Academic Senate November 21, 2006 PRESENT: Afonso, Brown, Carroll, Clarke, Covino, Davis, Deaner, DeCaro, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Garza, Grobner, Helzer, Janz, Johnson, Keswick, Kim, Lawson, Lindsay, Manrique, Mayer, Nagel, Nelligan, O'Brien, Petratos, Riedmann, Robbins, Routh, Sankey, Sarraille, Scott, Shawkey, Silverman, Stessman, Tan, Taniguchi, Thompson, Watkins, Werling PROXIES: Olivant (DeCocker) GUESTS: Carl Bengston, Carl Brown, Jane Bruner, Diana Demetrulias, Marjorie Jaasma, Gary Novak, Stephen Thomas, Ted Wendt, Andy Young Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman	12/AS/06/UEPC—Declaration or Change of Education Objectives Resolution, MOTION TO AMEND AFTER ADOPTION, APPROVED 14/AS/06/FAC—Procedure for Appointment of Faculty to Administrative Committees, FIRST READING Budget Priorities, DISCUSSED Next Academic Senate Meeting: Tuesday, December 5, 2006 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room Minutes submitted by: Steve Filling, Clerk

1. Call to order at 2:37 pm.

2. Approval of Agenda –Approved as distributed.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of November 7, 2006- Approved as submitted.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. SWAS wants reviewers for CSU EDD proposals. If you are interested, please contact the Senate Office by December 4th.

b. The UBAC is starting back up. We are working on figuring out the composition of the committee.

c. CFA President Filling reported 10 people from CSU Stanislaus went to the Board of Trustees meeting November 15 and assisted 1,200 people to voice their opposition to raising student fees and not negotiating with faculty. Also, CFA Stanislaus Chapter will host a breakfast on November 29th 7:30-9:30 am. It will give faculty a chance to talk to CFA people. He encouraged faculty to attend. Mayer questioned if there had been any feedback after the event and is there precedent for that amount of people showing up? Filling replied in almost 20 years of his and Speaker Sarraille's being involved with CFA, there have never been that many people attending a rally. Everyone had a good time, including the students that shut down the Board of Trustees meeting. Senator Romero got the Trustees to pay attention that increasing student fees is an important issue. Filling stated he has also received calls from local newspapers about the vast disparity of what the Chancellor is offering and what he tells newspapers he's offering.

d. Lindsay stated he consulted with Vice President Stephens and Assistant Vice President Paulsen regarding travel

reimbursement for faculty. After discussion, the following statement was developed: "If an airline ticket has been purchased more than one month prior to an anticipated travel date, a faculty member may request reimbursement for that airline ticket in advance of the actual trip. An approved travel request, along with a proof of purchase from the airline ticket, should be sent to Financial Services, Attention: Travel Desk. The signatures on the travel request are the only authorizations that Financial Services needs to process the reimbursement for the airline ticket. The reimbursement will then be processed by the travel coordinator. After the trip has occurred a travel claim must be filed for all costs related to the trip including the reimbursed airline ticket. Additional expenses will be reimbursed once the claim is received. A comment should be included at the bottom of the claim form indicating that the airline ticket has already been reimbursed."

e. O'Brien announced the 3rd dean candidate in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences will be here November 27th.

f. Provost Covino reported we have been asked by the Chancellor's Office to hold a one-day campus conversation regarding the CSU Strategic Plan. It will be on March 8 and is to be attended by trustees and other folks and us. He suggested we hold conversations prior to that in order to prioritize our discussion. The development of our Strategic Plan is germane to this. He stated we want to have our priorities in place before we enter this discussion. Sarraille stated he received communication about this and SEC will be discussing coordinating the local plan with the systemwide plan. O'Brien stated the SWAS is discussing this and they want to ensure campuses have a voice in it. Tan asked where the CSU Strategic Plan is located so she can review it and Sarraille replied it is on the CalState website. He will send the URL to ASnet.

g. Carroll reported although this item was in the UEPC report, it is important enough to repeat it again and that is the eCollege experiment in evaluating the feasibility of keeping it appears that we won't have sufficient information this year to make a recommendation. It will be carried over until next year.

h. O'Brien stated that much of the original Cornerstones resolution (Strategic Plan) was implemented except faculty compensation.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

Nagel asked about the mention of the structural deficit in the FBAC Report. Who characterized it as such? Lindsay replied he heard the term from the Provost and it was his understanding it is a systemic defect. Year after year, our expenditures exceed our anticipated revenue. Covino added that this term has been used by the President to describe the situation. Sarraille noted the term is being used by many campuses. DeCaro asked what exactly is a structural deficit. Is the whole system lacking money and if so, why don't we have money? Lindsay stated from his perspective as an accountant, it indicates we have reached a point year after year our budget expenditures will exceed our anticipated revenue. The problem could be on either or both sides of the equation. DeCaro asked if we have too much payroll in administration vs. instruction. Lindsay replied it could be, but we won't necessarily find the whole answer in any single category. Currently what is happening the budget expenditures are not always spent, like when a faculty member retire or quits and we will have a budget line for say $80,000 for salary, but it only takes $40,000 to hire an adjunct professor to teach the same courses, but the budget line is for $80,000 so $40,000 won't be spent. Historically, the money would stay in the college and the dean could use it, but in the last two years, the deans have not had budgets. They have had spending plans so if they don't spend the $80,000, the $40,000 doesn't stay in the college. It reverts to the University as a whole and the University as a whole uses it to pay other things so we won't have our deficit turn into a debt. Up to now, as far as he knows, the deficit has not rolled forward. DeCaro asked if there is any way to find out where the deficits lie and Lindsay replied our total budget expenditures are too high. We have choices to make. We would have to look line by line. Filling agreed with Lindsay except he was told repeatedly we don't have budgets, but spending plans, so how can we have a deficit if we don't have a budget? It seems we have an institutional tug of war. It is also the case that the discretionary funds Lindsay mentioned are now aggregated at the vice presidential level and used by them. Since dollars are fungible, we can't trace precisely what those dollars are funding. O'Brien questioned Lindsay about responding to an email Stone sent to him. Her question was "what is the total budget for the campus and what is the deficit. The answer is $74M and we have a $6.3M deficit. Lindsay stated those figures were last year. O'Brien asked when did the structural deficit begin, and how are we paying for it? Lindsay stated he asked that question of Vice President Stephens and she replied it was covered all by salary savings. Lindsay added that since this is the second year we have had spending plans, it could be

related to that, and coupled with the budget crisis four years ago. Covino advised that FBAC has 5 years of data and will be reviewing it. UBAC will also be discussing things like this. But speaking generally, we did have very significant budget cuts in recent years and this campus responded by prioritizing, cutting in other places and also developing flexibility by using one time dollars and salary savings to fund reoccurring costs because the state budget is not sufficient. Those one time dollars could become insufficient so we will see an erosion. We are not cutting positions or academic programs or instituting layoffs but rather instituting efficiencies and limiting the colleges and academic programs to an expenditure plan that can be funded and centralizing any excess dollars that can occur during the year so we see we can reach a point revenue matches our expenditures. We are not there yet, probably a couple of years of lean operations.

Nagel made two points l) in 2005/2006 some lecturer faculty were not rehired in the College of Education. So to say our academic program was not affected or that we did not cut positions is not accurate. When we say we are avoiding academic cuts, we need to be sure it is accurate. A similar situation is occurring at Humboldt State although worse. We need to be aware it could be us. It would be nice if the CSU administration found some way to increase revenue, maybe by lobbying. After reviewing the spreadsheet provided by Vice President Stephens, Filling advised it looks like the major budget cut**s** occurred about five years ago and it looks like the deficit was first mentioned last year, although it is difficult to determine unequivocally because of the large increase in the university wide category of expenses. Covino apologized for not having that information in front of him, but based on what he recalled, a large portion of the $21 million is a result of shifting the benefits portion of salary to one single line in the budget. That year the benefit shifted to universitywide line in large part accounts for the $21 million. Filling remarked that seems to be quite a coincidence. Thompson stated he was glad to hear salary savings do exist. In a similar discussion a couple of years ago at SWAS, the chief financial officer stated there was no such thing as salary savings. Thompson asked Lindsay if FBAC could follow up on the idea of what salary savings are, and the actual amount that is going to the structural deficit. Lindsay agreed. O'Brien asked Filling to send the document out over Asnet. Filling agreed.

Covino clarified that the November 1 FBAC report mentioned money for faculty recruitment allowed for only one dinner with one faculty member and the candidate. He assured Senators there is money to fund all meals while the candidates are here. It is not that bad. The restriction is that only one faculty member accompanying the candidate will have his or her meal funded.

6. ACTION ITEM

a. Motion to Amend 12/AS/06/UEPC—Declaration or Change of Education Objectives Resolution

Sarraille explained on Page 9 of the Senate packet there is a motion to amend after adoption. The text is the resolution Senators passed at the last meeting, except the 3rd paragraph from the bottom is a suggested substitution or amendment to what AS passed. What is going to be suggested is to substitute Carroll's wording in place of the AS amendment.

DeCaro asked if it requires a majority or 2/3 and Sarraille replied, a simple majority. Parliamentarian Thompson concurs.

It was MS Carroll/Filling

To amend the third Resolved clause to read: That the "Declaration or Change of Degree Objective" form be modified as appropriate to implement this resolution.

Discussion:

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on the amendment passed.

7. FIRST READING ITEM

a. 14/AS/06/FAC—Procedure for Appointment of Faculty to Administrative Committees

Thompson stated this was introduced at the last Academic Senate meeting.

Resolved: that the Academic Senate, California State University, Stanislaus affirm the *Procedure for Appointment of Faculty to Administrative Committees*, approved by the Senate Executive Committee March 16, 2004 and by the Dean's Council March 24, 2004.

Rationale: The Faculty Affairs Committee interprets the language of the Constitution of the General Faculty, VI.1.2.b, where a specific duty of the Senate Executive Committee is to "Advise the President of the University on the appointment of faculty members to institutional and advisory committees," to include that the President and administrators who serve at the pleasure of the President must consult the Senate Executive Committee for its recommendation before the appointment of faculty members to institutional or advisory committees. *The Procedure for appointment of Faculty to Administrative Committees* flows from the constitutional language, is a statement to support and facilitate the long-accepted past-practice based on the Constitution, and has been accepted by current and past Presidents.

Eudey asked for clarification. Are we reaffirming a prior policy? Sarraille stated his understanding it is asking the Academic Senate to reaffirm a process we have had for a while that has recently come into question. Thompson added it is not a request to reaffirm because the Senate has not affirmed. At the bottom of page 8 it says SEC approved this on March 16, 2004 and the Deans Council approved this on March 24, 2004. Recently FAC discussed this noting it had not been approved by the Senate so it was decided to forward this to the Senate for their approval. It is a memo of procedures just asking the Academic Senate to affirm the practice.

Novak stated this was recently discussed in Deans Council and although there are only two remaining Deans from 2004, many thought the previous Deans Council never approved this memo/process. Provost Covino replied he reviewed past Deans Council minutes and they did approve this memo/process. Jaasma asked if this process were to be used at the College level and Sarraille replied this deals only with the University level.

Thompson added that this is a Sense of the Senate resolution. It is not making a policy.

This will be an action item at the next Senate meeting.

8. DISCUSSION ITEM

a. Budget Priorities

Sarraille referred to the attached copies of previous budget priorities resolutions on page 10-13. Basically, it has been the practice of Academic Senate to pass a budget priorities resolution that expresses how they want the money spent. Usually the FBAC starts the process, and then a resolution comes to the Senate. This year we are doing it in reverse. We will start the discussion here and send recommendations to FBAC to develop a Budget Priorities Resolution.

Thompson questioned if we are still on a three year computer replacement plan and Covino replied he met with Associate Vice President Whitman last week and gave him the list of faculty up for replacement. He is working to create the most cost effective packages working with various venders. He stated he has every intention of moving forward with this replacement policy of every three years. Thompson asked if FBAC was going to be working on a budget priorities resolution and Lindsay replied yes, after guidance from the AS. Thompson asked if FBAC would be looking at this in relation to the Strategic Plan and Lindsay replied the SP is for 10 years and the budget resolutions are typically annually. So past practice is that the resolutions are short term and the Strategic Plans are long term. Thompson stated his hope that this will include most of the things from before, especially reducing or maintaining the student/faculty ratio. Lindsay replied we need to be careful with that terminology. Student/faculty ratio means something different than the average number of students in a class because of assigned time. Are we concerned with SFR or is it average class size or both? SFR is calculated campuswide by FTES/FTEF. But it doesn't mean those faculty are in the classroom or how much they are teaching. Average class size is the average number of students in a class, which may vary widely across classes, departments, colleges and semesters. We could express guidelines about optimal average class size and optimal SFR if that is the wish of senators.

Garcia asked GC Chair Nelligan to put this before the Graduate Council. He voiced surprise that none of these past budget priorities

resolutions focus on graduate education. The graduate fee differential could also be addressed. Taniguchi stated this brings up another topic. It seems as though this just focuses on faculty issues rather than programs. It appears when we read the SP, a lot of our future vision is program driven. Shouldn't we incorporate that vision in our budget priorities? And under 1.2 and 1.3 of the Strategic Plan, it appears that this is setting up a situation where programs will compete against each other. It is the exact opposite of our assessment practice. She stated a resolution is coming forward regarding assessment principles and they do have budget implications. She then read the "Assessment Principles No. 8: Assessment data will not be used to make comparison across programs, departments, or colleges. Assessment data will be used only for the facilitation of student, program, college, and university development, and are not intended for comparative judgments. Assessment data will be made available to those most closely involved in and responsible for the learning that is related to the data. And Principle 9: Successful assessment requires University support. Assessment works best when undertaken in an environment that is receptive and supportive. Development of sustainable assessment efforts by faculty and programs require additional faculty time and departmental resources. CSU Stanislaus is committed to the development of an ongoing program of assessment and will provide the necessary resources for assessment activities, including professional development for faculty. Innovation, alterations, and activities undertaken by departments and programs as a result of the assessment process must be seriously considered in the allocation of resources." Taniguchi stated since we are in the process of program assessment, it would be useful for us to consider the entire universe of issues which should give us much better input into decisions that will affect the future of the University.

Sarraille thanked Watkins for the wording Taniguchi just read. Eudey suggested except for a line about retaining quality staff, she would like to see a push for programs that enhance student life, programs that enable their scholarship such as funding for the Writing Center, and Counseling. Staffing cutbacks have occurred in these offices and it harms our academic mission.

Carroll suggested adding a bullet that says "continue to provide market equity increases."

9. OPEN FORUM

Tan stated she saw in the newspaper a reference of naming of Science II. She asked if we have more information about that. Sarraille stated the President asked SEC to approve a naming opportunity for the Science II. SEC was told the Naraghi family would immediately give us $2 million and it would go into an account and we could use it immediately. Half would go to student scholarships and half would go to faculty scholarships. The intent was expressed that the deans of the colleges would have the keys to the treasure box. Janz asked if the deans would have responsibility for student scholarships and Sarraille replied he did not know. Helzer asked where the Naraghi family made their money and Sarraille replied it came from real estate and farming.

Tan stated at one time when Ruud was the Vice President of DUR, there was a promise that when we have our 50th anniversary, DUR would have raised $50 million. Lindsay agreed the catch phrase was $50 million on our 50th anniversary. Since we have a new fundraising director, we should ask him of their progress.

Nelligan suggested the Academic Senate pass a Sense of the Senate resolution thanking the Naraghi family for the $2 million donation. The Senate agreed. SEC will develop a resolution and bring to the Academic Senate.

10. ADJOURNMENT at 3:47 pm