CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES
December 4, 2001

PRESENT: Almy, Bargetto-Andres, Buell, Carroll, Christopher, Farrar, Fazal, Filling, Floyd C., Floyd R., Harris, Johnson, Kobus, Kohlhaas, MacDonald, Mayer J., McLaughlin, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Peterson, Russ, Saraille, Sereno, Shipley, Sivak, Tan, Thompson, Towell, Yang, Zarling

PROXIES: Bowers (Akwabi-Ameyaw), Hogan (Rhodes)

ABSENT: Afonso, Blodgett, Burroughs, Clark, Ferriz, Gackowski, Kimyai, Manrique, Mayer M., Potter, Robbin, VanRuiten

GUESTS: Hughes M., Paulson B., Young T.

23/AS/01/FAC--Administrative Review Policy, TABLED

22/AS/01/GC--Fee Waivers for Graduate Students Carrying Teaching Responsibilities, TABLED

24/AS/01/FBAC--FBAC Budget Priorities, APPROVED

________________________________

Next Academic Senate Meeting:
Tuesday, January 29, 2001
2:30-4:30 p.m., South Dining Room

________________________________

Minutes submitted by:

Steve Filling, Guest Clerk

It was MSP Thompson/Farrar to approve the agenda. Peterson asked that the November 20 minutes on p. 4 in the second to last paragraph be amended to read: "Peterson stated her support for the recommendations, but indicated the report has some serious problems and is not ready for public release. She stated the current FBAC has not discussed the report although some have concerns. She asked that the report and recommendations be split."

Zarling - p4 - thrust of his argument re post tenure review it was a bad policy. It is also a bad policy with respect to administrative review.

It was MSP Thompson/Saraille to approve the minutes as amended.

REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. Speaker/SEC (Russ)

Russ reported that we are in the middle of the Provost search. Four finalists are on campus this/next week. Please attend forums and provide comments/insights.

Russ attended the 27th Annual CSU Academic Conference held in San Diego. The topic was primarily the
budget - key issue is that quality not be reduced as budgets are. There was some discussion on fee increases.

There is pressure on CFA and the CSU to settle the faculty contract.

There is talk about hiring freeze [some layoff talk] - positions this year will be filled.

Add to agenda - item 6 - consent item [FBAC resolution] [time certain 3:30]

1.47% reduction this year, definite 5%, possible 10 % reduction next year.

Thompson reported the presentation from CSUS at the CSU Academic Conference was about Ida Bower's bridge project.

Russ advised that the Master Plan for higher ed is mutating into master plan for k-phd [starting next summer with work]. Thanks to Thompson for presenting Bower's program at the academic conference.

CSU/UC signed off on joint doctoral program - students will get UC credit for it, but we will write the curriculum.

b. UEPC (Floyd)

1) Academic Program Review - UEPC agreed that several departments can use November 1 draft Academic Program Review as a pilot.

2) January UEPC will bring Grading Option to the Senate for discussion.

3) Currently reviewing Psych revision [labs to seminars]. Just keep in mind, this has effects on facilities.

c. FAC (Towell)

no report

d) FBAC (Filling)

no report

e) GC (Blodgett)

1) GC sent a letter to Interim Provost Rhodes expressing unhappiness about space issues in new building.

f) SWAS (Thompson/Sarraille)

no report

g) Provost/VPAA (Rhodes)

no report
h) ASI (Johnson/VanRuiten)

Still interviewing Union Director candidates.

**ACTION ITEMS**

a) 23/AS/01/FAC--Administrative Review Policy

Towell notes that the resolution was distributed previously. Deans have been working on budget issues and have not reviewed the document, so she asked to table until the issue of Post Tenure Review is addressed. It was MSP Towell/Christopher to table.

b) 22/AS/01/GC--Fee Waivers for Graduate Students

Blodgett asked for deferral until next meeting. It was MSP Blodgett/Thompson to tabled until the February 26th meeting.

Russ notes that the Jan 29 meeting rules will be suspended so we can discuss the roles of committees, constitutional issues, etc. Also to ensure open forums on this.

**CONSENT ITEM**

a. 24/AS/01/FBAC--FBAC Budget Priorities

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee should serve as the faculty's representatives in the budget planning process and should participate in all budgetary discussions from the inception of the planning process until the determination of final budget allocations, and be it further

RESOLVED, that our major priorities for institutional budget allocations are those essential to the academic mission of the University, including maintenance or reduction of the student/faculty ratio without increasing the proportion of part-time faculty, maintenance of academic equipment and technology budgets to support teaching and research, maintenance of the library acquisition budget, and support of professional development and travel.

**RATIONALE:**

CSU Stanislaus has been directed by Chancellor Reed to reduce its 2001/02 General Fund budget by $713,670 (1.46% of the General Fund) and warned that "further budget reductions for next fiscal year are likely."

In 1995, the California Higher Education Policy Center predicted a 12% increase in enrollments in the California State University System between 1999-00 and 2004-05. On October 29, 2001, Chancellor Reed stated, "during times of economic hardship, more students choose to stay in school and many workers return to higher education," suggesting that the enrollment increase may be even greater than earlier predicted.
President Hughes has announced that she will begin work immediately with her Cabinet to develop a process to guide campus efforts to adjust to budgetary reductions during a time of increased enrollments, and has expressed a commitment to engage the campus community in the budget planning process to "ensure inclusiveness and honor shared governance." The CSU Stanislaus faculty is the key component in achieving President Hughes' goal to "sustain our educational mission and preserve quality" and should be involved in the budget process throughout its entirety.

Russ explained that Consent Items are either accepted or not. If not unanimous, it goes to a First Reading so we can have discussion, and then we might act on it in February.

Sarraille - the terminology is that we resolve not to increase proportion of p/t faculty, which implies that we could cut back faculty [if we cut back students] or as long as we did f/t and p/t cuts proportionately.

Zarling - assume that SEC and FBAC will be forthcoming with respect to discussions?

Buell - yes- FBAC's thought is that frequent reports would be forthcoming.

Farrar - there is no mention of salary freezes, cuts or benefits reductions.

Peterson - this is a very general resolution - not sure that we want to put ideas in their heads as to cuts. We might want to follow Sarraillie's lead.

Floyd - if there was a thought as to how this would play out in the planning process, and noting that this is likely a multiyear process, is there some anticipation that the participation process recommended be continued?

Buell - yes - Tom Young was at FBAC last meeting, and the BPAC review process is in redesign at present.

President Hughes - at this time the Vice President for Business and Finance is preparing a number of scenarios. That information will be used as a context for discussion. It is my hope that between now and the time BPAC meets, we will be able to consult with FBAC, deans council, etc. This is accelerated but not as complicated as next year's budget. Further, I would like for us to build a sustainable model for continuing use in the next years. 2nd semester will be the time to evaluate strategic plan and use the system we have structured to communicate.

Morgan-Foster - this resolution is institutional, not system level, so there is not much point in talking about benefits.

J. Mayer - what has the role been in the past?

Russ - standing committee, FBAC, which is advisory to the Vice President for Business and Finance, Academic Senate, BPAC, looks at apr with respect to resources. BPAC is being revamped now. FBAC is still being reviewed by SEC. We will see how effective it becomes. So the resolution is seeking to prompt FBAC to a more active role.

Carroll - it's worth calling attention to the rationale. What they provide is less a rationale than a context. Wondering if FBAC wants to provide a rationale.
Thompson - I think this is an important resolution at a critical time. I support it. Is the second resolved clause essentially the same as last year?

Buell - pretty much.

Thompson - the first resolve - how does this affect faculty rep on BPAC?

Russ - we don't see any voices lost in BPAC.

President Hughes - the first wave [concluding 14 Dec] will be concluded by the old BPAC. I want to underscore that it's not easy to reduce budget by $714k, but enrollment targets netted an almost equal amount of $, plus some possibilities. I want to ask for support from this group to get the word out that we are not in layoff mode. We will be selectively deferring some positions.

Thompson - this is for ongoing work. I don't see how that interacts with faculty representation on BPAC.

Sarraille - seems that this is designating FBAC as BPAC.

Russ - no, BPAC and FBAC have both been there. We are trying to give them more presence.

Farrar - 1] rationale assumes facts not in evidence - are we married to increased enrollment? 2] is campus community the 'on campus' group or is it more? 3] we're working with no contract, so whatever % cut needs to be looked at by CFA - needs to be communication between FBAC/CFA.

Macdonald - 1] what is relationship of FBAC to deans and 'lower levels' of budget discussions? 2] Chancellor Reed - how did he get the 5% number? I confess to not trusting his #s - is there retribution in the air?

President Hughes - Chancellor Reed and the Board discussed these issues in relation to the mandate from the Governor. At first the Chancellor and the Board mandated 1% ...it was directly related to Governor stated need. This is a very iterative process. The 5% is a possibility, no more no less...... this is not scientific, it is ongoing and interactive. Be aware that the Governor is driving a lot of this. The Board, the Chancellor and Presidents are working with the Governor.

Kobus - just for clarity - is BPAC intended to be an open process involving the entire university?

President Hughes - I designed BPAC for open budget process. Supposed to ensure that continuous conversations occurred.

Young - it was a very large and unwieldy group. We attempted to be inclusive.

Kobus - I support this resolution and think the faculty have a very important role to play.

Sarraille - it's difficult to figure out CSU disposable income - For instance, consider CFA statements about energy funds.
Floyd - is there a time frame attached to this?

Russ - it's a statement, but intended as a philosophic statement, so ongoing

Christopher - timing is important here - I can't see anything said to date that indicates the resolution does harm to anything. Decisions and processes are being put in place now. Can we all agree that it may not be perfect but it's main import is to state that faculty need a voice in the budgeting process?

Harris - are we about to vote on a matter of import to the entire faculty based on first sight? [Russ - yes] Second note - there have been three resolutions to date going directly to a vote. I wonder why we continue to proceed in this ad hoc fashion. With respect to Farrar's point - when the budgeting process is driven by the state, it would be appropriate to continue with 'assumptions' about growth in mind.

Floyd - I agree with Christopher because of time constraints. 1] the important thing is that all discussions from the inception is a major change. 2] I understand that the President is supportive. In the interests of that collaboration, I suggest moving forward.

J. Mayer - do we need the second resolved or the rationale given the expedience? That might remove some of the concerns.

Buell - we'll accept that as a friendly change if that is the sense of the Senate.

Carroll - I support Christopher - If we vote as a whole, we should accept. I think Mayer is right, but am willing to accept as is. I think Harris' points are important and require some response.

Thompson - that is why we are not suspending the rules - this is a consent item and is allowed under our Standing Rules.

Zarling - I'm opposed to separating the two - they are related. The second gives direction to the first. It is a good thing to have enrollment projections in there as it makes them a focal point.

Harris - Voiced concern about the foundations of representative democracy. Concerned that items become matters of consent rather than debate. In this matter, he urged colleagues show deliberate restraint and show due deliberation and actually consider things. We don't know that these priorities are indeed the priorities of the campus.

J. Mayer - the next time we meet will be in January. This is an immediate issue -Harris' argument brings up why we need to separate the two resolves. It is interesting that we are thinking of moving quickly. I suggest again separating the two.

Farrar - if we pass the resolves, we are not passing the rationales.

Thompson- agrees with Farrar. Those are the same as whereas clauses.

Nagel - we've been discussing the grave import of this resolution. I don't see any grave import. All it suggests is that FBAC/SEC are our voices [which they are], and that it suggests that the priorities therein are carved in stone, which they are not.
Kobus - with respect to 2nd resolve - this does not exclude other priorities. I don't disagree with them. The general principle is that we're arguing for the academic mission of the university.

J. Mayer - I support whatever we decide to do as a body. Down the road if we look to amend, I'd rather add than subtract or rewrite.

Kobus - what is the process.

Russ - makers can decide.

Thompson - does anyone object will suffice.

Russ - then if no one objects, this resolution is approved as submitted.

It was MSP Floyd/Sarraille to adjourn.