

Academic Senate Minutes

March 23, 2006

3:00 – 5:00 Commons

Abstract

Chair's Report. Agenda amended and approved. Consultation Policies postponed. Resolution on the Green Music Center approved. Resolution on Censorship at Dominquez Hill approved. Priority Registration Policy approved. Resolution on Faculty Workload referred to FSAC. Provost's Report. Good of the Order.

Present: Elizabeth Stanny, Elaine McDonald, Melanie Dreisbach, Edith Mendez, Robert McNamara, Catherine Nelson, Rick Luttmann, Paul Draper, Noel Byrne, Birch Moonwomon, Michael Pinkston, Steve Wilson, Kristen Daley, Elizabeth Martínez, Robert Train, Thaine Stearns, Liz Thach, Bob Vieth, Raye Lynn Thomas, Tia Watts, Murali Pillai, Richard Whitkus, Sunil Tiwari, Wanda Boda, Sandra Feldman, Myrna Goodman, Glenn Brassington, Melinda Milligan, John Wingard, Sandra Shand, Marguerite St. Germain, Eduardo Ochoa, Lindsey Simoncic, Sara Statler, Greg Tichava, Art Warmoth, Perry Marker, Carlos Ayala, Doug Jordan

Absent: Robert Coleman-Senghor, Steve Cuellar, John Kornfeld, Bruce Peterson, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

Guests: Leslie Deming, Barbara Butler, Carol Blackshire-Belay, William Babula, David Abbott, Elaine Leeder, Elaine Sundberg, Katie Pierce, Jean Wasp, Katharyn Crabbe, Mary Gendernalik-Cooper, Saeid Rahimi, Susan Kashack

Chair's Report – E. Stanny

The Chair reported that Trustee George Gowgani would be visiting the Senate next time. The Chair then made comments about collegiality in terms of the consultation policies before the Senate and the student suffrage issue. She noted that terms are being used whose meaning is not agreed to, so she shared some language from the CSU Statement on Collegiality. She said that the statement is a statement on shared governance. In the third paragraph it says the faculty have primary responsibility for "admission and degree requirements, the curriculum and methods of teaching, academic and professional standards, and the conduct of creative and scholarly activities." Then in the fourth paragraph it says "The collegial process also recognizes the value of participation by the faculty in budgetary matters, particularly those directly affecting the areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility." So the faculty have primary responsibility for the curriculum and only in rare circumstances can the President over rule that. The faculty has one level of decision-making power in regard to the curriculum. It is another level for the budget. The statement says it is a consultative role, not a decision-making role. On the curriculum, it is not joint decision-making. She then stated she valued the students' role in faculty governance. She wished the faculty had the same role with the administration, since the students are there at the beginning and end giving input. Input and decision-making are different things. Shared decision making is different than joint decision-making. Successful shared governance depends on

trust, mutual respect, honesty, truthfulness, early and effective communication, broad consultation and open decision-making. She encouraged the students to work with the faculty on a consultation policy.

A Senator noted that in HEERA it says: "The Legislature recognizes that joint decision making and consultation between administration and faculty or academic employees is the long-accepted manner of governing institutions of higher learning and is essential to the performance of the educational missions of these institutions, and declares that it is the purpose of this chapter to both preserve and encourage that process." He further stated that joint decision enters again and again in academic discussions on shared governance.

Correspondence: The Chair noted receiving correspondence from the Associated Students on student suffrage in faculty governance.

Approval of Agenda – changes to the agenda: time certain requested for item 6 – Censorship at Dominguez Hills of 4:00. No objection. Motion to add Student resolution on Student Suffrage as a discussion item. Second. Discussion. *Approved as amended.*

Consultation Policies – Second Reading – E. McDonald

E. McDonald clarified where the body was in the discussion. There was a substitute motion for the policy as well as an amendment to the substitute.

Senator Byrne, who proposed the substitute motion, discussed his sources for using joint decision-making in his proposal.

The Chair responded that his sources were national and that some of the universities are not under the same constraints we are. She relies on the Statement on Collegiality, as that is specific to the CSU.

Incoming Chair-Elect Wandling spoke to the issue. He said what we want is academic leadership and the law talks about academic management. Shared governance is somewhere in between. To him the curriculum is intimately tied to the budget at this university. He thought the job of the Senate was to be the voice protecting the academic mission of the university. He did not want the faculty to lose any power given them in HEERA, Title V and the Statement on Collegiality.

A Senator asked how joint decision-making would impact the faculty's role in curriculum. Respondents stated that administrators make curricular decisions or decision that affect the curriculum all the time. What is needed is a stronger voice in that decision-making.

Senator Nelson offered a motion that attempted to blend the original policy with the substitute policy language. It was seconded. **It was moved to postpone the item to the next meeting so that hard copy of the proposed amendment could be provided. Second. *Approved.***

Resolution on the Green Music Center - Second Reading – R. Luttmann

R. Luttmann said he took into account suggestions that were made between the first and second reading. He discussed the changes in format and content. He argued that the campus cannot afford the amount that Academic Affairs would be contributing each year to the Green Music Center. He noted other items on the agenda that were related to the Resolution. He argued that the Senate was never asked to approve the Green Music Center and that the people who thought it up should come up with the money to make it run.

He moved to substitute his new version for the old version. Second. *Approved.*

The Provost spoke about growth money coming to the campus and Academic Affairs portion. He stated that the money for the Green Music Center would not take a penny out of direct instruction. The growth money that comes to campus will be at an SFR at 18:1. From all the academic support money that comes, only 24% would be used to fund the GMC. He said in relation to the total Academic Affairs budget, it would only be 1.8%. He said they are compiling data about OE budgets for disciplines nationally, and are finding that there is a wide range in funding levels across disciplines. Music and Theatre Arts are 33% below average. So these programs are deserving even if the point is not conceded that the personnel would be serving the whole university.

Senator Wingard gave a very concise statement on the GMC and was kind enough to send his notes for inclusion in these minutes. They are included in full as many people referred to them as the meeting continued.

“This is clearly a complex issue that touches on many areas of the University.

Many people have spoken quite eloquently on the needs of the Performing Arts programs and on the virtues of the Green Music Center

I don’t think, however, that these are the real issues. I don’t think anybody questions that the Performing Arts programs have real needs. Nor do I think anybody questions the quality and virtues of the Green Music Center.

I do, however, think one can legitimately ask if this particular facility was the wisest solution to the Performing Arts programs’ needs, and a wise decision overall.

And this brings us to what I think are the real issues.

Despite the fact that the projected share of the costs borne by Academic Affairs has been reduced from \$1.5 million to approximately \$620,000, this is still a significant burden given existing needs and resources of the University.

As stated in the rationale of the Resolution, the University’s Academic Affairs division has been operating for several years under severe budgetary duress. Even without this new burden, Academic Affairs is heavily encumbered.

For example, my own School, Social Sciences, was assessed approximately \$355,000 this fiscal year. Given that 98% of the School budget is salaries, even if no monies were allocated to operating expenses, that represents over a quarter of a million dollars coming directly out

of the school's ability to support the staff and faculty that perform the core mission of this university. A quarter of a million dollars right off the top. While that may represent only a very small square on a budget diagram, we feel it acutely every day.

In my own department, I already have two program coordinators, one of them coordinator of a graduate program, who receives no reassignment time and no compensation for managing these programs. In addition, I work with the program coordinators of two interdisciplinary majors who are effectively department chairs, who, likewise, perform these duties over and above their regular teaching, advising, research and service demands without reassignment time nor compensation. I am certain senators from other schools have comparable or even more egregious examples.

And new costs arise regularly. The schools must now find monies to do the WASC assessments. We still have to find a way to finance the off again / on again computer refresh program. Over the past two scheduling cycles, we have had to prioritize our course offerings and identify shadow sections in the event that there isn't enough money to cover all of our needs. And faculty hires are repeatedly delayed and requests for additional faculty denied.

As sections go unfunded and faculty unhired, our SFRs continue to rise limiting our ability to offer the kind of educational experience our students come here expecting to receive.

At a previous Senate meeting, President Arminañá spoke of requests from faculty for larger classrooms. This is not a reflection of our desire to teach larger sections, but rather what happens when students must be funneled into fewer sections. More, larger classrooms are not what we need; what we need are more sections and more faculty. These are not isolated, qualitative expressions of angst. These are systemic, quantitative symptoms of a struggling institution.

And it is this environment that structures the faculty concerns with and response to the Green Music Center.

We are assured that the students will come and the dollars will follow. I sincerely hope the administration is right. But it is the faculty and students that will bear the burden if they are wrong. Given the volatility we have seen over the past several years, and the stresses we are currently operating under, it would be foolhardy, indeed, to put too much confidence in predictions about the future.

I am concerned that, once built, the Green Music Center will become like the creature in The Little Shop of Horrors whose demands kept growing and could not be ignored.

I am concerned that the Green Music Center will take a privileged status in funding decisions.

I am concerned that the needs and demands of the Green Music Center will negatively impact the ability to meet the needs of other departments and programs.

To prevent this, the faculty must clearly and formally make their concerns known, not just to the current administration, but future administrations as well for the Green Music Center will still be with us long after the members of the current administration are gone.

This resolution is our opportunity to send a clear, unambiguous message to current and future administrations that the Green Music Center should not and must not become a burden to the faculty and students of this university should the optimistic, but highly

questionable, assumptions of the current administration prove to be wrong. For these reasons, I support this resolution and encourage other Senators to do so as well."

A Senator noted that the campus has gotten growth money for years and workload and SFR has gone up. As access of faculty to students diminishes so does quality. He supported the resolution.

A Senator said that having a separate entity to run the Center reminds him of the relationship between the University of Oregon and the Ashland Shakespeare Festival. He encouraged exploration of that model. **He moved to amend: RESOLVED that no re-ordering of expenditures related to the Green Music Center from the Academic Affairs budget shall be countenanced. Second. Approved.**

He moved to amend: RESOLVED that the Academic Senate requests that Administration decision making regarding the Green Music Center respect the CSU Statement on Collegiality. Second. Vote = Yes = 11; No = 12, Failed.

A Senator commended Senator Wingard on his statement and said she had consulted with her constituency and all spoke in favor of Senator Wingard's statement.

Motion to extend discussion 5 minutes. Second. No objection.

Motion to amend: RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommends to the Administration that it find ~~other~~ sources external. . .Second. Discussion.

Motion to substitute amendment: RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommends to the Administration that it find ~~other~~ sources external to Academic Affairs. . .Second. Approved.

A Senator asked what the assessments were for in Senator Wingard's school.

The Provost responded that assessments were a key issue. He said that they are working on getting relief from the assessments.

The Senator asked again what the assessments were for the school in specific. People mentioned various items such as the Darwin remodel and the flood. The Senator argued that assessments spread around the university support the whole university and cautioned against limiting support in this way.

A student Senator spoke to her experience as a theater arts major and argued that the GMC would provide classrooms for the performing arts, which are greatly needed.

Question called. Second. Approved.

Vote on Resolution on the GMC – Yes = 20; No = 12. Approved.

RESOLUTION ON THE GREEN MUSIC CENTER

RESOLVED that the Academic Senate applauds the Administration's decision not to use any funds from Academic Affairs to meet operating costs of the Green Music Center for any activities not directly associated with the University's academic mission; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommends to the Administration that a separate legal entity be created to assume liability for any potential deficit incurred by non-academic activities of the Green Music Center, so that Academic Affairs will never be forced to pay an assessment to cover such costs; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Academic Senate recommends to the Administration that it find sources external to Academic Affairs to cover the operating costs of the Green Music Center; and be it further

RESOLVED that no re-ordering of expenditures related to the Green Music Center from the Academic Affairs budget shall be countenanced by the Academic Senate until and unless actual student enrollments require shifts in resources and these shifts are approved by the faculty acting through the Academic Senate; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Academic Senate requests that the Administration respect the CSU Statement on Collegiality, which grants authority to the faculty to make decisions regarding curriculum and requires consultation with the faculty in other matters; and be it further

RESOLVED that this resolution be publicized by the Faculty Secretary to the campus, the local community press, and the California State University leadership.

RATIONALE: After nearly 10 years of planning the Administration is proceeding with the construction of the Green Music Center, and is looking to the Academic Affairs division to provide an estimated \$620,000 per year toward the operating costs of this facility. The faculty of Sonoma State University, whose official voice is the Academic Senate, did not request that a Green Music Center be built and has never approved the significant shifts in academic, curricular, and pedagogic emphasis that will be entailed by this project. As the Provost has noted, "The President's strategic decision to build the Green Music Center was anticipated to have some impact on the growth of the performance arts programs..."; that is to say, the President made the decision, even though a curricular impact unapproved by the faculty would be the consequence.

Although the Administration points to "reports" it has made to various University bodies such as the President's Budget Advisory Committee (but not the Academic Affairs Budget Advisory Committee), the Foundation Board, the Enterprises Board, the Campus Planning Committee, and the Campus Re-engineering Committee, as well as (on seven occasions, most at the request of the faculty leadership) the Academic Senate, such "reports" do not equate to "consultation" and certainly not to "approval".

Had the Academic Senate been asked to prioritize the directions in which it would like the University's programs to grow, new facilities for music and the Center for Performing Arts would have been on an extensive list which might also have included new or expanded offerings in engineering, business, nursing, modern languages, peace studies, psychology, Hutchins, and other severely impacted programs, for example.

The coming on-line of new instructional space does not in-and-of itself increase either the number of students served by this University nor the dollars received from the State for this purpose. When the student population of this University does grow, any new "discretionary" growth money must be used to fund goals that support the mission of the university, that is, the funds received must be used to provide instruction to the additional students, in whatever fields their academic interests require – which means primarily new faculty hires, but also all the attendant needs such as secretarial staff, computers, counselors, library resources, etc.

The Provost has said (on Senate Talk) "there have not been any real forecasts of future numbers of majors by discipline at SSU (or the CSU, for that matter), other than rather simple extrapolations of past enrollment used for capital planning purposes", and (paraphrased) a highly likely scenario is that the enrollment (and hence the growth funding) may not materialize. The President noted in his January Convocation speech that "the days of 'build it and they will come' are over".

When and if new students do show up, they may not be significantly skewed toward studying in the performing arts; or they may, but there is no data to suggest they will.

The University's Academic Affairs division has been operating for several years under severe budgetary duress, which has created or exacerbated such problems as increasing class sizes, increasing student-faculty ratios, increasing faculty workloads, and a significantly impaired ability to deliver the kind of high-quality personal educational experience for which the University has a reputation. As the Provost has said, "[The GMC project] clearly cannot be undertaken at the cost of damaging our primary academic mission." The Academic Affairs division is in no position to shoulder any additional expenses associated with the Green Music Center, now or for the foreseeable future.

Resolution on Dominguez Hills Censorship – R. Luttmann

R. Luttmann introduced the item which describes Dominguez Hills censorship of CFA material over email and resolves that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University finds that the censorship of CFA materials at our sister campus at Dominguez Hills is intolerable, outrageous, and unacceptable, and stands resolutely in solidarity with the faculty at CSUDH in deploring this act of censorship and calling for its immediate end.

Motion to waive first reading. Second. *Approved.*

Vote on resolution. *Approved.*

RESOLUTION
(E-MAIL CENSORSHIP AT DOMINGUEZ HILLS)

WHEREAS the California State University Dominguez Hills campus administration attempted to prevent the California Faculty Association from using the campus e-mail listserv to send its 5 January edition of "Headlines" (its state-wide on-line weekly newsletter sent electronically to all members who join a list-serv); and

WHEREAS the CSUDH administration unilaterally declared CFA's weekly missive to be "partisan" in its critiques of the Trustees' and governor's CSU funding proposals as described in the Governor's State of the State speech; and

WHEREAS, although there are statutes that prohibit the use of public resources for partisan purposes, the intent of the law and past litigation has limited the prohibition to partisan campaigning for candidates in an election; and

WHEREAS censorship is the systematic use of power to broadly control freedom of speech and expression, a restriction on speech or writing which includes restrictions on forms of expression before they are disseminated; and

WHEREAS what the CSUDH administration imposed meets the test for censorship because it has prevented CFA from reaching campus employees on a voluntary listserv, a listserv that members can leave anytime they wish; and

WHEREAS the CSUDH administration had previously imposed censorship on CFA e-mail communications: in October 2004 when the CSUDH administration attempted to block two stories discussing two initiatives on the upcoming ballot, and the preceding June when it imposed a one-working-day preview on "all CFA material distributed through the campus e-mail system"; and

WHEREAS clearly, the CSUDH administration is attempting to use its power to impose restrictions on any opinions it views as critical or contrary to its own; and

WHEREAS in this environment CSUDH can never become the "communiversity" mentioned in the campus vision statement: a place where free speech, diversity of opinion, and open communication are valued; and

WHEREAS CFA plans to file an unfair labor practice charge with the Public Employees Relations Board, saying this is a unilateral change in a major working condition without bargaining under the terms of the contract; therefore be it

RESOLVED that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University finds that the censorship of CFA materials at our sister campus at Dominguez Hills is intolerable, outrageous, and unacceptable, and stands resolutely in solidarity with the faculty at CSUDH in deploring this act of censorship and calling for its immediate end; and further be it

RESOLVED that the Faculty Secretary be directed to notify the CFA (Chapter and State-wide), the Statewide Academic Senate, the Chancellor's Office, and the administration of CSUDH of this action taken.

Priority Registration Policy - Second Reading – D. Jordan

D. Jordan introduced the item and reminded the body that no policy currently exists. The policy describes who is entitled to priority registration and how to go about getting it. There were questions about the list of categories of students that will automatically received priority registration. Sentiment was expressed to limit priority registration to students that really need it. It was noted that historically athletes in NCAA sports and students with Presidential Scholarships were given priority registration and that these remained in the policy.

Vote on policy. Approved.

Motion of time certain now for 10 minutes for student suffrage issue. Second. Withdrawn.

Resolution on Faculty Workload – Second Reading - C. Ayala

C. Ayala reported that FSAC decided to make no revisions to the resolution.

Motion to change: That a reasonable distribution of workload be a total of 30 WTUs per academic year be to comprised of (a) *no less than 6 WTUs/yr assigned time for advising, curriculum development, committee work, university service, service within the academic discipline, and service to the external community; (b) no less than 3 WTUs/yr assigned time for research, scholarship, and creative activities; and (c) no more than 21 WTUs/yr assigned to instruction; and be it further*

to

That a reasonable distribution of workload be a total of 30 WTUs per academic year be to comprised of (a) *no more than 21 WTUs/yr assigned to instruction; (b) no less than 6 WTUs/yr assigned time for advising, curriculum development, committee work, university service, service within the academic discipline, and service to the external community; (c); no less than 3 WTUs/yr assigned time for research, scholarship, and creative activities; and be it further*

Second.

Substitute amendment

That a reasonable distribution of workload be a total of 30 WTUs per academic year be to comprised of (a) *no more than 21 WTUs/yr assigned to instruction (b) no less than 3 WTUs/yr assigned time for research, scholarship, and creative activities; (c) no less than 6 WTUs/yr assigned time for advising, curriculum development, committee work, university*

service, service within the academic discipline, and service to the external community; and be it further

Second. Vote on substitute amendment – *Approved.*

A guest suggested finding an audience for the resolution and using the active voice as opposed to the passive voice.

Motion to remove from second resolved - *faculty and other faculty in departments that emphasize research, scholarship, or creative activities.* Second.

Motion to refer back to FSAC to consider after their consideration of the RTP policy. Second. Discussion.

Question called. Second. *Approved.*

Vote to refer to FSAC. *Approved.*

Provost Report – E. Ochoa

E. Ochoa reported that he personally supported about 75% of the resolution on the GMC. He validated the notion that the faculty helped create a significant shift in decisions about the funding of the GMC. He described the function of the GMC advisory council.

A Senator remarked that her constituency asked her to bring to the administrations attention the timing and amount of time involved in the assessment workshops being held on Friday afternoons. There were only two weeks notice and it was implied that at least one faculty from each department would attend six weeks of workshops. She said the content of the workshops was valuable, but was another example of a demand on faculty time without consideration of the timing or amount of time. Many faculty use Friday afternoons to catch up on work.

Good of the Order – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach recognized the input of the faculty in talking to the administration about the GMC and particularly commended the Chair for her clear voice and persistence on this matter that has had an impact.

R. Luttmann said he was convinced that Provost Ochoa agreed with the faculty and wanted to protect the funding for Academic Affairs and was pleased they found 75% agreement.

Adjourned

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström