

Senate Minutes

March 22, 2001

Abstract

A special presentation from Bob Cherny, Chair of the Statewide Academic Affairs committee regarding Faculty Resource in the CSU preceded the agenda. Agenda and Minutes approved with small changes. J. Filp presented consent calendar item for changing math requirement in Chemistry's B.A. Substitute motion offered by D. Hammond and E. Mendez for P. McGough's substitute motion for P. Phillips Resolution of No Confidence in Chancellor Reed. P. Phillips withdrew his original resolution. Hammond/Mendez resolution approved with one small amendment. Report from Vice President Larry Furukawa-Schlereth with Deborah DuVall regarding bridges over Copeland Creek, the Telecommunications Infrastructure Initiative and classroom renovations. R. Luttmann's YRO resolution accepted for first reading. Lecturer's Council proposal tabled. Reports from E. Carlson (and S. Pridmore), R. Luttmann and S. McKillop. Emeritus Dinner announced.

Present: P. McGough, R. Luttmann, L. Brooks, P. Phillips, S. McKillop, W. Poe, W. Boda, D. Hammond, G. Parker, E. Martinez, T. Wandling, H. LaMoreaux, V. Garlin, S. Tiwari, E. Mendez, T. Nolan, R. McNamara, C. Merrill, H. Smith, C. Nelson, P. Marker, R. L. Thomas, S. Miller, R. Deorsey, B. Goldstein, L. Furukawa-Schlereth, E. Carlson, S. Pridmore, J. Filp, S. Heft, M. Dreisbach, S. Moulton

Absent: M. Rattigan, A. Merrifield, R. Armiñana

Guests: Megan Solomon, Bert Holcomb, Steve Orlick, Katharyn Crabbe, Dennis Harris, B. Plank, B. Coleman-Senghor, D. Martin, D. DuVall. Steve Wilson, Benet Leigh.

Proxies: D. Poland for D. Trowbridge

Special Item: Report on Faculty Resource in the CSU by Bob Cherny, Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Statewide Academic Senate. T.C. - 3:00

Phil McGough introduced Bob Cherny. A handout that summarized his report was passed out to attendees. It is included in these minutes.

B. Cherny – The Academic Affairs committee began last September to respond a request from D.B. Albert, Chair of the Joint Committee concerning the Master Plan for Kindergarten through University in California. We have written a comprehensive look at the Master Plan. Your two Statewide Senators, Susan McKillop and Peter Phillips are both on the Academic Affairs committee and both have been major contributors to this report.

The report has moved now from the Academic Affairs Committee to the Drafting Committee. If you have comments please give them to S. McKillop for our revision. My presentation today discusses portions of our report on the CSU at the beginning of 21st

Century. The full report is online in PDF format at <http://bss.sfsu.edu/cherny/AAC/Draft4.pdf>.

(Dr. Cherny's actual presentation is not recorded here, as the full report is available for review as well as a summary. Following is a record of the questions and answers after the presentation.)

V. Garlin - Where is the leadership in system to come from to implement these proposals?

B. Cherny - Not from the Chancellor. He never asks for enough. We are hoping we can educate some Trustees and Legislators. We also hope Academic Senates can provide some leadership.

V. Garlin - Many of these proposals do not require more money but reorganization. They could be done without the Legislators or the Governor. Where are the pressure points to get these proposals looked at seriously?

B. Cherny - We are looking at decision-makers, people who can provide that kind of pressure. We want to identify who has the ability to talk to Trustees and Legislators. This has not happened in the last 10 years. We want to see something different happen.

D. Harris - The last time this report was presented the question was raised about what would be an appropriate audience for this report. Do you know where it will be presented?

B. Cherny - My understanding is that the next generation of presentations will be shown to the Trustees in May. There is a plan use it in lobbying the Legislature. One member says we should send it to every newspaper but we do not have consensus yet.

S. McKillop - In today's Press Democrat there is an article about the discussion at the Trustee's meeting about the applied doctorate. When the Trustees have a meeting the media is there.

E. Carlson - The CSU is asking for monies. On our campus we are lobbying for the applied doctorate for education. The CSU is looking at the problems and are addressing them.

B. Cherny - Let me remind you of the slide about faculty salaries. The Trustees have not asked for enough money to bring faculty salaries into parity. This year is the first time they've asked for subsidized faculty housing. They proposed \$10 million. We joked that that's about 10 houses in San Francisco. It is a drop in the bucket for what's needed. We need to change the full-time faculty workload for graduate students from 15 to 12. Looking at the annual increases in university budgets, the UC always gets a larger percentage than we do. We are not arguing that the UC shouldn't get that, but that we should get an equal amount. Our administrators don't ask for enough, they only ask for what they think they can get. In terms of the applied doctorate, our sense in the Academic Affairs committee is that other areas that may have greater need than the EDD, for example Nursing. The Chancellor thinks the EDD is the easiest to get. If we ask for other things the UC will be upset.

M. Dreisbach – It is very important to rework the workload formula. Workload has really changed. There is more demand within teaching and service plus higher expectations for scholarship and research. I'm very pleased to see this issue in your report.

S. Heft – I think it would be good for the press to get it at some point. I'm a Librarian and so I thank you for your kind words about the library.

S. Orlick – It is hard to approach the legislature asking for more money when the CSU has received growth money and little of it has made it into the classroom and little has been used to hire full-time faculty.

B. Cherny – And that's not the faculty's fault. I'm not sure there's a legislative solution to that. What might be done is to return to a formula driven situation. I saw that as attractive but no one else did.

L. Brooks - Maybe I didn't understand about the redefinition of 15 to 12 for graduate students - how would that lower the SFR since it would increase the number of FTE?

B. Cherny – It wouldn't but increased funding would go into instruction. If that were the case it would change the reality. It depends on how the funding would go, whether funding would go to instruction.

B. Plank - Does the report deal with the changing nature of our current students? I teach in Computer Science and one to two students per class cannot attend because they have to go on a business trip. Most of my students are working full-time. Many will drop out or fail. So in a strange way our enrollment figures are inflated. Students have to repeat because of outside work.

B. Cherny - I teach history and have students with the same issues. We haven't addressed that. We looked more at remediation. It is an interesting issue. I'm not sure how to address it. Maybe somehow we let students become real full-time students

V. Garlin – I want to underscore the workloads on this campus. We have crushing workloads and to mitigate it we are hiring lecturers. There are very few classes that meet the 120 student guideline for people to double their WTUs. We can't do it on this campus. I wonder whether the committee considered including the changing percent of budget for administrative costs and comparing growth of presidential salaries over the same time period to faculty salaries?

B. Cherny - I don't recall anyone suggesting that. If the amount of student money coming is above but faculty salaries are lower, where is the money going? We can take that to the Drafting committee and see if they want to include that. The administration always takes the position that it is such a tiny part of budget it doesn't matter.

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Phil McGough

Since our last meeting a new resolution from San Luis Obispo has been passed so I pass it on to you. Also we've handed out an overview for the argument for the EDD. I hope it will be useful to you.

Approval of the Agenda- There was a request to move item #3 to #1 – MS *Approved*

Approval of Minutes - Changes were noted for Deborah Hammond's motion. She will provide missing text. MS *Approved*

BUSINESS

Consent calendar item from EPC – Chemistry B.A proposes changes in Math requirement – J. Filp – attachment

J. Filp – EPC provides you with this proposal to change the Math requirement in the Chemistry B.A. It increases the units of math required from 6 to 8, which puts them in line with other programs in CSU system. It does not involve other courses. They worked on this for 10 months. It has been approved by the Curriculum committee and approved by EPC. I present it to you for the consent calendar.

D. Martin - This unit difference is just a historical accident that we want to bring in line.

C. Merrill – A point of information. Historically we have not brought to the senate such minor changes. It seems we only saw major changes in terms of curricular matters. I ask the Executive Committee to look at that. That it not be required to come to the Senate if it is not a major change.

P. McGough – Previously it was stated that not enough was being brought to the Senate - I'll bring it up.

Resolution of No Confidence in Chancellor Reed (Phillips), substitute motion (McGough), and second substitute motion (Mendez and Hammond) – attachment and see packets of 2/8, 2/22 & 3/8.

R. Luttmann chaired this item.

R. Luttmann – Deborah Hammond is asking to withdrawal her previous motion and use this substitute one. Are there any objections?

No objections

D. Hammond – I was not happy with the choice of the two extremes between the Phillips and McGough resolutions presented. We felt it was important to address the Chancellor's leadership and appreciated the arguments in favor of no confidence. We thought that the Statement of Collegiality was useful to find a middle ground.

R. Luttmann – Please confine your debate to whether we substitute this new one for McGough's.

E. Mendez – We also felt we could send this in with performance evaluation of the Chancellor going on now.

P. McGough – I see two separate issues here. One is FMI and the faculty contract which is in the self-interest of the faculty. The other is the performance of Chancellor Reed. To put them together I think leads to a lack of credibility of faculty – I am opposed to the

substitute substitute motion. It will have no credibility. We need to separate these issues.

B. Poe – I support this recent resolution strongly. The Chancellor's failure in leadership is linked to his performance. It is a well-crafted motion.

T. Wandling – I agree with B. Poe. The FMI is not just bad for faculty; it is bad for the whole system. It is not just our own self-interest. This is inclusive.

W. Boda – I still feel the same and agree with P. McGough. It is more effective to deal with his review process. I still do not want to pinpoint a specific person.

V. Garlin – I would choose the Hammond/Mendez motion if I have to choose between theirs and McGough's. It is an appropriate motion. Thanks for bringing it. To those who are concerned about naming a person, Chancellor Reed is hard as nails. He will not take offense. Most Trustees look to him for leadership on faculty affairs. It is essential he be named. Public policy can become personified in a particular person.

P. Phillips – This resolution seems to express the feelings I share and perhaps less bluntly - thank you for putting it forward and at the proper time I would like to withdraw my motion and I urge P. McGough to do the same.

J. Filp – I like this motion. Especially where it states that the Chancellor's acts and the imposition have impacted our morale. But I would not vote for it to wait for an opportunity to make strong point on the FMI.

C. Merrill – It is still a no confidence vote in the Chancellor. I don't think we should name a person, particular when there is a review underway. I'm not ready to take that stand. The time may come, but I don't know if that is the case at this pint. I think we should split the two - contract and FMI process.

E. Martinez – I have read San Luis Obispo's resolution and really liked it. I like it having more meat addressing FMI. I would prefer P. McGough's.

Vote was called. R. Luttmann clarified that a Yes vote puts the Hammond/Mendez substitute on with the Phillips resolution and a No vote puts McGough's with Phillips.

Final vote: Yes = 16, No = 9, 2 abstentions - *Approved*

R. Luttmann – Now the Phillips resolution is on the floor. Will we substitute it with the Hammond/Mendez resolution?

P. Phillips – With the permission of the body I would like to withdraw my motion.

(There was a parliamentary discussion concerning whether if Phillips withdrew his resolution, the Hammond/Mendez resolution could be amended.)

P. McGough – I move to waive our rules on amendments.

Seconded.

Vote on waiving the rules for amendments. Yes = 17, No = 7, 2 abstentions - *Approved*

R. Luttmann – Is there any objection to Phillips withdrawing his resolution?

No objection.

S. McKillop – I move that the word complete in the third whereas be stricken.

Seconded.

No objections.

L. Brooks – In the first resolved, I move to use “serious concern about” instead of “lack of confidence.”

B. Poe – There is a difference between using the terms lack of confidence and no confidence. It is appropriate to use strong language in this instance.

V Garlin – I agree with Bill. The resolution very artfully deals with position that Phil raised. There are skillfully chosen words and it uses confidence in a way that expresses how I feel. I urge this amendment be defeated.

Vote on L. Brooks motion - Yes = 7, No = 17 - *Failed*

P. McGough – (to T. Wandling) I agree that the FMI goes beyond faculty interest. The resolution as it now reads is about the CSU. I propose an amendment to the first Resolved that it read the Chancellor’s commitment to the faculty and its importance to the value and mission of the University.

B. Coleman – This is a move to shift it, it clarifies.

S. McKillop – In terms of mission and commitment - Faculty are very important to put in here - other constituencies thinks he is doing a great job.

B. Poe – McGough’s amendment completely changes the meaning. I don’t want any closer relationship with the Chancellor. I have no hesitation stating that the faculty defines the values of the university.

D. Hammond – The first resolved refers to the mission and the reference to the statement of collegiality refers to values.

Vote on McGough’s amendment - Yes= 8, No = 13, 6 abstentions = *Failed*

Motion to close debate – seconded.

Vote in favor of closing debate - Yes = 22 no = 5 - *Approved*

Vote on Hammond/Mendez resolution - YES = 18 No=8, 1 abstention - *Approved*.

Time Certain was reached for the Vice President of Administration and Finance’s report.

Vice President/Admin. & Finance –(L. Furukawa-Schlereth) - TC. 4:50

L. Schlereth - I have 3 items to report to you today. The first concerns bridges over Copeland Creek. I have with me today Deborah DuVall, Director of Campus Planning. Our campus master plan states that we will accommodate 10,000 FTES. The EIR assesses this. The campus and community can comment on the EIR and we went through periods of public comment - 80-90 days. The amount of cars and traffic when we come to 10000 FTES was a concern. Cotati and Rohnert Park were distraught about the number of cars coming to campus. They asked - what do you plan to do to mitigate this? What we came up with is the north entrance to campus. People could then enter campus from Rohnert Park Expressway, Petaluma Hill and E. Cotati. At one point it was asked if the bridge would be used for emergency vehicles only. The President misspoke about this. At the time he answered this question he was not aware of the concerns about traffic mitigation. The EIR raised the question that emergency vehicles should come from both north and south directions. There will be three bridges - one for cars and two for pedestrians. The Administration recognizes the value of Copeland Creek and has a commitment to enhance the creek area. I have asked Deborah to work with environmental consultants to find ways bridges could be used with limited environment impact.

D. DuVall - (showing map) The vehicle bridge will be between parking lots G and H. A footbridge will be located near the larger lake. It will clear span the creek and will not alter the streambed. We narrowed the size of the bridge to accommodate this. We picked out locations that were least destructive to the habitat and could accommodate the narrowest bridges. None of the run off will drain into Copeland creek and lighting will be restricted to the bridge deck. We will redo vegetation that is disturbed. We will create bat and other bird habitats under bridge to encourage them there.

G. Parker - Why can't the bridge remain for emergency vehicles only and have people walk over?

D. DuVall – The point of view of the project is that it is primarily a vehicular bridge.

G. Parker - Is there a way to urge reconsideration?

L. Schlereth – We would have to reopen a comment period. The University not prepared to do this at this point.

E. Carlson –Rohnert Park and Cotati need all traffic not to come in one way. The input from all surrounding communities is that all traffic coming down E. Cotati would be a blight. They could not handle the traffic.

G. Parker – Wouldn't people not be using E. Cotati because of the parking lot at the music center?

L. Schlereth - Our interpretation is that we cannot limit the bridge vehicle traffic to emergency vehicles because of what we said we would do in the EIR. We can encourage people to do this, but cannot require it.

S. Pridmore – I'd like to try to understand your concern. The campus has mitigated run off - what exactly is your concern?

G. Parker – I don't like more traffic circulating around campus.

R. Luttmann – I want to make sure I understand you correctly. The EIR is essentially a commitment that this bridge be open to traffic. Changing that would open up a comment process again. This bridge is critical to mitigating traffic on the three streets that surround campus. We are also providing pedestrian bridges to cross by foot.

L. Schelerth - This road is not limited by the EIR. If we limit it we would not be following what we said we would do. We would open ourselves to litigation and it is not what we sent to the Trustees.

S. McKillop – Wouldn't it be an option to come across to G and H but block off access to the campus past tennis courts? That's within our campus.

S. Pridmore - Delivery trucks wouldn't be able to get off campus.

V. Garlin – If not for the Green center and its collateral consequences would this bridge have come up?

L. Schlereth – This bridge has nothing to do with Green center. Under our master plan we will grow to 10,000 FTES. When we get to that level we will have traffic issues. The Green center has traffic issues at non-peak traffic times. The campus followed the public comment period and this has been extensively discussed and will not be reopened.

B. Coleman-Senghor – This is a report on something that is long underway.

McGough - We can continue this discussion at the next Executive committee meeting.

L. Schlereth – The next item I would like to tell you about is the CSU telecommunications infrastructure initiative. This is a \$6 million project funded by the CSU to bring state of the art technology to every faculty office and classroom. It will disrupt your lives, but we will try not to disrupt it too much. The details are very technical. There is a PowerPoint presentation on SSU website (<http://www.sonoma.edu/IT/TII/TII.ppt>) This is a highly positive thing that will cause about two years of disruption but it will provide a much better situation.

P. McGough – I recommend the website to you.

L. Brooks - Will the technology be hardwired?

L. Schelerth - Some classrooms will be hardwired and some will use wireless technology. If you use technology you will like it.

W. Boda - Will this happen before the Stevenson Hall renovation?

L. Schelerth - Yes. We will receive the formal renovation plan from Bob Karlsrud. When planning for classroom renovations we asked to the Executive Committee to send five professors to help with this. From this we have developed a scheme for our 64 classrooms. We hope this summer to do our first six.

D. DuVall – Our task force has a representative from each school. We wanted the classrooms to be high tech, durable, and ergonomically as good as we can get. Furniture defines what goes on in the classroom. We have three formats – lecture, moveable, and formal labs. We picked out classrooms that represent these styles so we can pilot these and learn what goes right and wrong. We want to satisfy our primary client and anyone else who would use it. (She then discussed details of specific elements such as carpet, colors, etc.) The first six rooms identified are in Stevenson.

L. Schelerth - The expense will be about \$300,000 for six rooms. This will not affect the instructional budget in anyway. We have permanent dollars for renovations in 10 years cycles. The faculty members of the committee were Martha Ruddell, Armand Gilinsky, James Christmann, William Crowley Christine Renaudin.

J. Filp – The design looks good. Will there be any bulletin boards in classrooms?

D. DuVall – Yes there will be.

L. Brooks – This is a good thing. Congratulations.

V. Garlin – I want to ask about ventilation in interior classroom rooms.

D DuVall - We need to look at every situation. If you are finding the ventilation in a particular room bad let's have the engineers look at it now. Call them in.

YRO Resolution – R. Luttmann - attachment

R. Luttmann – We are hearing lots of rumors about YRO that are unpleasant and really violate documents about faculty governance. It is important to take a stand and let the Chancellor know our position.

The resolution was accepted as a first reading.

Proposal from Lecturer's Council – See packet of 3/8

Tabled.

REPORTS

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

No report.

Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs - (B. Goldstein)

No report.

President of the Associated Students - (E. Carlson)

S. Pridmore – I am working on the Renter's Bill of Rights that will be distributed to students to help them be aware. I know of students whose rights have been violated.

The Alternative Mascot Committee has met twice and is drafting a question to put to students and alumni. We are looking for \$500 to mail it.

Chair-Elect of the Senate - (R. Luttmann)

R. Luttmann – We agreed to have a Senate Budget committee. We have three nominations now but this body thought we should have six to run the election. Our Ad hoc Committee on the new dorms will have a report and recommendations shortly.

S. Heft – Another nomination for the budget committee is coming.

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

S. McKillop – In your packet is a report on the remarks between Spence and the Statewide Senate. Please note on page 4 there is a discussion about YRO.

Chairs, Standing Committee - (Moulton, Filp, Heft, Dreisbach,)

No reports.

Items from the Floor – none

Good of the Order

P. McGough – An Emeritus Dinner is coming April 20th. More information will be forthcoming.

Adjournment 5:30pm

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom