Academic Senate Minutes  
September 21, 2004


Guests: Mimi Bradley, Deannie Brown, Lynette Findley, Marvalene Hughes, James Klein, Sari Miller-Antonio, Donna Moore, Mary Stephens, Ted Wendt.

Absent: Foreman, Regalado, Sarraille, Senior.

Speaker Filling called the meeting to order at 2:37 pm.

The agenda was approved as distributed.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

a. President Hughes

President Hughes thanked Speaker Filling for yesterday’s (9/20) meeting. Her optimism is high regarding the pledge to continue communication efforts to understand each other’s style. They are both committed to the University and will do everything they can to move the University forward.

President Hughes announced her transition for this year and explained that life is a series of transitions. One does not retire in life. She expressed appreciation to the faculty that participated in the extremely successful Convocation, and to Student Affairs for organizing the event.

The CSU Trustees Search Committee has been appointed. Members are: Trustee Debra Farar (Chair), Trustee Carol Chandler, Trustee Herbert Carter, Trustee Murray Galinson, and CSU Chancellor Charles Reed.

The Advisory Committee to the Trustees Committee are: John Phillips, Past President of the CSUS Foundation, Ben Duran, Chair of the University Advisory Board, Ken McCall, Chair of the Alumni Association Board, Bill Eisenhardt, President-California Maritime Academy, Cynthia Morgan, Dean-CSUS-Stockton, Jane Rodgers, ASI Senator, and Steve Filling, AS Speaker. One support staff will be elected by the staff and two faculty members will be elected by the faculty.

The first meeting of the Advisory Committee will be held October 26. Campus visits will be the week of March 7. Then to the CSU Board of Trustees at the March 15-16 meeting in Long Beach.

Naming of the Classroom Building for Dorothy and Bill Bizzini will be on Thursday, September 23 at 3:30 pm. Grounding breaking for the Science II Building will also be on the 23rd at 4:15 pm. Please show your appreciation by attending these events.

President Hughes gave an overview of the beginning of open communication when she arrived in 1994. She stated that she became aware of the closed and incomprehensible budgetary process. One problem was that there was little leadership in Business and Finance to carry out the agenda. But, then she found Vice President Stephens and she understood and pursued ways to implement change. The second phase was led by Tom Young and others to streamline the huge budget committee (UBAC) and make the process functional. Intentions were always to encourage maximum input when the final recommendation was forwarded to her. The Committee was never to be the decision-making committee, but a recommending committee to the President.

Using the process stated above, there were a series of open fora where our principles were agreed upon to reduce budgets. Once the good news regarding the restoration of reductions to the budget would be appropriated to campuses, she instructed the co-chairs of UBAC to provide a draft that assured that layoffs
would be averted and restoration to programs that had been cut or where budgets were reduced became the priority.

The Lottery Fund Review Committee will be formed soon. The President attended the International Conference in China for Women University Presidents where her paper was selected to represent the United States, and was well-received. The President hinted at developing opportunities with the University of China at Beijing, including the possibility of a visiting professor in Management and Women’s Issues.

President Hughes introduced 2004/05 ACE Fellow Dr. Lynette Findley. She is one of 33 ACE Fellows being hosted this year at universities around the country. The program was established in 1965 that identifies and prepares promising senior faculty and administrators for increasingly responsible positions in higher education administration. Fellows are nominated by the presidents or chancellors of their institutions and selected in a national competition. Dr. Finley is from Eastern Michigan University.

b. Speaker/SEC (Filling)

1) Speaker Filling announced the term of office for Faculty Trustee on the Board of Trustees will expire June 30, 2005. Our current Faculty Trustee is Kathy Kaiser. He has not received any indication she will not apply again, but if there is anyone faculty think might be interested in applying, please send the name to him.

2) Executive Vice Chancellor Spence sent a letter asking for our assistance in promoting faculty interest on campus in resident director positions. Application packets and further information is available from our campus ACIP representative Kofi Akwabi-Ameyaw. Packets are also available at www.calstate.edu/ip.

3) Presidential Search Committee: The first ballot went out Monday, September 20, with ballot counting this Friday, September 24. The top four vote getters will be on the second round of balloting which will go out Monday, September 27, with ballot counting Friday, October 1.

4) Filling noted that questions regarding any committee should be addressed to the committee chair and to SEC. He also advised consulting the Faculty Affairs website, and noted that URPTC would brief the body at the next meeting.

5) Congratulations to Panos Petratos who successfully defended his dissertation last week.

6) The Provost was thanked for providing refreshments.

c. Other Announcements

1) Elaine Peterson announced the All Staff Employee Picnic will be held this Saturday, September 25 at the John Stuart Rodgers Faculty Development Center Veranda.

2) Susan Neufeld revealed that a new Interim Director of the FCETL would be announced at week’s end.

3) Peterson encouraged unsuccessful Leaves and Awards applicants to reapply.

4) Floyd advised on a lack of clerical support for UEPC subcommittees.

5) O’Brien noted that the dominant concern at SWAS is compensation for Faculty and Faculty Administrators.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

Committee reports and the Provost report are sent over ASNET. There were no questions about reports.

WORKLOAD REPORT (Giventer)
Larry Giventer, the CFA Faculty Rights Representative, explained the status of the Workload issue on campus. On March 17, 2004, the CFA filed a grievance alleging violation of Article 20 of the MOU regarding assignment of workload. The grievance was not about net workload, but distribution of assigned time as a component of workload. He further explained that the College of Business has 5 WTU per tenure-track faculty, the College of ALS has 1.2 WTU and the College of Education has 0.9 WTU. That disparity is what the grievance was about. The remedy last year was that the Academic Senate passed a resolution on May 11, 2004 that specified a reasonable distribution: a total of 30 WTUs comprised of no less than 6 WTU’s assigned time for advising, curriculum development, committee work, university service, service within the academic discipline and service to the external community; no less than 3 WTUs assigned time for research, scholarship and creative activities; and no more than 21 WTUs assigned to instruction. Part of the problem is that Article 20 does not have numbers listed. The number the campus has been using comes from a document many years ago, included by reference within an appendix to the MOU. This document, “EP and R 76-36,” defines workload as 24 WTUs, 6 WTUs for committee work, advising, etc.

Giventer went on to say that many meetings had taken place between himself, John Sarraillle, Provost Dauwalder and Associate Vice President Wendt, resulting in two ways to go. One, CFA could pursue as a grievance, send to level 2 into the hands of professionals of CFA and the CSU; or two, CFA could withdraw the grievance and form a committee to work on the issue. The latter, amending the withdrawal to “withdrawn without prejudice” (which means CFA can refile), is what CFA has done. The committee is made up of Associate Vice President Wendt, Interim Dean Klein, CFA representatives Larry Giventer and Peter DeCaro. Although the committee has not met, the deadline for completion of their work is December 2004. If it is not resolved by then, we will decide our next step. But the main issue is we need to account for assigned time. The CFA has issued a demand letter to the CSU asking for the numbers over the last three years. The CSU has not replied. He stated they are trying to work not toward a change in workload, but a fair distribution of workload across the University, accountable to all three areas (teaching, scholarship, service), with fair recognition and fair reflection in assignments.

Thompson questioned if there is a differential SFR funding for the different colleges, and, if so, does that differential relate to a discrepancy of assigned time and has the CFA discussed this with the Administration? Giventer replied no. Provost Dauwalder replied there was a differential in funding used when he first arrived on campus. He has moved the system into resetting enrollment targets college by college. Thompson queried whether the adjustment has erased the differential SFR funding. Dauwalder replied that it was still one at the end (he thought), for a variety of reasons. Workload is not a big part; another element to consider is class size. Bottom line is that COB is smaller, but whether that offsets he can’t say.

Young questioned if this were to pass, would it influence the flavor or emphasis of teaching as opposed to research and Giventer replied that no prescriptive formula would apply to individual faculty.

DeKatzew asked what criteria would be followed and how would it be implemented. Giventer replied he would keep in mind the desires of the Academic Senate. How that distribution is arrived at remains at the department level. We need to put in place a new practice and procedure that will keep the bare-bones EP and R but change the status quo.

Wendt endorsed the previous remarks of Giventer stating they recognize that there is appropriate assigned time, but we are struggling with trying to make the system more accountable so we aren’t forcing any particular department or faculty member into a lock-step so there is equity built in using assigned time. The devil is in the details: workload reports will become more important in the future.

CONSENT ITEM


The 2004/2005 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate were accepted without dissent by voice.
DISCUSSION ITEMS


Filling reported that the attached 2003/2004 resolutions are the official acts of the Academic Senate, General Faculty and the President last year. Some of these items will be coming back to the Senate: Budget Priorities, Amendment to the General Faculty Constitution adding a lecturer to the Academic Senate and Workload.

b. Senator Orientation

1) Academic Senate Review (Thompson)

Thompson explained the relevant attachments and distributed a paper version of a slide presentation titled “Orientation for Senators.”

Charge: The Academic Senate is the official representative body of the General Faculty which has the delegated authority to act for the General Faculty in the formulation, review, and revision of all academic, personnel and professional educational policies and procedures, facilities planning and maintenance. The Academic Senate has no authority to make judgments regarding grievance; academic due process; academic freedom; professional ethics; retention, promotion, and tenure; and nominations. The Senate has one elected representative from each academic department, counseling, and the library. In addition, two students, elected by the Associated Students, are members of the Senate, as well as one member elected by and from the CSUS Emeritus and Retired Professors’ Association. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President of Student Affairs, the Chairs of the Faculty Affairs, Faculty Budget Advisory, Graduate Studies, and the Educational Policies Committees, the Speaker-Elect and the Statewide Academic Senators are members of the Senate. The Speaker and the Clerk of the Faculty also serve as Chair and Secretary of the Senate. The Senate holds at least one meeting each month.

Thompson called special attention to the following details: the California Code (Section 3560 (c)) states that we have “insulation from political influence” as a part of academic freedom, which is clearly not the case; a distinction between “joint” and “shared” decision-making may influence the course of that decision-making—“joint” implies parity and balance, “shared” suggests some variability; faculty have primary responsibility over curriculum and the personnel who implement it; “the professional competencies that are central to curricular and academic policy decisions should be comparably decisive and significant in the genesis and implementation of faculty personnel policies, procedures, and criteria.”

2) Overview of committee charge by chairs:

a) Committee on Committees (Petrosky)

Members: Arthur Buell-Chair, Chuck Floyd, David Lindsay, John Mayer and Al Petrosky

Charge: The COC is a five member Committee with responsibility for appointing faculty members to all non-elective Academic Senate committees including Liberal Studies, Social Sciences, and other committees as stipulated by the Academic Senate. The Committee consults with the University President or Academic Vice President prior to making these appointments. It oversees committee structure, approves or disapproves the establishment of additional General Faculty or Academic Senate Committees; nominates candidates for offices of the General Faculty/Academic Senate and for elective committees, conducts all university-wide elections.

b) Faculty Affairs Committee (Thomas)

Members: Stephen Thomas-Chair, Nael Aly, John Garcia, John Sarraillé, Koni Stone, Jim Youngblom, Flora Watson
Charge: The FAC is composed of seven tenured members, including a chair and chair-elect. The duties of the FAC are as follows: expedite the resolution of professional concerns of members of the General Faculty when requested to do so by one or more of the individuals involved in or directly affected by the matter; address questions regarding faculty morale when requested to do so by the Academic Senate or by a committee of the General Faculty and submit for the General Faculty's approval policy recommendations in the best interest of general morale at CSUS; develop and recommend to the Academic Senate faculty personnel policies, in general to include but not limited to promotion, tenure, retirement, leaves of absence, sabbatical leaves, research grants, awards, publications, selection and retention of instructional staff and such other faculty personnel matters as may be referred to the committee by the President or the Academic Senate; interpret the Constitution and Standing Rules with reference to all policies, procedures, and actions of the General Faculty and its committees, the Academic Senate and its Committees, officers of the General Faculty and the President of the University.

c) Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (Johnson)

Members: Lynn Johnson-Chair, Elmano Costa, David Dauwalder-Executive Secretary, John Garcia-Chair Elect of GC, Annie Hor, Elaine Peterson-Chair Elect of UEPC, Brian Rando-ASI Rep, John Sarraile, Kim Tan, Richard Weikart-Chair Elect of FBAC, Rose Zhang

Charge: The FBAC is composed of a chair and chair elect, five tenured/tenure track faculty members, an executive secretary appointed by the President, a student appointed by the Associated Student Speaker and the chair-elect of the UEPC and GC shall serve as an ex-officio members. The FBAC advises the Administration with respect to University budget policy, planning, and resource allocation, including the development and/or allocation of special funds; review and interpret budget requests and budget allocations to the General Faculty through reports to the Academic Senate; conduct special studies regarding budget allocations, when so requested by a committee of the faculty.

d) Faculty Development Committee (Neufeld)

Members: Susan Neufeld-Chair, Betsy Eudey, Marjorie Sanchez-Walker, Koni Stone, Ted Wendt-Executive Secretary, Kaylene Williams

Charge: The FDC is composed of five faculty unit employees, each from a different discipline. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall appoint a non-voting Executive Secretary. The duties of the FDC include the following: help faculty improve their competence as teachers and scholars, promote the professional development of the faculty, encourage faculty research, scholarship, creativity, and artistic activity, promote an atmosphere of shared scholarly activity, advise the Vice President of Academic Affairs on faculty development.

e) Graduate Council (Tynan)

Members: Advanced Studies, Dawn Poole; Business, Randy Brown; Criminal Justice, Peter Nelligan; Interim Dean of Graduate School, Jim Burns; English, Arnold Schmidt; History, Richard Weikart; Interdisciplinary Studies, David Lindsay; Marine Science, Pam Roe; Psychology, Gina Pallota; Public Administration, April Hejka-Ekins; Social Work, Margaret Tynan, Chair; Student Representative, Jane Rodgers; Teacher Education, Dennis Sayers; Social Work, John Garcia, Chair-elect; Int’l Finance, Andrew Wagner; Ex-Officio: Provost: David Dauwalder; Dean/Library: Carl Bengston; Dean/Business: Amin Elmallah; Interim Dean/Education: Armin Schulz; Interim Director/Research and Sponsored Programs: Suzanne Burns; Assoc. Dean/ALS: James Klein

Charge: The Graduate Council is composed of a chair and chair-elect (elected), the graduate program coordinators from each department/college that offers a master's degree, and a representative from the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee. The Academic Senate and Associated Students each have a representative on the Graduate Council. The Dean of the Graduate School shall serve as Executive
Secretary and the Director of the Graduate School serves as recording secretary. All faculty members on the Graduate Council must be tenured or tenure-track. The duties of the GC are: formulate, review and recommend to the Academic Senate graduate curricular policy; review and evaluate proposals for graduate and post baccalaureate credential programs and courses of study based on approved criteria and procedures; evaluate 5-year reviews of graduate and post baccalaureate credential programs and recommend to the UEPC continuation without modification, continuation with specified modifications, or discontinuance; review plans for academic development of new graduate and post baccalaureate credential programs in both on- and off-campus/distance learning programs; submit an annual report to the general faculty at the Spring General Faculty meeting, maintain close liaison with the UEPC and consult with this body on policy issues of mutual interest, such as scheduling, grading, calendar preparation, registration, and resources; establish criteria, standards, and procedures for all aspects of graduate course offerings.

f) Leaves and Awards Committee (03/04 Chair Peterson)

Members: Rita Asher, Mimi Bradley, Harriet Blodgett, Jere O'Donnell and College of Business rep to be elected.

Charge: The LAC is composed of five tenured faculty members. The Committee recommends policies and procedures to the Academic Senate concerning faculty leaves and awards; reviews sabbatical applications and makes specific recommendations to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs regarding the granting of faculty leaves and awards.

g) Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Policy Committee (Miller-Antonio)

Members: Miller-Antonio-Chair, Amy Andres, Suzanne Burns-RSP rep, Bob Danziger, Pi-Sheng Deng, Marjorie Jaasma, Peter Nelligan, Ken Schoenly, Jita Singh-ASI rep, and Kweku Smith

Charge: The RSCAPC is composed of nine voting members. The Committee deals with research, scholarship, and creative activity policy development; coordinates the promotion and support of research, scholarship, and creative activity for undergraduate and graduate students; advocates funding recommendations for faculty research, scholarship and creative activity, fellowships, publications, Journal of Research, faculty symposia, and travel; provides support for WASC re-accreditation in areas relevant to research, scholarship, and creative activity, performance, and policy; provides advice to administration on issues related to system initiatives on research, scholarship, and creative activity, including academic planning related to research, scholarship, and creative activity; and consults with other university committees before proposing research, scholarship, and creative activity policy to the Academic Senate.

h) University Educational Policies Committee (Floyd)

Members: Renae Floyd-Chair, John Brandt, Bret Carroll (Spg), Diana Demetrulias-Executive Secretary, Marjorie Jaasma, Lynn Johnson, Ping Luo, Elaine Peterson, Jane Rodgers, ASI rep.

Charge: UEPC is composed of ten voting members including a chair and chair-elect who are both tenured, six additional faculty members; one member from and elected by each college; one member of the library faculty, and one member of the counselor faculty (SSP-AR), elected from their representative areas, one member at large, elected by the General Faculty, one full-time student appointed by the Board of Directors of the Associated Students. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs serves as executive secretary. The UEPC formulates, reviews, and recommends to the Academic Senate undergraduate curricular policy; reviews and evaluates proposals for new undergraduate programs and courses for study based on approved criteria and procedures; evaluates 5-year program reviews for existing undergraduate, graduate degree, and postbaccalaureate programs, and recommends one of the following: continuation without modification, continuation with specified modifications, or discontinuance; reviews plans for academic development in both on- and off-campus undergraduate programs (including extended education and distance learning); submits an annual report to the General Faculty at the Spring General faculty meeting; consults with and recommends to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs in the interpretation of the University's
undergraduate curricular and instructional policies; maintains close liaison with the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee and the Graduate Council and consults with these bodies on policy issues of mutual interest, such as scheduling, grading, calendar preparation, registration, and resource allocations; oversees and evaluates the General Education Program; prepares the academic calendar.

i) Statewide Academic Senate (O’Brien and Thompson)

Charge: The Academic Senate of the California State University consists of fifty-one faculty members elected by their colleagues at the twenty-three individual universities comprising the California State University system. The Senate, founded in 1963, recommends academic policies to the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor.

The Executive Committee of the statewide Academic Senate, led by the Senate Chair, organizes the activities of the Senate and is principally responsible for representing the Senate in its dealings with many groups, including the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor and his staff, the California State Student Association, the CSU Alumni Council, statewide policymakers, and the public. With offices at the CSU Headquarters in Long Beach, the Senate operates throughout the year as an agency of CSU faculty governance.

j) Senate Executive Committee (Filling)

Members: Steve Filling-Speaker of the Faculty, Al Petrosky-Speaker-Elect, Scott Davis-Clerk, Renae Floyd-Chair of UEPC, Lynn Johnson-Chair of FBAC, Stephen Thomas-Chair of FAC, Margaret Tynan-Chair of GC, Paul O’Brien-SWAS, Mark Thompson-SWAS.

Charge: The SEC is a seven member committee which includes the Speaker, Speaker Elect, Clerk, and the Chairs of UEPC, FBAC, GC and FAC. The two Statewide Academic Senators are ex-officio members. The Committee advises the Speaker on matters of procedure, sets the agenda for meetings, and acts as a consulting and advisory board to the Academic Vice President and President of the University, coordinates the work of the Academic Senate, committees of the Senate and of the General Faculty, acts for the Academic Senate whenever the Senate cannot achieve a quorum.

OPEN FORUM

a. 2004/2005 Budget Discussion

Filling asked for a couple of parameters be followed. Please keep comments to two minutes or less and comments should speak to the issue and be non-personal. He asked all present to appreciate and acknowledge that all interested parties were trying to do good. The following handouts were distributed: 1) Draft September 20, 2004 UBAC proposal for 2003/04 carry forward funds and the unexpected funding received with the State’s final fiscal year a2004/05 budget, 2) Memo from Co-Chairs of UBAC Provost Dauwalder and Vice President Stephens regarding summary of Cabinet proposals to be reviewed by UBAC, 3) September 9, 2004 email from UBAC faculty representatives Johnson and Sarraille to faculty regarding the proposed budget allocations by the Cabinet and 4) IT statistics and comparison data from like campuses.

Johnson advised the UBAC was asked to review the Cabinet’s proposal to the President. UBAC quickly approved most of the items, but deferred four items for further consideration: Master Plan ($300,000), University Excellence Incentive Award Program ($200,000), Assessment ($100,000) and Golden Handshake ($428,529-two or four year payback.) Johnson noted that UBAC is a widely representative committee. She then went over UBAC’s recommendations and asked for feedback from Senators so she can take it back to the next UBAC meeting.
Peterson stated she felt UBAC’s recommendations were good and she was glad to see funding restored to the Tutoring Center. Further, although it’s nice to have tempting new initiatives, so many things have been cut (OIT, Library) and they should be a priority.

O’Brien stated his concern that we laid off 60 staff and in the College of ALS, we’ve cut 7 FTES faculty, about 200 sections. He asked if that is being added back. Stephens replied not the entire 60, but it is closer to 50. We accommodated all permanent employees where their positions was restored or reassigned. There has been significant reorganization, and some things are not being done. It changes how we do things. O’Brien stated it is our morale obligation to hire those that were let go and reinstate classes. Although we agreed to reduce because of the budget crisis, once funds were restored, we thought cutbacks would also be restored. Stephens replied that we protected our permanent employees, and restored many temporary vacancies with one-time money.

Doraz voiced two concerns: $300,000 for the master plan—we don’t need to review now; and $200,000 for the Excellence Fund. Rather than awarding people to be more excellent, we should give the money to departments. That will give them a boost. The $500,000 could be spent better.

Provost Dauwalder stated that 7 FTES reduction does not reflect the numbers he has. In the College of ALS it shows an increase of 5 FTES. Seven faculty have retired, we had to reduce state support for faculty positions, but we took the reduction during summer session. Klein added that we did cut seven that had been previously scheduled. We did restore some by adjusting for higher targets without Summer.

The Provost explained that the Excellence Fund is a marvelous opportunity for units to define what they do to move to the next higher level. He understands the concern about the budget, but in order to achieve the University’s goal of identifying what we are, it is a great opportunity to do so with the Excellence Fund.

President Hughes explained the importance of the Master Plan. She has proposed this the past four or five years, but we have had no money to do it. We are at a disadvantage today because we don’t have one. It was last reviewed in 1984. Other campuses with sophisticated plans get priority attention from system-wide, and suggested that VPBF office can better educate others as to the benefits.

Floyd stated that in her discipline, students are saying why they come here. Because we are already performing excellently. We need to define those programs and put money into them. Further, the second paragraph on page two of the UBAC Draft states “Faculty members on the committee desire further consultation with the Academic Senate before such a program (University Excellence Incentive Award) is implemented.” She hoped that no one present would disagree with that.

Stephens stated there are operational needs. We need to discuss basic planning issues. Internal and external consultation is needed. The parking issue as well as bookstore needs to be discussed. Both need to be expanded. Doraz questioned why it costs $300,000 to initiate the Master Plan review. Stephens stated there are environmental issues to consider, architectural experts, etc. Doraz asked for a listing of what is needed and cost.

Thompson questioned summer session figures. $52,000 is the amount for faculty leadership? The Provost replied yes. He further explained that there is a 10% reserve requirement. Thompson questioned how much we get from Accounts Receivable and the Provost replied we anticipate getting half of that. It should eliminate the negative number and be slightly above. Thompson noted that although the second sentence indicates previous consultation regarding the Excellence award, that is incorrect. He does not remember any previous consultation. He stated he has put his concerns on Facnet and to the President. He feels this issue needs shaping by the faculty and consultation, especially as it applies to academic programs.

Tan asked where the money is going regarding summer session. Provost Dauwalder replied it will go to UEE reserve account. It is a system requirement. Filling explained that the requirement is an annual
revenue of UEE. Our base level reserve is over, so we don’t have to do this. We have met the mandatory requirement already. The Provost said he would follow through on this.

EOIR Director Brown explained the term “consultation” that the President or Cabinet might take. She further explained that the President has discretionary money she can earmark for distinction. From the President’s pov, she attempted to engage faculty at the President’s retreat this past summer on this issue, explaining that faculty interests were represented by the Provost, the Vice Provost, the Deans, as well as the Speaker and Speaker-elect. Also, UBAC has faculty representatives and this issue has been discussed there. So, when the President and/or Cabinet stated there had been faculty consultation, they were probably referring to this. There was an attempt to honor the campus goal of participating in shared governance.

Thompson shared an experience he had this past summer in his critical thinking class. Students had no where to go for additional help because the Writing Center was closed. They can’t do the portfolio option because of this and it looked like the Tutoring Center would also be closed. Their department secretary is temporary, for how long, no one knows. If students can’t get services, but you take large amounts of money ($300,000 $200,000, $100,000, $128,000, $50,000 etc.) for initiatives, we need to look at this ethically, pragmatically on what we are trying to accomplish.

Doraz agreed, stating we are also experiencing again and again continued degrading of the Library. The budget keeps eroding. We need to support our compromised fundamental needs and inadequacies rather than special projects in the continuing “McDonaldsization” of the University.

President Hughes summarized her thoughts on the Master Plan again stating that we will be remiss if we don’t engage in master planning. Also, it would set a precedent if we used all of our resources for the campus to operate. Further, Presidents are entitled to their initiatives. In fact, some campuses take the money off the top of the budget. $200,000 is considered by some to be minimal. The Board of Trustees and our strategic planning process have identified the need to differentiate in order to achieve some order of distinction. It is just a beginning. Be careful that we’re not thinking “penny wise.”

Morgan-Foster thanked Doraz and Thompson for their commitment to students. Both of their concerns (tutoring and writing center) are being addressed.

Donna Moore (Staff Representative to UBAC) stated many staff feels the intra structure is not strong enough to support new students coming in. Staff are all working very hard, but we are falling behind. We can’t add more. We need to have a conversation about the future of our campus. Questions should be asked: What is most important for the University? What is our goal? Where do we go from here? So far, staff has had little input.

Stephens reminded Senators what we are trying to do is not only to recognize cuts, but balance restoring what we had, and going forward. The Master Plan is one of those things that will define ourselves. We need to look toward the future at the same time.

Myers replied it would surprise him if no one present recognized the importance of planning, but also noted this was the first he has heard about the Master Plan. He would like to know more about the process and faculty need to be included in the discussion about how planning is carried out.

Tan asked where the $300,000 and $200,00 come from and the President replied that $300,000 is restoration that came back from enrollment and that all disbursements need to be guided by the Strategic Plan. Stephens continued that we planned for July 04 to be $6.5 million down. When we were only cut by $5 million, we had $1.5 million more in base funds than we thought we would have. An additional source was carry-forward funds. Some is going to the initiatives; most staying to address divisional needs.

Johnson stated regarding the Excellence Fund, the concern is that you would designate certain areas for flagship programs. It could have a significant impact on academic programs. She is also worried about the
time frame and lack of unity and faculty discussion. A decision as to which areas we identify is something that requires a slow and thoughtful discussion with all concerned.

Schoenly stated we are only looking at the tip of the iceberg. We have a new master’s program coming on line that will need to be included in the budget discussions. It will involve the Library.

Filling asked Senator Mario Estrella from the ASI for input from the student perspective. If he could send something to the Speaker in the next couple of weeks would be helpful. Estrella agreed. Filling acknowledge the healthy, edgy nature of the discussion today, especially as it included newer voices. An open forum will be held on September 30 at 11:30 am to continue discussion on these issues.

Brown commended the Speaker and the Senate for engaging in such an important discussion.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.