

<p>Academic Senate August 28, 2012</p> <p>Present: Bice, Floyd, Broadwater, Burroughs, Colnic, Crayton, C. Davis, Deaner, Espinoza, Eudey, Filling, Garcia, Gomula, Gonzales, Grobner, Guichard, Hartman, Hidalgo, Lore, Jackson, Jasek-Rysdahl, Johnson, Kane, Littlewood, Marcell, Martin, McGhee, Mulder, Nagel, Park, Peterson, Petratos, Petrosky, Regalado, Salameh, Scheiwiller, Silverman, Strahm, Strong, Thompson, Vang, Werling.</p> <p>Proxies: Filling for McGhee, Mark Grobner for Marina Gerson, Ed Aubert for Barbara Manrique, and Greg Morris for Werling.</p> <p>Excused: Avwundiogba and Nhu-Y Stessman.</p> <p>Guest: Glenn Pillsbury, James Tuedio, Dennis Shimek, Carl Whitman, Dean Oddmund, Lauren Byerly, Kevin Nemeth, Reza Kamali, Steven Wood, John Sarraille, Marge Jaasma, Linda Nowak, and Brian Duggan and President Sheley.</p> <p>Isabel Pierce Recording Secretary</p>	<p>.</p> <p>Consent Item: 1/AS/12/SEC – 2012/2013 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate (Sense of the Senate) Approved unanimously.</p> <p>First and Second Reading of 2/AS/12/AS Resolution in Support of AS-3090-12/EX Support of Proposition 30 on the November 2012 ballot: Temporary Taxes to Fund Education. Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding. Passed.</p> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting: September 18, 2012 2:00-4:00pm, JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <p>Minutes submitted by: Cathlin Davis, Clerk</p>
--	---

1. Call to order

2:02pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Approved unanimously.

3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of May 1, 2012

Approved unanimously.

4. Introductions

Speaker Grobner welcomed the following guests: Glenn Pillsbury, James Tuedio, Dennis Shimek, Carl Whitman, Dean Oddmund, Lauren Byerly, Dean Kevin Nemeth, dean Reza Kamali, Steven Wood, John Sarraille, Marge Jaasma, Dean Linda Nowak, and Brian Duggan. We may have a visit from Interim President Sheley today.

5. Announcements

Barbara Manrique had a hip replacement last week and Ed Aubert is her proxy today. Betsy Eudey distributed 2 cards if folks that know Barbara want to sign them.

Renae Floyd noted that the FDC continues to graciously sponsor the bi-weekly mediations in this room. They meet on Mondays and Thursdays at 12:15pm and you're welcome to join them.

This has been an ongoing campus group for 4-5 yrs. There's no need to commit to regular attendance. These are half hour silent sessions and there's no religious affiliation with this group.

If you need instructions, you can call her at X3381. Feel free to use as part of stress management.

John Sarraile noted that they're having voting on the ratification of the faculty contract until Thursday at 5 PM. Please encourage faculty members to vote.

6. Committee Reports/Questions

Interim President Sheley arrived.

Hello. I'll start by saying that I'm sorry that I wasn't at the general faculty meeting. I heard it was a good meeting and a good way to start the year. I've been running hard and had to take care of a problem just now, but I did want to come by. You need to know that you can work with me. I am an old Senate hand way back to my kid faculty days, and I was the Senate chair for 2 years. I learned more in my years as Senate chair than I did in 15 years as a faculty member. As an administrator, I still hold those couple of years on the Senate as near and dear to me. I don't treat it as perfunctory, or apart from what we do on the rest of campus. It is an important piece of what we do — broadly academic, curriculum, hiring, promotion and tenure issues — and that to me is shared governance and pretty sacred stuff. I've been meeting routinely with Mark Grobner, and the Provost talks to me multiple times weekly. The Provost has been trying to get a sense of where I'm going to be on some issues. I want to learn more about why and where people want to go with the campus. I won't be over here every meeting, but when you need me I'll certainly be here. The main person I need fully engaged is the Provost and the Speaker so I can ask them if I'm hearing and reading things correctly. This is what I did at Sacramento State as the Provost. Above all else, the goal is that any disagreements are honest and over substantive issues.

I won't remember all of your names, but remind me until I do. I am looking forward to getting to know all of you. I hope that you all will come to the presentation tomorrow at Snider Music Hall. It's open to the campus community, students, staff, faculty and community members. It's not so much agenda building as it is my attempt to give you my idea of the biggest challenges we face right now. I want to ask people to work together to solve problems. I'm hearing all over the place that students can't get classes. I'm not sure if that's correct regarding the required GE classes. I don't want to just hear from a few people that it's a problem without knowing the dimensions of the problems. If it's a very small subset that's one thing, but if it's across the board it's a problem.

Over the summer I've met a lot of people; alums/business people and I've gained a lot of positive views of the campus. The community folks hold it in very high regard, but they have a million things they'd like us to do. Some are in reach and we could make a difference. The last thing I'm going to mention is about how we can get noticed outside of this region. We're not going to be down forever, and when the gates open again, there will be a lot of who's going to

get what in a 23 campus system and we need to be competitive. For me that's a big deal. People ask me what's my vision, but that's inappropriate for me to say without a discussion. We need to get noticed in a positive way. We need community advocacy. The more competitive campuses will go after it, and I don't plan to eat their dust. I need your help with that, unless that's not where you want to go. Please come to the University address tomorrow. It's a mixed group, which will shape what's said. On any of the themes that get raised, if you want to devote a Senate agenda time to them, just ask. I look forward to working with you. We're in big trouble, but it's not trouble we can't handle. We just want to make sure that we don't get distracted by other things and try to serve our students.

7. Information Items:

a. Clicker Training

Speaker Grobner provided a training of the iClickers and noted that if you enter more than one vote that your last vote will be the one that is counted.

b. Introduction to Shared Governance PowerPoint (Mark Thompson)

Speaker Grobner thanked Mark Thompson for providing a presentation on Shared Governance. Thompson noted that his presentation is adapted from a presentation by Bob Cherny, Professor of History at San Francisco State University. Thompson stated that Senate Executive Committee thinks we need to see this every year, and this is a slightly different version. The current context for this coming academic year is the budget which looms over everything, but faculty should be involved in enrollment management, prioritization of academic programs, and workload. We have a responsibility and authority in those areas. Thank you. (Applause.)

Thompson shared the presentation with the Senators via ASnet at this link:

https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/103NtHCve9Df57zcL2SL62Ex6Bx3y5Ks-I4euR76-kHY/edit#slide=id.g1afa3203_1_107

c. Statewide Constitutional Amendment #3076 “Statement Upholding Academic Freedom (Amending CSU AS Constitution). Requires GF vote in fall 2012.

Filling noted that the academic freedom has been a subject of much discourse the last couple of years. The court system dealt with the Garcetti vs. Ceballos case and the decision suggests people don't have freedom of speech as state employees. Faculty rights to freedom of speech on academic and university matters needs to be imbedded in the constitution of the ASCSU. Changes to the ASCSU constitution require a vote of all faculty in the CSU system. We will be submitting a vote to the general faculty electronically through Qualtrics this fall semester.

8. Consent Items

a. 1/AS/12/SEC – 2012/2013 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate (Sense of the Senate)

Last year we limited speaking or written statements to 3 minutes, which we will continue this year. The 3rd page reviews various actions. The basic process is that an item comes to senate for a first reading and then it might go back to the committee to be amended. It comes back to the Senate for a second reading at which time we vote on it. Read over the standing rules, and hopefully we will follow Robert's rules of order.

1/AS/12/SEC--STANDING RULES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

INTRODUCTION

The General Faculty has delegated to the Academic Senate the authority to act in its behalf on matters related to policy and advocacy. All actions of the Academic Senate are subject to referendum by the General Faculty. In the absence of a call for referendum, Academic Senate actions are General Faculty statements.

The Standing Rules of the Academic Senate are intended to supplement the Constitution and Robert's Rules. Their purpose is to facilitate the orderly and efficient conduct of Senate business. The Speaker may appoint a Senate Parliamentarian for any scheduled meeting or meetings of the Academic Senate.

The Standing Rules will take effect when approved by the Academic Senate (a two-thirds majority of the voting membership is required). They will remain in effect until amended or rescinded by the Senate (the same two-thirds vote is required).

RESOLUTIONS AND OTHER ACTION ITEMS

Resolutions and other items that are intended for consideration and possible action by the Senate are to be submitted in finished form to the Senate Executive Committee for placement on the Senate agenda.

It is expected that the necessary research, writing, and editing of resolutions will have been completed prior to their submission to the SEC.

Committees and others proposing a resolution should be prepared to address the following:

- a) the issue that prompted the resolution;*
- b) the degree of urgency, if any;*
- c) the salient features of the resolution;*
- d) the resolution's relationship to established CSU and/or CSUS policy;*
- e) the contribution to a learning centered University and strategic goals;*
- f) the resolution's relationship, if any, to other previous or pending actions by the faculty;*
- g) the fiscal implications of the resolution, if any;*
- h) the probable consequences of Senate action;*
- i) whether the resolution should be a "sense of the senate" or should go to the President for signature*
- j) the desired effective date, if approved;*
- k) the wording of the policy as proposed.*

Administrative liaisons to Academic Senate and General Faculty Committees, including Subcommittees and Ad hoc Committees, will inform the Speaker of the Faculty via a memorandum, with a copy to the Speaker's Executive Assistant, of all proposed agenda items, including estimated deadlines for action, before, or at the same time, they are presented to that particular committee.

To assure expeditious treatment, resolutions should be submitted to the SEC a minimum of 10 days prior to a Senate meeting and should follow the format of resolved clauses followed by a rationale in paragraph form.

ACADEMIC SENATE MEETINGS

The schedule of Senate meetings for the year is approved by the SEC. The Senate will meet at least once each month during the academic year. Regular meetings are scheduled on Tuesdays from 2:00 – 4:00pm in the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center Reference Room.

Academic Senators unable to attend a Senate meeting may give a proxy to a full time faculty member in their department. The proxy should be in the form of an email sent to the Clerk by the absent Senator or by memorandum, signed by the absent Senator and handed by the proxy-holder to the Clerk before participating in the Senate meeting. Members of the SEC also elected to be a representative of their department will have the right to cast two votes; one for their department, and one for SEC.

The agenda for each Senate meeting is prepared by the SEC. The agenda, copies of resolutions, and the minutes of the previous Senate meeting are sent to each Senator approximately 5 calendar days prior to each Senate meeting.

The quorum for Senate meetings is 60% of the voting membership of the Senate. (In 2012-2013 there are 46 voting members; thus, the quorum is 28.)

TYPICAL AGENDA FOR A SENATE MEETING (see explanatory notes below)

1. Call to order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of previous meeting
4. Announcements
5. Questions concerning Reports
6. Information Items
7. Consent Items
8. Regular Business
 - a. --First Readings
 - b. --Second Readings (Action Items)
9. Discussion Items
10. Open Forum
11. Adjournment

"Announcements"

Limited to brief statements on matters which may be of interest or concern to the entire Senate.

"Questions concerning Reports"

Committee Chairs will disseminate brief reports electronically to Senators a day or two before meetings. Senators will have the opportunity to raise questions in response to the reports.

"Information Items"

Any non-action item that might be of interest to the General Faculty. Sometimes an item is placed on the agenda under "Information" for clarification or notification before being placed on the agenda as a First Reading item.

"Consent Items"

This is an assemblage of presumably routine or non-controversial agenda items. They are scheduled early in the meeting so that they can be dispensed with quickly, i.e., without extensive discussion or debate. Items on the Consent Agenda that elicit objections will be shifted to the regular agenda.

"First Readings" and "Second Readings"

Resolutions will be handled on a "First Reading" - "Second Reading" basis. Normally, the "First Reading" will occur at one Senate meeting and the "Second Reading" at the following meeting. This procedure provides for: a free and open discussion of resolutions and their underlying issues in a relaxed and informal atmosphere; sufficient pause for reflection and consideration; and timely debate and decision.

First Reading: *Committee chair bringing forth the resolution will move the resolution. Speaker will ask for a second. Then the maker and seconder of the motion will introduce the resolution and provide a briefing. The Speaker will ask for questions, comments, discussion, and possible straw votes--but no amendments or any other formal Senate action. When recognized by the speaker, each person will have the floor for up to three minutes. Only people who are physically present at the meeting will be recognized. People who are unable to attend may give a prepared statement to another person who can read the statement to the senate when they are recognized by the speaker. After the First Reading, the committee or individual sponsoring the resolution will consider the questions raised and recommendations made in the discussion and make any appropriate revisions, this will facilitate expeditious handling of the resolution during the Second Reading.*

Second Reading: *Discussion/Debate/Decision-- Ordinarily, time limits will not be strictly enforced. As a general guide, however, thirty minutes of discussion/debate should be sufficient for each resolution being considered; and two minutes should be sufficient for each speaker. During the discussion/debate a speakers' list will be maintained. Preference will be given to those who have not yet spoken. If a direct question is asked to someone who has already spoken, that person will normally be given the chance to respond briefly. At the conclusion of the discussion, Senators will vote on the resolution. Tabling and referring are also possible during the Second Reading, please refer to table 1 on the next page.*

"Discussion Items"

An opportunity for discussion of emerging issues and policy questions.

"Open Forum"

An opportunity for input.

SUSPENSION OF RULES: Any of the above rules may be suspended at any Senate meeting by a two-thirds majority vote of those present.

Table 1. Dealing with Common Actions in the CSU, Stanislaus Academic Senate

There is some variation in the interpretation of Robert's Rules of Order. To avoid confusion and lengthy parliamentary discussion, it would be helpful to have agreement within the Standing Rules about how to handle certain common actions and what some of those actions mean:

Motion	Floor?	Second ?	Debate ?	Amend ?	Vote
Amend	Y	Y ¹	Y	Y	Majority
Amend Amendment	Y	Y	Y	N	Majority
Call for previous Question (end debate and move to a vote)	Y	Y	N	N	2/3 ²
Challenge ruling of the Chair	N ³	N	Y	N	Majority
Debate, limit	Y	Y	N	Y	2/3
Divide the question ⁴	Y	Y	N	Y	Majority
Division (provide a countable vote)	N	N	N	N	N/A
Point of information/parliamentary inquiry	N	N	N	N	N/A
Table to a certain time	Y	Y	N	Y	Majority
Table indefinitely ⁵	Y	Y	Y	N	Majority
Refer (e.g. to a committee)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Majority
Waive 2 nd reading--move to action item	Y	Y	Y	N	2/3

Floor? If yes, you must have been recognized by the Chair and have the floor to take this action.

Second? If yes, the action requires a second.

Debate? If yes, the action may be debated.

Amend? If yes, the action may be amended.

¹ For any amendment, the proposer may ask if the amendment is "friendly", meaning acceptable to the senate without the need for debate. If it is "friendly", it is simply incorporated into the resolution. Any senator may object to an amendment, thus making it "unfriendly" and causing the proposed amendment to require a second and majority approval.

² Requires a vote by show of hands to allow counting. Vote is 2/3 of those voting (rather than 2/3 of those present) and excluding abstentions. Outcome is determined by taking the number of "no" votes, doubling that number, then seeing if it is greater than the number of "aye" votes. E.g. **23** aye, 12 no; 12 x 2 = **24**, motion fails **OR 24** aye, 12 no, 12 x 2 = **24**, motion passes.

³ That is, you may interrupt.

⁴ For example, in a resolution on program review an amendment is proposed adding "that the program reviews will receive written feedback from the Provost and the President to the program under review." Someone might wish to "divide" and consider separately whether the Provost provides feedback and then whether the President provides feedback.

⁵ Table indefinitely means the resolution is "dead" for that college year but may be proposed again in the following or subsequent college year.

Amendment by Substitution: Occasionally action is proposed to replace an entire resolution with a substitute. The process is:

1. Move to substitute (require second).
2. Perfect the substitute motion (i.e., open to amendment)
3. Perfect the original motion (i.e., open to amendment)
4. Vote whether to substitute. (If yes the original motion is no longer under consideration.)
5. Vote whether to approve the substitute (no substantive amendments).

Underlying documents: The document under consideration for action by the senate is the numbered resolution itself (e.g. 7/AS/2007/UEPC). The resolution may include several “resolved” statements. Resolutions are often accompanied by attached documents, including a rationale that explains how the resolved clauses originated. For example, the senate may consider a resolution to endorse a policy regarding online courses. The policy normally is attached to the resolution for review by senators. While the senate may amend or take other action on the resolution, it cannot amend the attached policy, or the included rationale. If a policy is incorporated as part of a resolved statement, the policy can then be amended.

Filling moved to approve the Standing Rules. Approved unanimously by voice vote.

9. First Reading Items:

a. 2/AS/12/AS Resolution in Support of AS-3090-12/EX Support of Proposition 30 on the November 2012 ballot: Temporary Taxes to Fund Education. Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding

Filling moved the resolution, seconded by Eudey.

2/AS/12/AS Resolution in Support of AS-3090-12/EX
Support of Proposition 30 on the November 2012 ballot: Temporary Taxes to Fund Education.
Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding
(Waiver Requested)
Sense of the Senate

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University Stanislaus supports Proposition 30, Temporary Taxes to Fund Education, Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding, and be it further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate urges faculty, staff, students, alumni, families, and friends to support Proposition 30; and be it further

Resolved: That this resolution be distributed to the “Yes on Prop 30” campaign, and local media.

Rationale:

On July 31, 2012 the Statewide Academic Senate passed resolution AS-3090-12/EX in support of Proposition 30.

The Academic Senate of CSU Stanislaus joins others in supporting funding for public education and safety. We recognize the importance of investing in the future of California, and that such investment

includes funding for the education of California's citizens. Should Proposition 30 fail, the CSU will again be forced to cut enrollments and leave those seeking an education with fewer affordable and accessible options, severely limit programs and services that impact the quality of education provided to those enrolled, more severely limit the quality and scope of research and service that impacts our campuses and broader communities, and lose even more employees. Ongoing budget cuts diminish the ability of the CSU to fulfill our mission and obligation to enhance the quality of life for our students and to improve conditions throughout the state and beyond. Predictable state support is critical to control tuition costs for students and their families.

The following is the Statewide Senate Resolution that our resolution endorses:

AS-3090-12/EX
July 31, 2012

Support of Proposition 30 on the November 2012 ballot: Temporary Taxes to Fund Education. Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding

- RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) support Proposition 30, Temporary Taxes to Fund Education. Guaranteed Local Public Safety Funding; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the ASCSU commend the California State Student Association for its early support of Proposition 30 and for its commitment to educate and mobilize CSU students and others to support Proposition 30; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That the ASCSU urge campus senates to endorse Proposition 30 and to encourage their campus faculty, staff, students, alumni, families, and friends to support Proposition 30; and be it further
- RESOLVED: That this resolution be distributed to the Board of Trustees, campus presidents, campus senate chairs, California State Student Association, California Faculty Association and other collective bargaining units in the CSU, Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates, membership of the California State Legislature, Governor Jerry Brown, and the "Yes on Prop 30" campaign.

RATIONALE: At the July 17, 2012 meeting of the CSU Board of Trustees, the importance of Prop 30 for the CSU was made clear. According to AVC Robert Turnage, campuses are already struggling with the effects of the \$750 million reduction in state support last year. The failure of Prop 30 on the November 2012 ballot would guarantee another \$250 million trigger cut to the California State University system. If this trigger cut is implemented, annual state support for the system will fall to approximately \$1.8 billion, a loss of annual funding of almost \$1.2 billion, or 39 percent, from the peak level of state support of nearly \$3 billion in the 2007-08 fiscal year.

On that day, the Board of Trustees approved a resolution endorsing Proposition 30 "given its direct relationship to the systems' fiscal stability and funding levels in 2012-2013 and beyond." (<http://www.calstate.edu/BOT/Resolutions/Jul2012.pdf>). The California State Student Association had previously unanimously approved "A Resolution in Support of Governor Brown's Tax Initiative Proposal" (CSSA-06-12) on July 15, 2012. The California Faculty Association and

numerous other education, public safety, business/community groups, and labor organizations also endorse Prop 30 (<http://www.yesonprop30.com/index.php/endorsements>).

The ASCSU joins others in supporting funding for public education and safety. We recognize the importance of investing in the future of California, and that such investment includes funding for the education of California's citizens. Should Proposition 30 fail, the CSU will again be forced to cut enrollments and leave those seeking an education with fewer affordable and accessible options, severely limit programs and services that impact the quality of education provided to those enrolled, more severely limit the quality and scope of research and service that impacts our campuses and broader communities, and lose even more employees. Ongoing budget cuts diminish the ability of the CSU to fulfill our mission and obligation to enhance the quality of life for our students and to improve conditions throughout the state and beyond. Predictable state support is critical to control tuition costs for students and their families.

Approved unanimously by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate of the California State University, July 31, 2012.

This endorsement was also supported without dissent by 50 of the 53 ASCSU senators who responded to an email inquiry from the ASCSU Chair.

Filling noted that we are threatened with an additional \$250 Million cut to our budget and it's a "do or die" moment. There's a significant number of the population that is somewhat hesitant to give the state more money, so anything we can do to make an effort to fund education is important.

Eudey said that it's important to remember that the California State Student Association also unanimously support this resolution as does the Board of Trustees and CFA, and us adding our voice gives strengths and shows unity across different constituencies.

Hidalgo noted that the staff union, CSUEU also supports this proposition.

Salameh stated that the ASI is also proposing a resolution in support of proposition 30.

Filling asked for waiver to move to a second reading, seconded by Nagel. Results of the vote to move to a second reading, 41 yes, 2 no. Moved to a second reading.

Regalado asked if we have any idea where this proposition stands and where there might we some push back.

Filling noted that the last poll showed 51.8% in favor of Proposition 30 and also noted that it fluctuates daily. Those who oppose Prop 30 say that the government has too much money. Major anti-Prop 30 funding sources are the Harvard Jarvis Assoc. and a wide variety of anti-tax groups.

Provost Strong strongly supports this resolution and encourages you all to do whatever you feel is appropriate to communicate with our community. If this tax measure is not passed we will

have an even more difficult year ahead. We don't have very much slack left that we can use to reduce our share of the \$250 Million cut. Do what you can to encourage people to vote in favor of Proposition 30.

Marcell asked if we can put a placard on our door in support of this proposition.

Strahm said that one thing that may be a pushback is the anti-union sentiment in our community. She thinks that that we can point out that as faculty members we haven't had a raise in many years. We are working to sacrifice for the benefit of education as well. If someone wants to make an argument about overpaid faculty, it isn't true.

Colnic mentioned that the Sacramento Bee had a really nice article that attested to a slight majority being in favor of the tax but underneath that a lot of voters aren't really supportive. The answers are varied depending on how the question is asked. Also the State Park debacle has resonated with the voters. We don't have big pools of money to pull from, but that's working against us.

Sarraille stated that anything that President Sheley might be able to do to get the message out to stakeholders would help our efforts in supporting proposition 30. He encourages us to get the message out. Hopefully there will be a lot of discussion among students/faculty/staff. We should discuss it in class when possible. We shouldn't say to others "vote my way," but we have a responsibility to foster honest and full discussions about these issues with everyone.

Regalado noted that one of the biggest hills that we have to climb is how we divorce ourselves from the bad publicity from the pay raises the Presidents received. He doesn't know how we convey our similar outrage and divorce ourselves from that issue. If the students were more informed and really involved in these issues it would help.

ASI Vice President, Mariam Salameh, stated on behalf of the students that they are well aware of the importance of proposition 30. They are holding open forums with local elected officials, and she feels that Regalado is wrong about students not being well informed. It's the faculty's duty to stress the importance of voting.

ASI President, Shanice Jackson noted that on the state level, they're sending out packets to all the campuses to promote voting and the proposition so we can have one united voice.

Lauren Byerly noted that there's a provision in the bill that's supposed to have oversight so that the money goes to classes and teachers, rather than administration. She's not sure how well it will work, but there's supposed to be that provision.

Results of the vote. 43 yes, 1 no and the resolution passed.

10. Discussion Items

a. Reorganization Effects on GF Constitution and Governance Committees

Speaker Grobner stated that the college reorganization is underway and it will require changes to constitution. Mostly the changes will be to the membership of governance committees. SEC decided not to remove any current members on this year's committees. We didn't feel justified asking anyone to step down. CoC will be looking at the structure of committees to reflect the reduction of colleges.

b. Pending discussion item: Two-Pass Registration System

At this point we don't need to talk about this. There was a glitch in this first round, but it didn't have to do with the two-pass policy. If we ask students about it now, they'll focus on the glitch and not the actual system, so we'll wait until next semester. That's what the resolution asked for—that it be reviewed after 1 year.

11. Open Forum

Colnic curious if there's an academic freedom resolution coming to senate this year as the one from last year was denied by President Shirvani. Are we going to ask for an amendment to our own constitution to assure academic freedom at Stanislaus? Grobner believes that this will be reviewed by FAC this year.

Regalado noted that in terms of proposition 30 that he hopes he's wrong and that the students are involved as he would love to be wrong on this. How do we make our argument in support of the proposition given the bad publicity? Do we write letters to editors?

Sarraille said that at the same time we can talk about reforms that we want to start up: for example reforming the Board of Trustees, that there should be more representation of the people of California on the Board, and less appointing of people who gave money to political campaigns. We can encourage a joint resolution of the legislature calling for public funding of the CSU to be spent a certain way. There are many advisory things the legislature could do to set the tone. Regarding how we insure our voice is heard, CFA members give small payments of approximately \$10 per month to be used for political action. This enables CFA professionals to work hard in Sacramento to represent faculty. There's another proposition, number 32, that seeks to prevent us from making contributions to our unions for political action. If prop 32 passes, next time things like prop 30 or prop 32 come along, we won't have a voice.

Jackson noted that the ASI Board of Directors is searching for a faculty representative for the Board. They meet on Tuesday's at 5pm.

12. Adjournment

3:05pm