major commitment of enrollment growth money to technical and academic support of the Green Music Center. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded not too much and to reassure you that's only 300 FTE.

R. Coleman-Senghor said this speaks exactly to the question of how many we are going to have. When you are presenting this building the question for him is are we talking about phase one, phase two or the whole complex. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded phase one. R. Coleman-Senghor said on the basis of offering a justification of the educational component to the university, where does the FTE issue fit in? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said we know we can easily justify 300 FTES happening there. In what disciplines, is an academic planning question. R. Coleman-Senghor asked what would be the impact of this 300 FTE in that

building with respect to our future. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he picked the 300 after consultation with Professor Langley to find out direct instruction that we know now that's happening over here would happen over there, Bach Choir. . . J. Langley noted that just ensembles that exist right now, if we move them over there the growth would come in those ensembles, the Concert Band, the three Choirs, the Indian Singing Ensemble, the Chamber Music groups, all of these performance ensembles that exist right now, he thinks they will grow easily even before we get to lecture classes, he thinks 300 is a reasonable target for expected growth in those ensembles. R. Coleman-Senghor said given the fact that we're moving those 300, isn't the state going to ask us what we're going to do with the 300 that's left? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded yes and he would let E. Ochoa tackle that one. He also stated he was happy to talk individually with people at any time about the finances for the Green Music Center.

C. Nelson said that on behalf of the Academic Senate she would like to wish Senator Garlin a happy birthday. (*applause*)

## **BUSINESS**

### **Long Range Academic Plan and its relation to Strategic Plan. T.C. 3:55**

C. Nelson introduced this discussion item and asked R. Coleman-Senghor to begin.

R. Coleman-Senghor said what is at issue is the status relationship of the Long Range Planning document, the status of the Strategic Planning and the question of the organizational/functional role of APC. In preparing for this presentation he went through past minutes of APC and the Senate and he came up with a proposed charter for the Academic Planning Committee in which it laid out very clearly "to represent the faculty's vision regarding the academic character and mission of the university." Notice here it is not the mission of an organization or division within the university, but rather the mission of the university. This was the charge to us and it was wide ranging. It was to go about the business of looking at university wide bodies concerned with curriculum, budgets, space allocation, facilities development and master plan considerations to create a coherent picture of all campus level planning as a context for academic planning. One needs only to recall that there had been a recognition by WASC that we did not have, in the mind of the WASC team, a meaningful relationship established between academic and fiscal planning with respect to all dimensions of the university. Our goal in APC is to carry out this list of responsibilities which includes monitoring and advising and recommending routes to take and also to continue to update the Long Range Plan document which was ratified by this body and also ratified by the Provost and other officers of the university. APC takes the position in reviewing this document that it is a document not fully realized. We saw a clear need for our processes to reach beyond our own concerns as faculty into those other areas as reflected in the statement of responsibility and to be able to bring in those other bodies, officers, campus leaders into that process. The committee represents a great deal of that. In the last two years we've tried to create a culture of planning and in the moment the Provost began his planning initiative, one of the things our document calls for is campus wide planning and the coordination of planning efforts at all levels and it does also encourage that planning take place at all levels, so that means that within the institution there are various sites such as Academic Affairs that need to be engaged in its own planning so in one sense our Long Range Planning document is in agreement with what is actually going on with the Strategic Planning Process. One of the things he has spoken to Provost Ochoa

about and Chair Nelson, is that the Strategic Plan is a strategic plan of the Academic Affairs division. So for him and the committee, there is a clear distinction between the Long Range Plan and the Strategic Planning that is going on. What we're looking at is the way in which we can make the Strategic Plan of Academic Affairs as kind of a model for the kind of planning we want to see happen in other sectors of the university and to bring that into the Long Range Plan itself. In conclusion, the need for the university wide plan, that's what we need. We need to move and extend that to incorporate the various planning efforts in all sectors of the university and that this planning of necessity must continue and we see that APC is in fact the body that can make sure that that planning process continues and that it can continue to serve in an oversight capacity, making recommendations and assessments of what is going on with planning on campus.

E. Ochoa stated at that it seems to him right off the bat that we know that if we're going to engage in planning leading to allocating of resources within the Division of Academic Affairs as an administrative responsibility, we have to do it in partnership with the Academic Senate. That's why he initiated this process by asking C. Nelson to co-chair the committee with me and engaging the faculty and engaging the Senate itself, he would say organizationally through its representative that are sitting ex-officio on this committee to be a full partner in this process. He has a clear notion in his mind of why we're doing that and where it fits in. The real question is there was something else going on in the area of planning before we started this and the introduction of this new process, how does that effect what was already going on there. He thinks he said before its not entirely clear to him how things will finally settle out. We have introduced a new body which at this point is ad hoc and there's a new activity going on and that clearly is bound to have some repercussions in the overall organization. But in part it depends on the quality of the experience of this new activity as to what will happen. So his preference has been to withhold judgment on that, not form an opinion, until we have more of a sense of how productive this effort has been and where we might all want to go in the future with how we organize ourselves to engage in planning. For him the bottom line is that in general we have to do planning and planning has to be linked to resource allocation. Because general principles are ones he subscribes to and he knows APC was happy to hear him say that as they felt that way themselves. It has to be a partnership between the Division and the Academic Senate. Those two core principles are clear. What the implications for that are in terms of the organization and the status of the product developed earlier is not so clear in his mind, but is something that we have to jointly explore and decide on at some point. That's on the organizational side. On the produce side there is a document that is before this body that is the Long Range Plan, that itself has a history and was developed over time. There is a lot of good thinking that went into that document and a lot of ideas there that inevitably form the backdrop and the background in the minds of some of the same individuals who are participating in the Strategic Planning effort as well as provide a foundation on which to built a strategic plan for the Division. It's all good stuff and it's all going to have an impact in a substantive way. Now in terms of a formal relationship, what is the formal relationship between the two documents, he thinks ultimately that will depend on how we choose to organize ourselves in terms of these two committees and so in future cycles how we've chosen to arrange that will have some implications about what products each of these groups produces and what role they play formally in our process. He thinks the thing to keep in mind are the two core principles – we need to do planning and it has to be tied to resources and the in the academic arena it has to be a partnership between the Division and the Academic Senate.

V. Garlin stated he appreciate E. Ochoa's comment. It was reassuring. The word partner implies a level of equality. It does not imply a senior partner and a junior partner. It implies that we go forward in a way in which each partner is satisfied with the outcome and that nothings happens unless both partners are satisfied. That means the faculty of the Academic Senate, in his judgment, retains the right of refusal as does the administrative side of the house. If by partnership you mean an equal partnership, he finds that reassuring. Is that a fair statement? E. Ochoa responded explicitly that we have a de facto equal partnership, de jure he has responsibilities. V. Garlin said but on the ground and as applied it has to be something that we all sign off on. If it's thought that School A should grow and School B should shrink for whatever reason and resources need to be reallocated on the basis of that decision, that may have to happen. But that can only happen successfully at this institution on the basis of an equal partnership.

M. Dreisbach recommended E. Ochoa give an update on the Strategic Planning process. E. Ochoa said at the last meeting of the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning meeting we had a remarkably productive session. He thinks that's the largest group of people he's seen successfully wordsmith some text and actually take what had been four versions of the mission and vision statement and merge them in to something we all felt good about. That mission and vision statement he thinks will serve us well. The only reason he hasn't released it yet for campus review and comment is that because this was an extra session of the committee there were a number of people who could not adjust their schedule to come. So a significant number of members have not seen it and he wanted the courtesy for them to see it first. The Provost was then alerted that the information was already on the web. (*a check by the recorder did not find the mission and vision statement on the website at this time, only the drafts.* - <http://www.sonoma.edu/provost/planning/index.html>) So now we are officially starting on the peer review and comment by the full division and then starting in the spring semester we anticipate having three to four sessions of the committee to do several things. One is to how to categorize our strategy in terms of strategic areas or division and then identify a general strategy for each of these areas and that's as far as we can get in terms of general principles. Then the next step would be to actually formulate initiatives under those strategies, identify the resources necessary to carry them out, set the timelines for each of the initiatives and assign responsibility for those initiatives. Also identify the measurable outcomes or objectives we want to accomplish with these initiatives. Once we do that the first full cycle of strategic planning is complete. There's also the issue of campus input, comment, feedback on this. There seem to be two key points where input are needed from the wider community. The first one is the one we're just entering now on mission and vision. The next one would be on the strategic areas and strategies. And the last one would be the initiatives.

C. Nelson said for the Senate's information that she had sent out an email to Chairs of every Senate committee that the draft mission and vision will be on the agenda for the February 5<sup>th</sup> agenda next semester so the Senate itself will have an opportunity itself to talk about the draft mission and vision statements, get input from its committees and discussion, give feedback, whatever the Senate chooses to do.

R. Coleman-Senghor said he was struck last week by concerns stated by R. McNamara trying to get clarity and Provost Ochoa, your response was a future orientated response which was "we'll see." Today the formal relationship that exists between the Academic Senate's APC and the strategic planning initiative from the Provost's office and then with Victor's remarks that de facto it is a relationship of equality, but de jure that that falls to the

Provost. Then there was a phrase “how we choose to organize ourselves.” He was struck by this as we have organized ourselves in a particular way in respect to planning. That organization was one that was confirmed by the Senate with the respect of the past Vice President and Provost. So what we are really doing now is re-organizing ourselves. He wanted everyone to consider what they might mean for us as a Senate, as an institution because there is this re-organization that is going to take place. In every re-organization there’s a decision making process, someone or some body is going to decide and he wanted to know in this re-organization for the purposes of planning that “we” is the troubling pronoun for him. How we choose, which means, not de facto, but de jure. APC has a mandate not limited solely to Academic Affairs. It reaches beyond Academic Affairs. It is the responsibility of APC to look at the entire plant and all of its operations. We have no policy decision making power. Our role is principally to report the Senate the state of affairs of the university. The Senate is the body that says this is our plan, you go out and see if that plan has been realized. He asked the Provost, when he says “how we choose to organized ourselves”, exactly what that means not only de facto, but de jure.

E. Ochoa responded that first of all, de jure, the Senate has the right to establish any committee that it wants to establish. He would not presume to tell the Senate what it needs to do or not do. His impression is that there was a need felt to create an Academic Planning committee because there was a perceived lack of structured, organized planning at the university level on the part of the Senate and therefore they felt they needed a committee to devote some attention to this matter and generate a perspective that could then be shared with the rest of the university and hopefully influence actual decision making and resource allocation. So to him it seemed like a response to a perceived lack. Now he thinks that with Academic Affairs engaging in strategic planning, working explicitly in partnership with the Senate, he thinks that lack, at least in the Division of Academic Affairs is not going to be there in the future. Assuming it goes well at least part of the perceived lack that generated the need to create the Academic Planning committee will not be there. And then the Senate will decide how it feels about the new situation and whether that means changing the charge of the Academic Planning committee or what have you, that will be decisions the Senate will have to make based on their assessment of how things have changed. That’s about as far as he could go with that. On the side of Academic Affairs, de jure, he’s already played out his hand already and it knows what he’s doing.

S. Wilson asked how to find the information on the website. (*see above link*). R. McNamara said he was still a little unclear. We as body are going to be asked to endorse the Long Range Academic Plan and maybe sooner than later. Say we do endorse this and we’re presented with a Strategic Plan and there are contradictions, what, as a body, are we going to do about that. An example might be the future of graduate programs. If we are part of the Strategic Plan as a body, it seems to him that the Long Range Academic Plan from APC, if we endorse it, should be required reading for the Strategic Planning committee. E. Ochoa stated it was in the Strategic Planning binder. R. McNamara said that was encouraging. V. Garlin gave a hypothetical and asked the Provost to comment on it. The role of the Senate in this scenario – it’s decided by your office that in School A, departments 1 and 2 should be allowed to die by attrition and in School B, two new departments, not presently existing should be created to deal with the perception of the administration that there’s a need out there in the community for these departments. His expectation would be that such a plan would be presented to the appropriate bodies of the Academic Senate, APC and EPC and any other, and that the Academic Senate would thoroughly review and vet that proposal



before it would go anywhere. Is that the Provost's understanding of how that process would happen?

E. Ochoa responded that he was not prepared to say precisely what consultation route we would take with that, but clearly a decision like that is one in which we are re-deploying resources in pursuit of a strategy so it has to be done in partnership with the Senate. Exactly which committee or how we do it, he was not clear. V. Garlin said we would be thoroughly, integrally and organically involved in that process as he understood the Provost's answer. E. Ochoa agreed. R. Coleman-Senghor wanted to remind everyone just as the Provost says that we can do what we want to do, the Provost can do very much what he wants to do. That's the nature of his office also. The reason he says that is to make the point that APC is an advisory committee to the Senate. So what would happen in that instance that V. Garlin and R. McNamara brought up is that the Senate takes a look at what its planning expectations are, this is the Long Range Planning document of the Senate that has been endorsed. Now if that endorsement is going to be removed that is of concern to us. But the document that is going forward has already been endorsed. It is now being revised. If the Provost decides to go off in another direction, his point is that the voice of the Senate will be heard through its document.

**Resolution regarding Grade Posting by PeopleSoft Software – First Reading – attachment – R. Whitkus T. C. 4:25**

R. Whitkus gave background to the resolution. Last semester this body passed a resolution that stated that faculty should have the right to use the PeopleSoft method of posting grades or the traditional roster method and it was also discussed that at that time that this body should debate this new method of recording grades with the idea that we get appropriate information back from committees such as FSAC. Here we are at the end of this semester and we are still where we were last semester, so the current resolution is to say that without having done what we had thought we would be doing this semester, that we should let the last semester resolution stand pat until such time that we will debate the issue. Two other topics were also brought up in our debate last time. Issues related to workload as well as issues of confidentiality. Those are some of the reason why this body felt it was important to debate and discuss these issues and not just go ahead. One of the points brought up at the time was that this is the way it has to be done. If it's not done this way, how will grades be reported and that is of course a concern for students who are looking forward to receiving grades in a timely fashion. However, it should be pointed out that that is not a problem we as faculty should be worried about right up front because we did not create it. That was an issue created outside this body and this body should of course address that issue, but its not a concern we need to use to force the issue at this point in time. Another issue brought up at that time was it is the responsibility of the faculty to report grades. He did look on all the websites related to the CSU and to this body and there's absolutely no policy on how faculty report grades. Absolutely none. So the idea that this is the way is has to be done is actually not a policy issue per se. Maybe it is something that we as a Senate should come up with as a policy issue. But until that time he would like to resolve the issue as it was left last spring.

**E. Mendez moved to waive the first reading. Second.** R. Whitkus pointed out that this resolution has been before the body for at least three weeks and was sent out on Senate-Talk. **Vote on waiving the first reading = passed on voice vote.**

## Second reading

E. Mendez stated that PeopleSoft is not ready for prime time. She did manage to get one set of grades in she thinks. Last semester when she did it by PeopleSoft some students told her they couldn't get their grades. Maybe there was a button she didn't push. She's gone to all the trainings. The thing is impossible. Of all weekends, apparently IT is turning the server off Friday night and all Saturday. Some of us were planning to work on our grades and input them this weekend. D. Girman offered his support for the resolution. B. Peterson spoke against the resolution. As well as being a staff member here, he is also a union steward and in those roles he has formed an opinion that the staff in Admissions and Records are in crisis right now. There are many open spots that have not been filled. There are a number of staff members on 50% disability, there are a number of staff members on 100% disability. Many of these are stress related injuries due to PeopleSoft. They do not have the personnel to enter grades this year. He can guarantee that. If they were forced to they would probably have to chose between processing December graduation or entering grades. Admissions and Records is part of ESAS which is part of Academic Affairs. He knows that a number of Senators were surprised and disappointed that ESAS did not take a full cut this year, and that \$400,000 was taken from the Schools. He thinks the main solution the problem in Admissions and Records is hiring more staff there which means that the Schools would have to take another cut. We're in a zero sum game. We can't hire people in one area without cutting back another. He thinks that if the resolution was passed it would put an incredible burden on our colleagues in Admissions and Records and again there are training session set up to teach faculty how to enter grades. Once you learn how it takes a maximum of ten minutes to do a course. He's done it for three semesters now. It is a pretty easy process to learn. He strongly suggest that the body defeat this resolution. P. Phillips said last semester he turned his grades in by hand and he has taken the training. There's an implied issue here that goes beyond that. This was an imposed thing on this body. This was administratively imposed on us. We were not asked if this was ok. We never approved PeopleSoft as a system. There are certainly complications statewide with it and the legislature is even thinking of not implementing it in many campuses. This campus proceeded and went ahead with it. He said he would vote for the resolution and will probably still enter his grades electronically, but it is a principle that when it comes to academic performance and what we are asking the lecturers and faculty to do, something very specific, we need to be consulted on that in advance. And it needs to work and be pretty straightforward. These "required" meetings for lecturers, that was not right. R. Karlsrud stated he would oppose the resolution. He agreed with Senator Peterson. If you talk to folks in A&R, they are a beleaguered bunch. To believe that they should, no matter what the principles are here, no matter how it came about, we're looking at choices. They will either have to input all our grades, hundreds of us and spend hundreds of hours to do it or we're going to have to submit and learn how to do this electronically. He begged the body to think collegially here. This is not something they can do right now. He's hoping to persuade the body to think things through. He's afraid that if they don't and faculty are going to be stuck with doing it they might turn to their clerical staff, which would be highly inappropriate for them to do. He thought it fell on the faculty to take this responsibility on. M. Dreisbach also opposed the resolution. We require students to register online and we haven't asked them if they are in agreement with that. It is not at all a difficult process. She did not post her grades online last semester, but she did post one set of grades before coming to the Senate today so she would be able to speak with some knowledge of the process. She supports what Senator Karlsrud and Peterson have said about our colleagues. It is very difficult to do these en masse. Her only concern is about adjunct faculty who are

here part time. She did receive a call from an adjunct and she said help, she hadn't gone to the training and now she's told she has to speak with the Dean about how she could post the grades. M. Dreisbach did think we should cut some slack for our adjunct faculty who are not able to comply this semester and did think we should move as a community by next semester for everyone. B. Peterson said any faculty member who cannot enter them into PeopleSoft brings them to the Dean's office and the Dean gets them entered. E. Martinez said she appreciated Senator Whitkus bringing this to the Senate for discussion because we haven't had a place to talk about this and to talk about workload issues which seems to never be brought up, but incrementally semester by semester our workload is increasing. This is the time of year when it feels like we do hundreds of recommendation letters and most of us have not been able to begin grading yet, which we will do all weekend. The services and the assistance are not there to help us. She very much understood Senator Peterson's appeal, but she thought workload was going to be increased for faculty to make up for lack of staff in Admissions and Records if we are persuaded by this argument, whereas the matter is that additional staff needs to be hired. Faculty have lost assigned time, we have lost so many things and so many hours and hours of work have been added. One final note is that an AC in one School was trying to come to the assistance and help of a faculty member in another School and the AC was able to access PeopleSoft and help this faculty member from a different school input grades. So it's very easy to get into the system and she's not convinced that we have enough safeguards and this is a different matter in addition to the workload issue. N. Byrne spoke in favor of the resolution. He understood and was in sympathy with the points made by Senator Peterson and Karlsrud and Dreisbach, but he supported the resolution because he did not understand it as urging faculty not use PeopleSoft but rather that in the instances of faculty who have not been able to go to the training, specifically adjunct faculty, some of whom might be teaching as few as one unit and are tremendously burdened by their off campus obligations and get here for their teaching obligations and find it difficult to be here at other times. And if they are not able to make the training, they are in a particularly difficult position and on top of it to require the adjunct faculty to come on campus for the training that is not a part of their normal responsibilities. Only some faculty, and principally adjunct faculty who would find it necessary to not use PeopleSoft. So his sense it will not be a significantly increased workload for Admissions and Records. S. Wilson stated he was very supportive of electronic grade reporting and sensitive to Senator Peterson's concerns, but this is something that hasn't been through the Senate yet and shows what happens when you try to do something without faculty input. There are problems with this. He can't pencil grades in for students who didn't wind up getting registered. It takes about ten times as long with the current system to enter the grades as it does to put them on a piece of paper. There are faculty that aren't going to be able to do it and that's why there's this flexibility issue here. He is surprised to hear all these tenured faculty coming up with flexibility and trying to extend it only to lecturers and not letting other tenured faculty take advantage of this procedure. At the end you still have to copy the grades on a piece of paper and take them in. He agreed that the Senate should look into these issues.

**J. Beaulyn called the question. Second. Vote on calling the question – Yes = 18, No = 11. Failed.**

A. Wingfield said as a student she was confused by the resolution. PeopleSoft is a controversial issue and students were not asked about it either as stated previously and we're dealing with it. It is not that hard to use even though it has glitches. We weren't trained and we figured it out. She thought the faculty are our teachers and she thought

there would be more of an effort to evolve to PeopleSoft or get over the hump of dealing with PeopleSoft versus talking about it in an arena where we can talk about what's happened in the last week with units and Reg 2. E. Freed said that it seems part of the main purpose of the resolution is you protest the way that this grade posting method was forced upon the teachers here. He wanted to make that very explicit. E. McDonald added to N. Byrne's remarks. She supported the resolution and would be submitting her grades on PeopleSoft. But she understood that the ease of using PeopleSoft has a lot to do with the machine you are using. This last semester we were asked to migrate and this involves adding security certificates to your computer which is what PeopleSoft is about as well. It does not support Macintoshes particularly well. It doesn't support Netscape Navigator very well. There are all kinds of issues that we as faculty members had to deal with in this new world of not enough institutional support for our technology. What the resolution does is give some faculty members flexibility. She's very supportive of staff and doesn't want to burden staff, so those of us who do have an easy time of entering grades on PeopleSoft should do so, but we should not force people who do not have the technology set up to easily deal with PeopleSoft to have to go down to some school lab. Can you imagine entering grades in PeopleSoft in the 24 hour lab? S. Brannen agreed that the faculty should have been consulted about the change in grade posting and he agreed that the Senate should have discussed it, but we should have discussed it earlier. We forgot. It's our fault. This was brought two meetings ago. That's too late for something this important. People who don't want to enter them by computer don't have to, it's already been told. This resolution does nothing but express our anger at something that was our fault and he could not support it.

#### **C. Nelson asked to extend the meeting for ten minutes. No objection.**

V. Garlin stated he supported the resolution and pointed out that this was a case of concurrent jurisdiction between the Senate and the Union. It's a very good example. The Union could easily have asked for a meet and confer session on this as a workload issue. As soon as you hear the word workload you are hearing the word union. We did not do that and the reason was because we felt given the concurrent jurisdiction the Senate was dealing with it. As Union President he was perfectly content to have the Senate deal with it because he saw the Senate dealing with it. He didn't think it is a earth-shaking workload issue, but it is a workload issue. The question is who is going to do the work. It is going to be the faculty, is it going to be the MPP's in the office or is it going to be the CSEA people in the office who are going to do the work. There's no issue of principle here except how do we make decisions about workload when there's a question about who is to do the work. He supports the resolution so long as it's clear to the Dean's and below the Dean's that this is still an optional method for posting grades this semester. Then we can deal with it next semester in perhaps a better organized way. R. Whitkus stated this resolution is by no means a protest, is just as Senator Phillips and Garlin pointed out it is a matter of procedure. We need to follow the procedure of the Senate or we don't, that's basically what he wanted the Senate to recognize. R. McNamara said there were a lot of compelling arguments. He was very sensitive to mandates from the administration and if this resolution specifically addressed that he would support it. For himself he has not seen his workload go up and was most persuaded by Senator's Peterson's arguments and he has seen the workload shift to administrative coordinators on this issue. S. Shand said she was sensitive to procedural and security issues and that those should be addressed and that when we get down to the real workload issues, as a steward for Academic Professionals of California, this is a significant workload increase. It's either a small increase in becoming familiar with the new system for a large number of people or it is a very large workload increase for a very few

number of people up in Admissions and Records. We expect our students to be computer competent and she hopes technology issues can be addressed, but it is in fact a workload issue.

**Vote on resolution – Yes = 12, No = 14, Failed**

## REPORTS

### Vice President Academic Affairs/Provost – (E. Ochoa)

E. Ochoa reported at the first reg as we went through the week seniors, juniors and sophomores were able to get the classes they needed, but when it came to freshman there was a noticeable drop in unit load at the end of registration. So a number of freshman hit the wall Friday and came up dry. That's where the problem is. To address that in the second reg we will give freshman first priority and then we'll go to the standard order of priority after that. We're also getting a little more head room in terms of our target. We've been given informal dispensation to come in just under 7000. That has given a little more room for Social Sciences and Business which were the two Schools that were most critically effected by the constraint. Science and Arts & Humanities are going to use their normal adjustment of their schedule in terms of shifting the classes that they offer to more adequately reflect demand. That means if there are any low enrollment upper division courses they will be dropped in favor of possibility opening some lower division classes that are totally full. That is not qualitative different than what they normally do. He thinks it will help the problem. We are committed to getting freshman, particularly residential freshman, in their classes and getting classes for graduating seniors. Then we'll do the best with the rest of our student who by and large seem to be ok. Also to try to make sure everybody gets taken care of at a baseline level. We're keeping the 16 unit maximum load on second reg as well.

**C. Nelson asked to extend the meeting five more minutes. No objection.**

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth reported that today Governor Schwarzenegger issued two Executive Orders which imposed a statewide hiring freeze for all employees as well as certain expenditure curtailments for all state agencies. The CSU is requested but not required to cooperate with these Executive Orders. Chancellor Reed has issued a memorandum to the campus Presidents directing how the CSU will do that. He just got it himself about an hour ago. It does have impact for procedures that we have to put in place for hiring all employees including faculty and part time faculty and student assistants. As you know Dr. Armiñana is in New York, so we have not had a chance to review it with him, but we plan to overnight and be able to issue a statement to the campus. He encouraged the body to watch their email. He doesn't think its going to have major implications for all areas of campus, but hiring people is going to be a bit more bureaucratic, he thinks.

P. McGough stated that two or three weeks ago the Governor put freeze on state employees for traveling to conferences. Does that effect us? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded we are asked to cooperate with it. What he imagines would happen is that the professor will have to write a justification why that travel is essential to the educational mission. That's what

the spirit of Reed's memo says to us. Something that allows us to justify that. E. Martinez asked if it meant the expense or the travel itself? She often travels to conferences, but pays for everything herself. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he thinks it's the expenditure. R. L. Thomas asked if the hiring freeze effects anything in process. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded yes, anything in process is being pulled and we have to get a justification from the appropriate administrator to allow that to procedure. We don't know what the justification is. We have to talk to Dr. Armiñana to see what he needs for approval. S. Wilson asked does the travel freeze apply just to general funds or could one raise funds to travel. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded he thinks it will just be general funds, but he's not sure.

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

M. Dreisbach reported that we are in the process of putting together the committee for the Excellence in Teaching Award. LeiLani Nishime has agreed to serve a second year term and Bill Barnier will begin the first of a two year term and she's working with the Associated Students for the student representative. The faculty members are former recipients of the award. We have put out the call for nominations for the university wide election. The nominations are open until 5:00pm on Feb. 9<sup>th</sup>. We will be holding an electronic election between February 16<sup>th</sup> through the 22<sup>nd</sup>. We do have some nominations and the nominations to date: Chair-Elect – Senator Stanny; no one for secretary yet; At-Large Senator we have one position and its Melissa Vandevere; for Statewide Senator there is one position and Phil McGough is running; for Lecturer Senators we have one position and no one running yet; for the Senate Budget Committee, one position, we have Birch Moonwomon and Andy Merrifield; and for University RTP two positions available and Bill Poe is running.

### **Meeting adjourned.**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*