

Academic Senate Meeting  
January 30, 2001

Pandell called the Academic Senate meeting to order at 2:35 PM. The agenda was modified by moving 7a following reports and announcements. The agenda was approved as modified.

The December 5, 2000 AS minutes were amended to read on page three "Sarraille advised that the MOU says there must be a review at least every five years, but it does not say anything about what period of time shall be under review." The minutes were then approved as amended.

## **REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **a. Speaker/SEC (Pandell)**

Pandell reported that YRO will start Summer 2001. Pandell received a memo from the CSU Commission on Extended Education requesting proposals for projects that advance the CSU education objectives as set forth in the planning document, Extended Education in the CSU, A Framework for Action. These objectives are: 1) Outreach to under-served populations, 2) Development of statewide and regional instructional programs, 3) Development of distance education programs, and 4) Development of international programs. A brief concept paper is due February 16, 2001 with the final project proposal due April 27, 2001. If interested, Saugstad will have the information.

### **b. UEPC (Thompson)**

Thompson reported that the committee has approved most of the program reviews from last year. UEPC waited on other business until a discussion about imposition ensued.

Thompson presented the calendar change for the Cesar Chavez holiday. March 30<sup>th</sup> will be a holiday and it replaces May 23, 2001 as a Friday.

### **c. FAC (Anderson)**

No report (Jaasma).

### **d. FBAC (Oppenheim)**

Oppenheim introduced Norm Wagner as Director of Mediated and Distance Learning.

Oppenheim reported that FBAC presented a recommendation to the Provost on the one-time Faculty Development Funds, which was about \$94,000. The recommendation was to split the money in the following ways: some to faculty development committees, up to \$5,000 for GE cluster preparation, up to 40,000 to implement instructional television incentives, up to 25,000 for grants for faculty on faculty development, probably with a maximum of 1,000, and some to defray faculty unreimbursed costs to go to conferences within the past year. Money must be expended by June 30<sup>th</sup>.

FBAC continues to work on the information obtained from Development and University Relations.

FBAC also prepared the resolution regarding Interest Accounts that is on the agenda.

**e. GC (Dunbar)**

Dunbar reported that GC approved the Criminal Justice Masters Program.

**f. Statewide Academic Senate (Hilpert/Thompson)**

Distributed via FACNET

**g. Foundation Board (Dunbar)**

No report.

**h. Associated Students (Alvarez-Palma)**

Cross reported that the Associated Students are updating their vision and goals statement.

**i. Other**

**President Hughes**

President Hughes expressed her pleasure at being at the Academic Senate meeting and thanked Speaker Pandell for attending the Executive Cabinet retreat that was held on January 29, 2001.

President Hughes reporting the following items from the Board of Trustees Meeting:

1. President Hughes commented on the recent determination of the Board of Trustees to implement the Contract. Hughes reiterated a phrase from a letter sent to the faculty:

...The CSU Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, and I are disappointed that the long, tedious and tireless efforts made to resolve some outstanding issues were futile...Trustees are unanimous in their support of the Chancellor's actions and are eager to proceed with the implementation of your salary increases. While some of you may be disappointed with this outcome, others may be relieved that this process has concluded. In either case, please know that I deeply appreciate the quality of your work, your devotion to the University's learning-centered mission, and your deep commitment to educational excellence at CSU Stanislaus.

President Hughes stated that serious efforts were made to resolve the issues but it is impossible to understand the nature and essence of the discussions around the bargaining table. She also went on to say that she knows she can depend on the faculty to continue to provide quality education to the students.

2. CSU Stanislaus was highlighted on the Board's agenda. The 40th anniversary was announced, and Chairperson Gould and Chancellor Reed delivered a proclamation to President Hughes. The naming of the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center was also approved by the Board.

3. The Board approved the Cesar Chavez Day to be celebrated on March 30th.

4. President Hughes reported that the partnership with the University of the Azores is moving ahead. The Portuguese Studies Department has received a valuable collection of photographs from Mr. and Mrs. Manuel Dias featuring many aspects of Portuguese culture. The collection is displayed in the Library. Hughes further reported that she, Linda Bunney-Sarhad, and Elmano Costa went to the University of the Azores to celebrate their 25th anniversary and further refine the strategies to implement the memorandum of understanding. President Vasco Garcia is committed to cultivating the relationship with CSUS. CSUS has entered into an agreement with four other universities (University of Hawaii, University of Rhode Island, Auburn University, and Southern Colorado University) seeking federal funds from the Department of Defense for research projects. Lobbying has begun in Washington, DC regarding the collaborative research and education group.

President Hughes reported on the Executive Cabinet Retreat:

### 1. Academic Calendar

The Cabinet discussed a draft paper regarding the academic calendar. Chancellor Reed, the Presidents and the Board of Trustees are discussing a common calendar for the entire system. Should this happen, the Chancellor will fund the transition to a common calendar.

### 2. Development and University Relations

The capital campaign is on schedule. Discussions are in the exploratory stage to increase fund raising beyond the 10% goal. President Hughes stated that we must invest money to make money. Also increasing the percentage goal will require an assessment of the budgetary commitment to DUR.

### 3. Academic Affairs

President Hughes acknowledged the impressive summary of activities and initiatives underway in Academic Affairs. President Hughes voiced her interest in improving communication about the many positive accomplishments in Academic Affairs and other areas on campus.

### 4. Business and Finance

President Hughes reported that Vice President Stephens is creating reporting procedures to simplify the budgeting process.

### 5. Student Affairs

President Hughes reported that Vice President Keymer focused on Strategic Enrollment Management and that the deans are participating in determining the size and qualifications of the future student body. The deans' retreat yielded projected academic targets for student population. Hughes also reported that a search is underway for our first Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management.

Questions for President Hughes:

Oppenheim asked if Winter Term will be done away with. President Hughes stated that she could not make any conclusions. The Presidents and Chancellor are actively discussing a common calendar. Cecil Rhodes is preparing a paper to guide discussions on campus regarding the

academic calendar. Oppenheim asked if faculty are involved in the process. Hughes stated that there will be active collaboration with faculty on the discussion of an academic calendar. Other non-academic sectors on campus will also be involved in the discussions.

Gackowski raised concerns of not earning retirement credit for teaching during the summer. Stephens replied that the state retirement system does not allow you to earn more than a year's worth of retirement service credit. These are the rules.

Thompson asked about academic targets. Hughes stated that Deans set tentative goals to increase the student population.

Thompson asked if money for raises could have been released without imposition. Stephens stated that she did not know if the funds could or could not be released. Hughes stated that she followed instructions from the Chancellor and Trustees. Pandell responded that Spence did not state that it couldn't be done.

Thompson asked questions about summer rate of pay. Hughes stated that there has been a YRO team in training and none of those questions have been answered yet.

A question was asked how the Deans set academic targets. Where did the numbers come from? Provost Curry stated that the strategic academic plan came to the campus committees last year as an attempt to attract more qualified students. The framework was in the overall growth rates. Targets are based on receiving marginal funding for the growth.

Sarraille asked if there were marginal costs per students. Stephens stated that we know what the marginal costs are. Actual funding is higher than marginal costs when everything is factored out.

Farrar raised concerns of YRO and faculty recruitment. Is faculty recruitment being examined? Hughes stated that the Board of Trustees continues to examine faculty salary and housing issues in relation to faculty recruitment. The Board has a commitment to these issues. Farrar is concerned that more part time faculty will be hired. Hughes stated that there has been no discussion regarding this idea.

### **Curry: YRO**

Curry reported that we are currently looking at other campuses that have implemented YRO. We will be funded 178 FTE for YRO this year.

Summer session has gone through Extended Education in the past and this will have to change. The Dean of Extended Education is looking forward to the transition. The normal mechanisms used for Fall and Spring will be used for Summer session. The hope is to keep costs down by not forming another group to manage summer. Provost Curry stated that he is planning on getting more information out in the next couple of days.

YRO is meant for matriculated students. The students will pay regular state fees. Non-matriculated students will enroll at higher fees through open enrollment.

Johnson asked if the classes that are on the schedule for summer will remain. The Provost stated yes.

Savini asked if there is anything on the table to change marginal funding. Stephens replied that when she has asked the question, she has been told not to ask because we are funded higher than some other universities.

Farrar stated that in the past, summer courses have been low enrolled and it is hard to justify a full professor teaching the courses. Curry replied that enrollments have to be looked at because summer is on state support.

### **Hilpert (CFA)**

Hilpert reported that both GSI and SSI could have been released 8 months ago and were held up during the bargaining process.

Hilpert distributed a statement from CFA's point of view regarding the negotiations/bargaining. There is no collective action being taken by CFA during imposition. It is up to the individual campuses on how they are going to handle imposition. YRO is an issue to be bargained by CFA in the next contract. Although he stated that Humboldt and Sacramento have a separate agreement Hilpert cautioned faculty to look at the contracts being offered for summer session.

Hilpert invited CFA members to participate in Lobby day in Sacramento on February 28<sup>th</sup>.

Hilpert reported that there is a Women's Conference March 9-10, 2001. Five women can attend from this campus for free. Other CFA members who would like to go, the local chapter can help. Contact Hilpert for more information.

Hilpert reminded CFA members to fill out the form regarding collective bargaining issues in the CFA welcome back document.

### **Pandell (Semester System Calendar)**

Pandell reported that there is a draft proposal for a semester system calendar in the works. There has been no faculty involvement in the drafting of this proposal. It will come through the faculty governance process to be referred to the appropriate committee and then to the Academic Senate.

### **INFORMATION ITEM**

#### **a. Report from Ad Hoc Committee on Assessing Administrative Review and Hiring**

Deferred

### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **a. 23/AS/00/FAC—Resolution to include/not include FAR in PAF**

Deferred

#### **b. 22/AS/00/FAC—Policies and Procedures for Post Tenure Review**

Deferred

### **FIRST READING ITEMS**

#### **a. 3/AS/01/SEC—No Confidence Resolution**

It was MS Oppenheim/Russ:

WHEREAS, CSU Management has imposed a contract on the Faculty for the second straight year; and

WHEREAS, CSU Management approved imposition in the face of conclusions of the neutral fact-finder, who supported the positions of the Faculty; and

WHEREAS, Chancellor Charles B. Reed's request for these extreme and unfair measures continues a policy of confrontation designed to antagonize, weaken, and emasculate the Faculty;

WHEREAS, the Faculty firmly believe that the Chancellor's Office has dealt in bad faith and has continued to present deceptive information about the bargaining process and faculty compensation both to the faculty and the media, continuing a policy of obfuscation; and

WHEREAS, the actions of the Chancellor are a direct insult to those most central to the success of the CSU's mission, the instructional Faculty; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus expresses no confidence in Charles B. Reed and urges the Board of Trustees to replace him with a Chancellor whose attitude toward the faculty is one of respect rather than scorn; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate of CSU, Stanislaus urge the Faculty to hold a general referendum on confidence in Chancellor Reed; and be it further,

RESOLVED, that the Academic Senate of CSU, Stanislaus calls upon the Academic Senate CSU to hold a vote on confidence in the Chancellor; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Speaker of the Faculty inform the President of CSU, Stanislaus that, under these imposed conditions, the Faculty of CSU Stanislaus may only work to contract, and may refuse to act on system-wide initiatives until such time as Chancellor Reed, and preferably his successor, begins to treat the Faculty with a modicum of respect; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this resolution shall also be distributed to the newspapers in the University's six-county service area along with an explanation of Chancellor Reed's actions and the reasons the Faculty feel compelled to take these actions; and be it further

RESOLVED, that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Academic Senates of the other CSU campuses, urging them to act in a manner similar to that of the Academic Senate of CSU, Stanislaus.

Christopher suggested replacing the word emasculate in the third Whereas clause.

Oppenheim stated that this is a Chancellor that doesn't respect faculty, nor does he have a clue what the academic world is all about. He has done



everything to erode the standing of the faculty, and he will continue to do so. Faculty must take a stand or we will not survive. We need to act vigorously and ask the other campuses to do so, then bring this to our legislature.

Mayer asked about refusing to act on system wide initiatives. Does this include YRO? Oppenheim replied yes. The down side of not acting on initiatives is the Chancellor might act without us.

Farrar is against the no confidence piece because there is no teeth in it.

Hilpert stated that he is concerned that the process is not collegially. There are two years of grievances pending that are not being addressed by the Chancellor's office. The role of the Chancellor is to take the needs of faculty, staff and students to the Board of Trustees. This is not being done.

Thompson stated that another system wide issue is the accountability indicators. Do we want to move this to a second reading or stay in the first reading mode? When we state no confidence, we are asking for the Chancellor to be removed. This is not an easy statement to make. Administration doesn't know how the faculty really feels about imposition. This is a way to explain how this affects faculty.

Sarraille voiced support for the resolution, but stated that even if we get rid of one bad administrator, we could get someone worse. We might try to put something forward to influence how the Chancellor would get chosen.

It was MS Christopher/Riedmann to waive the rules and go to a second reading. It was passed unanimously.

Christopher stated that we need to know where we stand. Imposition is rare and in fact the CSU has experienced it twice.

Almy is concerned about how the resolution looks to the public when this appears in the newspaper. We need to look at the wording carefully. Maybe include: job actions, teach ins, and legal issues that will burden the Chancellor.

Costa recommended that in the language in the 4<sup>th</sup> resolve be changed and leave out the personal attacks.

Mayer asked to what extent the other campuses are doing similar actions. Pandell stated that we are one of the more active campuses. The other senate chairs are waiting for someone to do something and then they will

follow. Russ stated that the last time we voted no confidence, many other campuses went first. We are acting proactively this time. Russ stated that we will not be the only campus voting no confidence.

It was MS Hilpert/Thompson to amend 3d whereas: delete and insert: everything after designed and insert: "which frustrates, fragments and demoralized the faculty". Oppenheim stated that this might reflect emotion instead of reason. Savini stated his agreement with Oppenheim. We are talking about inappropriate actions. The consequence is to demoralize.

Carroll suggested an amendment to the first amendment, that the replacement should be "which disenfranchises the faculty". Reidmann seconded. Vote on the amendment to the amendment Yes: 21/ No:5 Carroll's amendment passed.

Farrar requested that the word "these" be deleted before extreme. Friendly amendment accepted by Carroll.

Sarraille stated that this really isn't the instrument to communicate to the public.

Johnson raised concerns about changing the document in this setting without thinking about it and working on the wording.

Pandell responded that this is the way the Senate usually functions. Pandell further stated that the resolves are the most important piece of the document. We could also add the rationale. Oppenheim stated that the words and meaning can be cleared up in a follow-up document. This is an important issue and we need to move forward today.

Reidmann stated that taking out the work "these" doesn't make sense in following the first two whereas'. Straw vote taken and "these" left in.

Almy stated that we need to target the audience this is meant for, which is Chancellor Reed and the Board of Trustees.

The question was called and vote on the amendment was approved unanimously.

It was MS Costa/Oppenheim to amend the 4<sup>th</sup> resolve to read "until such time as the CSU Chancellor treats the faculty with respect." Savini stated that the issue is that we want him replaced and the expectation that his successor doesn't do the same things. This resolution picks up on what

happened last year. Nothing has changed since then. We should leave in "and preferably his successor."

MacDonald asked what chance there is that Reed will step down or be removed? Is his goal union breaking? Thompson agrees with Savini and is against the amendment.

Question was called and vote on the amendment was: Yes:13/ No: 19. Amendment failed.

Nelson asked what happened last time we voted no confidence? Russ replied that all campuses voted no confidence and then each campus decided how to implement the process. We decided that we would only participate in things that affected students. The students supported us last year. CSUS was very productive. Nelson stated that we need to get the public behind us for support. The media spotlight can be very effective. Pandell stated that the no confidence vote last year brought the Chancellor back to the negotiation table.

MacDonald is concerned about what is the best strategy to respond to the imposition, especially when junior faculty would be involved. Russ stated that she understands the concern and that there will be a lot of support from senior faculty.

It was MS Carroll/Nagel to amend the first whereas to read "has taken the unprecedented step in imposing a contract...". Question was called and vote on the amendment passed.

Sarraille stated that it makes the Chancellor look bad when this type of thing happens. Also, the concern for untenured faculty putting themselves in jeopardy, tenured faculty will be in front to take any hits.

Nagel suggested a friendly amendment to the 4th resolve clause to read "...until such time as Chancellor Reed, or preferably his successor, treats the Faculty with respect; and be it further."

Gackowski questions the work preferably.

This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Farrar suggests that this resolution be carbon copied to the legislature. Saugstad stated last year we sent the resolution to the Governor and area legislators.

Thompson requested a friendly amendment to change the title: Position on Confidence in Chancellor Reed. Thompson stated that this is what we are actually doing. Oppenheim states that this title implies that we have confidence in him. Oppenheim suggested adding "Position on Lack of Confidence in Chancellor Reed". Dunbar suggested "Resolution on No Confidence." Thompson withdrew his amendment. Carroll suggested "Resolution of No Confidence in Chancellor Reed." This was accepted as friendly.

Christopher noted that she was a non-tenured faculty member when the previous No Confidence vote was taken, and she had no dire consequences.

The question was called. Vote on the resolution as amended passed without dissent with one abstention.

**b. 2/AS/01/FBAC—Interest Account**

Deferred

The AS meeting was adjourned at 4:35 PM