<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS</strong></th>
<th>3/AS/06/RSCAPC--Amendment to 12/AS/83/FAC--Sponsored Programs Administrative Policy--TABLED UNTIL APRIL 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES</td>
<td>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21, 2006</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 4, 2006 2:30-4:30 p.m., JSRFDC Reference Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Present: Afonso, Andres, Brown, Dauwalder, Davis C., Davis S., DeCaro, Hall, Janz, Jensen, Kim, Lawson, Manrique, Mantz, Mercier, Minor, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, Nelson, O'Brian, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Poole, Riedmann, Routh, Sanchez-Walker, Sankey, Saraille, Schoenly, Senior, Shawkey, Stone, Tan, Tavernier, Thompson, Weikart, Werling, Zarling

Proxies: Garza (Jacobs)

Absent: DeKatzew, Garcia

Guests: Burns, Demetrulias, Eudey, Stephens, Wendt

**Recording Secretary:** Diana Bowman/Margaret Ramos

Minutes submitted by:

Scott Davis, Clerk

1. The meeting was called to order at 2.40pm.

2. Agenda was approved.

3. Minutes of 3/7/06 were amended to reflect that Tavernier was present, and approved.

4. **Announcements**

   a. Speaker Petrosky announced that the ballot for positions in Academic Senate and General Faculty Committees will be out soon. Currently four positions will run uncontested: UEPC Chair-Elect, FBAC Chair-Elect, SWAS, and URPTC (COB representative).

   b. Saraille announced that the Provostís search is at a stage where three candidates will be visiting. Expect an announcement soon.

   c. Saraille also announced that the timeline for implementing the Workload Agreement is in discussion. Some chairs have reviewed it and find it workable. It looks promising.

   d. Thompson advised that an item on the Spring ballot will be a Constitutional Amendment on SWAS. In 2002, SWAS expanded, and promised it would "live within its budget." The Office of the Chancellor interprets this as "the budget will never be raised," and there is a current shortfall of ~$50-120K. The
proposed Amendment would reduce SWAS back to its original size to accommodate the budget. O'Brien added that once this is done, an additional Amendment would be proposed to have the SWAS budget increase with the state budget, to prevent this happening in the future.

e. Davis announced that the draft Strategic Plan is out and available for comment. There will be four Open Fora where all members of the campus community may provide input and feedback; these will occur on Fri 3/24, Wed 3/29, Thu 3/30, and Tue 4/4. In addition, an anonymous online threaded discussion area will be made available at panopticon.csustan.edu/stratplan/. We also plan to have an Open Discussion in the next Senate meeting (4/4). The window for public comment will close on Friday April 7, 2006, so please participate.

f. DeCaro announced that UEE would bring an MS program in Genetic Counseling to Senate for approval next session.

5. Questions about reports

O'Brien asked if Weikart could elaborate a remark in the FBAC report about "the general budget situation and lack of tenure-track searches, etc." Weikart responded that in September, President Shirvani announced raises to faculty and staff which would come out of enrollment growth dollars. That's where new faculty lines get funded. This year, instead of opening additional lines, we gave raises to existing ones. We have replaced those lost, but not funded any new ones. We have another $1.8M in growth dollars for next year, and we want to keep discussion open on how best to apply it. Sarraile asked for confirmation that in September, the President had identified the source of funding for the raises as enrollment growth funds, and got it.

Thompson asked how the number of tenure-track lines we shrank compared to the salary increases we received. Dauwalder replied that the number of tenure track lines didn't shrink; it just didn't grow. We replaced attrition from separations, retirements, and FERPS (in multiples), but granted no new lines. He informed AS last spring that this was the recommendation of (then-incoming) President Shirvani. He granted that additional monies were spent on non-tenure track hires. Weikart confirmed both that the tenure-track lines are the same, and that expenditures on contingent faculty increased. Sarraile observed that the amount of money spent so far in equity raises is approximately $230K of base funding out of $1.2M in growth dollars supposedly dedicated to them.

6. Action Item

a. 3/AS/06/RSCAPC ó Amendment to 12/AS/83/FAC ó Sponsored Programs Administration Policy

Schoenly updated the body on policy language changes made since the first reading, including the change to cost recovery in Section 3.5.4 (as recommended by Poole). He also noted that he had since received several additional concerns which were all grappled with previously; perhaps they didn't get the wording right. The four remaining concerns are:

1) Section 3.1.1: dept chair must review: is this necessary or desirable?
2) Section 3.2.2: definition of "employer"
3) Section 3.4.5: procedures for "cost recovery"
4) In general: where is "consulting" addressed?

Sarraile suggested that since the document is not finalized, we should put off a vote. Schoenly volunteered to take it back to committee. Every item of concern was sent to RSCAP, but they have not had a chance to meet since receiving this new list.
Burns claimed to have sent responses to O'Brien and asked if there were additional elements. O'Brien replied that her response addressed items 1 and 4, but not 2 or 3.

It was MS Sarraille/DeCaro to table voting for two weeks.

*Discussion of motion to table:*

Demetrulias noted that these items have all been discussed, and asked if there was a way to resolve the issue today. Nagel pointed out that the body only owns the resolution, not the attachment, and procedurally cannot modify the attachment. Thompson clarified that technically, we are considering tabling any consideration of the resolution, and referring it back to the originating committee. Sarraille pointed out that if there was no perceived need to change, there was no need to table. Zarling added that the appropriate venue for discussion and resolution of disputed areas is the committee.

Motion to table passed by voice. The resolution is returned to the RSCAPC for a period of two weeks, and will return as a second reading item on 4/4/06.

**7. Open Forum**

a. **ALS Restructuring Process**

Zarling noted that at the last Senate we approved the restructuring of the College of ALS with the proviso that seven areas of significant concern remained to be worked out. Meanwhile, the President is calling informal meetings to name interim deans and search committees. We have no idea where this timeline is coming from. Sarraille confirmed that the issue was not raised in SEC. Zarling added that the real substance of the restructuring report and the resolution endorsing it is contained in the details. He is concerned about the pace of movement without any consultation.

Demetrulias advised that it was her understanding that next year is a transitional year; the President working with the colleges to create interim leadership respects that timeline. These are the beginning steps of organization. Zarling conceded the action might be reasonable, but it was happening without consultation.

Sarraille agreed with Zarling, adding he would like to see more advise and consent about the process, or at least some discussion before things happen. He doesn't want to get in the way or protract these discussions. However, what bothered him is that the Natural Sciences meeting had no agenda. Zarling added that the President wants a decentralized approach, and wants college faculty to deal with issues appropriate to the college. She pointed out he met with the existing colleges as well. That process is consultation, and he feels it important to speak directly with groups, as well as governing structure. He should be able to meet with faculty of a college without codifying it in an agenda.

Demetrulias noted that the President wants a decentralized approach, and wants college faculty to deal with issues appropriate to the college. She pointed out he met with the existing colleges as well. That process is consultation, and he feels it important to speak directly with groups, as well as governing structure. He should be able to meet with faculty of a college without codifying it in an agenda.

Zarling expressed his delight in the Presidentís desire to talk, but added that the President had been considering for some time what was going to go on, and the faculty had five minutes to answer momentous questions about identity and naming, and point person for information. To know these things would have been talked about would have been helpful. Springing things like that on us cold is not genuine consultation, especially when it would have been inexpensive to alert us.
Afonso noted they had a similar meeting with the President in the new College of Arts, and left only with informal guidelines about how to proceed. They then received information which led to a confusing email discussion. The whole thing was counterproductive. If they had come to the meeting with idea of what to expect, they might have put more effort into it.

Thompson agreed, and admitted to the same surprise. The resolution says AS will consult. While it's important to talk at the college level, this could be perceived as jumping past the elected body to call his own meeting, with whomever showing up making decisions.

b. Faculty Affairs Rumors

DeCaro asserted his understanding that Faculty Affairs Committee was restricting summer teaching assignments to part time faculty and reducing the 30 unit VL contract to 24 WTU. Sarraille admitted that he was on FAC but was drawing a complete blank about this. Stone added that she knew nothing about any plans for summer. There has been a discussion about recommendations on Lecturer Workloads, but it doesn't go near the contract.

DeCaro persisted, demanding to know what validity there was to these rumors. Stone repeated that FAC has no power to write a contract. Sarraille added that any resolution likely will recommend that the normal teaching load for VLs be 24 units, as they are generally performing indirect instruction.

DeCaro asked if he would be given a chance to review this. Sarraille replied that if it came as a resolution to Academic Senate, he certainly would have the chance to do so.

c. Dedicated Classroom Space

Thompson is trying to request a dedicated classroom space, and wants to know who processes the request. Stephens advised to send it to Lisa Bernardo, who coordinates classroom assignments. Bernardo doesn't have the unilateral authority to assign, however; she advised consulting with the provost, if it came to that.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:20 pm.