

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

December 2, 2003

PRESENT: Andres A., Andres C., Aronson, Carroll, Feldman, Ferriz, Filling, Floyd, Gackowski, Garcia, Harvey, Helzer, Jensen, Katsma, Morgan-Foster, Myers, Nagel, Nelson, Neufeld, O'Brien, Oppenheim, Paterson, Peterson, Poole, Riedmann, Rios-Bustamante, Rumayor, Sarraille, Senior, Stessman, Tan, Thompson, Watkins, Weddle, Young, Youngblom

PROXIES: Davis (Shipley)

ABSENT: Bettencourt, Brown, Cunha, Dauwalder, Everett, Zarling

GUESTS: Edmondson, Erickson, Gallegos, Jaasma, Jaureguy, MacDonald, Misaki, Plants, Price, Rios, Takahashi, Thomas

Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman

17/AS/03/FBAC--Resolution on Budget Priorities, APPROVED WITHOUT DISSENT

20/AS/03/FBAC--Policy on Campus Distribution of Lottery Funds, APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

INFORMATION: Science II, Residential Life Village III and Emergency Preparedness

Next Academic Senate Meeting:

Tuesday, January 27, 2004
2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room

Minutes submitted by:

John Sarraille, Clerk

Speaker Aronson called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

The agenda was approved as submitted. Minutes of November 18, 2003 were also approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Two items from the last Senate meeting: Review of Interdisciplinary Chairs and Policy for Discontinuance of Academic Programs, have been referred back to committee.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

1. Nagel questioned when the lecturer survey will go out and Floyd replied that FAC will be finalizing it tomorrow and it should go out Monday.

ACTION ITEM**a. 17/AS/03/FBAC—Resolution on Budget Priorities**

Sarraille explained the changes made: In the set of bullets, the 5th one "retention of the current permanent

and temporary faculty" was added. Also the 4th bullet was added "support of California Assembly Concurrent Resolution 73, which urges the CSU to increase the tenure-track/temporary faculty ratio while providing that no temporary faculty lose their jobs." Resolution 73 is supported by the CSU administration, CFA, and the Statewide Academic Senate. The thrust of the changes is that we retain faculty positions and the people in the positions, and the resolution applies in all times - not just when times are tough.

Thompson questioned if there is anything in the resolution that would not be friendly to the Administration and Sarraille replied that the only thing he could think of is that it allows less flexibility when cutting. Thompson asked if this would be a Sense of the Senate resolution or would it be sent to the President. Sarraille stated that it is a tough call, although the last budget priorities resolution was approved by the President. Morgan-Foster stated that although she values the sentiments expressed in the resolution, the lack of flexibility could be a problem if times get difficult.

Aronson reminded Senators that this resolution states the faculty's priorities, not the institution's. Morgan-Foster replied that the resolution does say how the University should behave, and not knowing the budget situation, it might be difficult to abide by it.

Carroll stated that these are the faculty's priorities, and is only a value statement. Oppenheim advised that the last time we had a major budget crisis in the 1990's, the President at the time started out with the premise that every branch had to be cut by the same amount. The Senate Executive Committee convinced him that following his policy would be disastrous for the University. Areas that bring in revenue (such as faculty) should not be cut.

There being no further discussion, the question was called.

Vote on the resolution passed with one abstention. This will now go to the President for action.

FIRST READING ITEM

a. 20/AS/03/FBAC---Policy on Campus Distribution of Lottery Funds

Aronson explained that the lottery fund process has a definite timeline. We would like to consider moving to second reading today.

It was MS Sarraille/O'Brien

BE IT RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate, CSU Stanislaus, support and endorse the attached recommendations of the Lottery Fund Task Force ("Policy: Campus Distribution of California Lottery Funds"), and be it further

RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate commend and thank the Lottery Fund Task Force for its work.

RATIONALE:

Since the year 2000 it has been the policy of the CSU central administration to turn over most of the CSU share of lottery funds to the campuses and to allow the campuses to determine what to do with the funds. Our campus receives an average of roughly \$750,000 in such funds annually. Until now the allocation

decisions were made in an ad hoc manner. The proposed policy would formalize and codify an allocation process that conforms with accepted principles of shared governance. The proposed process would involve faculty significantly in the decision-making.

The Lottery Fund Task Force and the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee have worked extensively on revising and refining the recommendations. Both groups approve of the final version herein attached.

MacDonald distributed the final version of the Policy: Campus Distribution of Lottery Funds. Sarraille explained that this was developed over the summer by the Lottery Fund Task Force. It was then given to the SEC, they referred it to FBAC for review. FBAC made many suggestions and it went back and forth to the task force and FBAC for amendment and now it is in final form. FBAC and the Lottery Fund Task Force feel it is a good policy.

Sarraille noted that we get about 3 quarters of a million dollars each year from the lottery. These funds are purely for instruction. The proposed committee has a faculty majority to make allocation decisions. If we are to start the process this academic year, we need to waive the first reading and pass it today. If it is not passed today, we could continue to discuss it at the January meeting, but it will be too late for implementation this year. Further, for faculty morale, it would be good to pass it this year to give faculty a say in making budget decisions.

MacDonald, Chair of the Lottery Fund Task Force, thanked Aronson and SEC for bringing the policy here today. She thanked FBAC and Sarraille for the time they spent working on the document. It is a much stronger document now. She thanked O'Brien, a member of the task force. MacDonald advised that at her very first Cabinet meeting last summer, she was given the assignment to look into lottery. In July, the campus received \$750,000 from the lottery and we rolled the same amount forward from last year. It attracted attention that we had so much roll-over money and it raised the question of what we would do with it. Previously, we had followed the pattern the CSU system had set. But, in 2000, the CSU gave campuses discretion for these funds, but we continued to allocate as before. That is what the task force looked into—an internal process to allocate these funds. After much discussion, the task force decided to use the IRA process as a model. FBAC looked at what the task force recommended as well as suggestions by the Deans Council and the Cabinet. The final document before the Senate is the latest version from FBAC to the task force, with input from the Deans Council and Cabinet.

Floyd questioned 3 a) and c) and suggested it should say "Library/Counseling." Sarraille replied that the Counseling representative on FBAC suggested this language. She felt it was not necessary to include a Counselor. There are not many Counselors and they are already spread thin serving on various committees. She felt it more important to have a Library representative. Further, 3 c) would take care of the Counselors concerns.

O'Brien stated that he and Professor Fred Hilpert were members of the task force and that their goal was to assure that faculty are well represented on this committee. He noted that FBAC and specifically Sarraille, spent a lot of time on this document, and they are happy with the final version. It's good to see we are proactive for once. We usually get things too late to have input.

Oppenheim question the first page which says that California law stipulates that the net revenues of the California State Lottery shall not be used as substitute funds but rather shall supplement the total amount of

money allocated for public education in California. He asked if anyone has heard about spending this money for other purposes and Sarraille replied no. MacDonald commented that in the budget crisis of the 1990's, Library funding was cut, but some was replaced with lottery money. The Library never got all its general fund support back and it still relies on lottery funding. She added that instructions on lottery fund allocations from the CSU have varied over time. In practice, they do not investigate how money is spent.

Sarraille indicated that you can read the statement in the California statute in different ways. One way you can read the statement about substitute funds is as a promise from the Legislature to give lottery funds to the CSU and not to reduce other funding that comes to the CSU (e.g. general funds). Don't be reluctant to consider this. We should not interpret it in the worst way. We should not do ourselves harm by assuming that we cannot use lottery funds to compensate for other instructional funding that has been reduced or removed.

Thompson questioned page 15 in the packet. There were a couple of changes recommended that are not in the final document. Sarraille stated that in the remarks of FBAC, we say judgment on allocations should be based on University and faculty priorities. Thompson stated yes, that language was deleted. Sarraille pointed out that the following language was not deleted but just moved to position #6 in the document "6) The allocation of lottery dollars should support the University's strategic goals and priorities. Every effort should be made to produce the greatest possible instructional benefit for each dollar spent." Sarraille added that he was somewhat concerned that the language in #6 does not explicitly mention faculty (or staff or student) goals. He pointed out that this underscores the importance of faculty having strong influence on university strategic goals.

Feldman stated it is far better to have faculty input this year than to have no faculty input. He urged passage of this resolution today.

It was MS Feldman/Peterson to waive the rules and go to second reading.

Vote to waive the rules passed by voice vote.

Discussion continued as an action item.

Tan asked that the lottery fund allocation list be distributed to departments.

Youngblom asked if the appointments to the Lottery Fund Review Committee would be one year appointments and MacDonald replied there was general agreement terms would be staggered. Sarraille explained that FBAC didn't address the term of office. They felt this could be decided later and not be part of the policy.

Carroll questioned the timetable, noting in April the committee makes their recommendation to the President. Is the money determined at that point? MacDonald advised that the exact amount of money is unknown and the committee would use small numbers when recommending. It was suggested that percentages would be the best way to go. MacDonald agreed.

There being no further discussion, vote was taken and passed unanimously by voice vote. This will be sent to the President.

OTHER

Filling reported on the budget situation. The Governor is proposing a general fund spending cap at 2004/05 levels and a provision that revenues that exceed the cap would go into a budget stabilization fund over which the governor would have major spending authority. He would have the power to make mid-year changes without the approval of the Legislature. Filling urged Senators to get informed and make their Legislator(s) aware of their feelings.

INFORMATION ITEMS

a. Science II

Interim Associate Vice President Gallegos updated Senators on the Science II building. The new facility will be approximately 115,000 gross square feet with a construction cost of \$46.6 million (This was funded through the fiscal year 2002 bond) including design and construction management, and \$7.8 million of furnishings and equipment (the \$7.8 million is included in the fiscal year 2004 bond) for an overall project cost of \$54.4 million. The equipment and furnishings list includes microscopes, spectrometers, centrifuges, refrigerators, freezers, cabinets, chairs and desks. Science II will accommodate approximately 857 students in classrooms and laboratories. It also will contain offices for faculty and academic administration for the sciences as well as a new observatory, a greenhouse, and an animal care complex. The building will be a three-story structure sited south of the existing Science I building. Construction is scheduled to begin Summer 2004 and be completed Summer 2007. The building is expected to be ready for occupancy Fall 2007.

Residential Life Village III

Director of Housing and Residential Life Erickson explained that the need for additional on-campus housing led to the expansion of the Residential Life Village. The University is constructing a 300-bed apartment-style living facility to address the demand. The new three-story complex, including 75 four-bedroom apartments, will be located adjacent to the existing Village I and II projects. All three phases will be incorporated into a single complex. An adjacent dining facility will provide food service and meeting space for the residents. The project is on schedule to be completed and ready for occupancy for Fall 2004. Total cost of the project is \$16.3 million.

b. Emergency Preparedness

Chief Larry Plants, Lt. Steve Jaureguy, & Amy Thomas from Public Safety/University Police Services described the importance of maintaining a safe and secure learning-centered environment. The roles and responsibilities of faculty were described for preparedness, emergency response and evacuation. Public Safety offers training workshops on emergency preparedness, dealing with disruptive students, self-defense, CPR, first aid, and other things. They requested continued support of evacuation drills, practice exercises and open communication with safety ideas and concerns.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30.