1. **Call to order** 2:38 pm

2. **Approval of Agenda** - MSP O’Brien/Filling

3. **Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of October 9, 2007** - MSP Davis/Mayer

4. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
   a. Johnson announced the Provost and Speaker are co-sponsoring a forum November 8. The main issue to be discussed will be the appropriate relationship between research and teaching. Faculty are encouraged to attend.

   b. O’Brien reminded Senators of the faculty/staff picnic this Saturday. Taniguchi stated the DVD showing the history of CSUS will be shown in the FDC Reference Room.

   c. Mayer announced ‘Lend me a Tenor’ is playing through this weekend.

5. **QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS**

6. **ACTION ITEM**
   a. **20/AS/07/UEPC—Faculty Director of General Education**

   Johnson advised based on input from the last Senate meeting, the title will be changed to ‘Faculty Director of GE’ and any reference in the document will also be changed. There being no discussion, the question was called and vote was taken and approved without dissent.

7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. **ASPIRE Public Schools-Early College High School partnership**—Postpone to next AS meeting.

   b. **CSU Common Set of Talking Points for Board of Trustees**

   Johnson stated she attended a statewide meeting of campus chairs and they brought up that since we are visited by the Board of Trustees and Chancellor’s Office executives from time to time, if there are any points we want to make system wide, we should identify them so they are consistent. Some things already put forward:

   - There are positive things we can do. The feeling amongst those that work closely with the trustees say faculty are not always seen in the best light. Possibly it has to do with anonymity of faculty to trustees.
   - It has been suggested we invite the trustees to classes or introduce them to distinguished faculty.
It was suggested that we bring up workload and unfunded mandates.

She asked if Senators would like to add to this list. Suggestions are:

- Support staff growth.
- Make them aware of the diversity we have on campus, especially the age of our students.
- All campuses should bring up the sweetheart deals given to executives who leave the system.
- The failure of the trustees to lobby for additional funding above the compact and failure to enact ACR 73.
- They have shown too much eagerness to raise student fees, at the same time raising salaries of top-ranked administrators.
- Actual workload of faculty should be stressed and the way our diverse population of students are affected by this.
- Help our trustees see our students as humans.
- Each student is an investment in the future of California, not just a recipient of gifts from the state.
- Unfunded mandates tie into student success.
- It’s important to human relations to bridge the gap between the trustees and faculty. We need to find ways for us to get to know each other. We need to find out their expectations. There seems to be so much distrust, we should try to make progress.
- We need to educate the trustees about the history of our university and the area.

Thompson asked if we know if any trustee coming to campus and Provost Covino replied none that he is aware of. Thompson stated that SEC decided to invite Trustee Farar many years ago and it became a joint invitation by SEC and the President. Trustee’s expenses are covered, so there is no cost to the campus. If none are visiting soon, maybe we should issue an invitation to one or two trustees. Tynan noted that when it comes to diversity, the CSU has the most diverse student body of the two systems in the state. O’Brien stated that all points raised are good, but he would hope we do it in a positive way. The message should be uplifting. Talking about salaries can seem self-serving, but we can bring up the fact that higher salaries are needed for hiring good quality faculty. This would be a better approach than talking about raises. Tuedio agreed the trustees will probably not be open to us if we bring up a lot of our criticisms that they’ve already heard. With that in mind, he suggested we be very specific in stating our issue, and one is salary compression. It has a lot to do with morale and it would be good to make an appeal to establish salary equity and make progress on workload issues.

Johnson suggested we invite a trustee or two to campus to attend classes where selected faculty could do presentations. We could invite them on a day AS meets, set the day up so they can witness different things we do, then afterwards discuss issues with them. Keep a positive attitude, emphasize things we are asking for and things we are doing because we care about our students - that we need help in order to deliver quality education. Davis agreed this is an excellent idea, adding that maybe we should ask a trustee to follow a faculty member around for a day.

Sarraille opined that many of these types of things have been tried but have not helped. It is not a communication problem. We are at a point where faculty should be trying to change the Board of Trustees to make it more responsive to the public’s need. Further, he stated he doesn’t think trustees have the mindset that is required to take this institution where it needs to go. One way to change the makeup of the Board is to have trustees elected by the public rather than being appointed by the Governor. Tuedio wonder why we aren’t keeping our eyes on a higher level of power than the trustees. There are some people in the Assembly and Senate that are aware of our problems. They could discuss among their committee members, so maybe invite them here. They are in the best position to make changes. Thompson added that it is a matter of cumulative resistance. For example, trustees seem to have an interest in remedial education. How many have actually been in such a class? It might be helpful to show them what happens in those classes.

Davies questioned why ask the trustees for anything; just ask them to campus. If we dump criticisms on them, they won’t want to come back. Maybe we should invite trustees on a rotating basis just to visit our campus and see what we do. Later if we develop a relationship with the person, we can talk to them about our issues. Nagel replied this is a refreshing thought but we do know what their policies and actions have been. Being open minded is a good thing, but not to the point of forgetting what we know they stand for.

Borba stated our relationship with the trustees will not change; it is adversarial. He then asked for the CFA’s position on the BOT. Hejka-Ekins stated if you decide they are going to be adversarial, they are more certain to be so. Maybe we can do more with a more welcoming attitude. They would be shocked if we did. However, it could be good to work at a political level too. Filling explained that CFA is composed of 12,000 educated people, and their experience with the Board of Trustees is varied. Statewide CFA officers usually attend every Board of
Trustees meeting. When the last contract was signed, we agreed we would advocate for more money from the Legislature. CFA did, the Board of Trustees did not. The trustees get information from the Chancellor, not from faculty or CFA. It colors what they see. CFA is willing to work with them, but our perception is that they are not receptive to us. Sarraille added that CFA is attempting to do things legislatively such as changing operating procedures of the Board of Trustees, to make sure their actions are open, that all forms of compensations that executives receive are made public. Also, CFA is attempting to help make it possible for the Governor, Lt. Governor, Speaker of the Assembly and Superintendent of Public Instruction to send proxies to the meetings of the BOT, since scheduling problems often make it impossible for them to attend. Manrique added that the CSU administration blocked the appointment of Susan Meisenhelder (previous CFA President) to the Board of Trustees. We have to try to work with them, but they might not feel the same way about us. Meisenhelder was respectful to the BOT but was rebuffed.

Johnson asked Senators to think about this and come back next time and have another discussion and then decide if we pursue this.

c. College Constitutions

Johnson stated she received emails from faculty inquiring about the process for evaluating college deans. She stated she was surprised because in her College (College of Business) for many years there has been a provision in their Constitution that every three years faculty have the right to evaluate the dean. She has since learned that it is not the case in all Colleges. She stated she wants faculty to be aware there are differences in college constitutions and it might be good to compare the differences. Bowman will provide the six college constitutions to Senators.

Nagel suggested all college constitutions and college policies should be on line. Uniformity of college policies would be helpful. Borba stated this concern originated in the College of Education. The Education faculty thought the dean selects people to comment on his/her performance, plus the Provost or President also makes a selection. The Education faculty found out that some colleges have built in procedures in their constitutions to address the issue of evaluating deans. The College of Education does not, so they will have something on a ballot to address this issue he stated.

Filling asked if WASC mandates us to put these things online, especially given the fact we were told department elaborations would be put online for WASC. Novak stated that the College of HHS Constitution was based on that of the College of ALS. It was drafted by three faculty members from the three departments in the College. He does not recall the College of ALS having a review of the dean and he does not recall the subject coming up in ongoing discussions of the constitution. Not all colleges have provisions for evaluation of deans. He stated he would be happy to put the requested items online, but currently his staff does not have the ability to add content to the college web page. They are supposed to get access soon so the documents can then be put online.

Nagel voiced curiosity if the evaluation policy for deans and above are similar to how the faculty are evaluated. Is there a document that specifies how, when, by whom, administrations, including deans to be evaluated? Provost Covino replied there is a local policy for evaluation of MPP’s online with Human Resources Department.

Hejka-Ekins stated it would be great if College Constitutions and policies are posted so we can take a look at everything so we know what we are talking about. Sarraille added that colleges should consider constitutional issues such as checks and balances, and separation of powers. Also, colleges should look at the General Faculty Constitution and compare it with their college constitutions. He indicated he hopes all colleges over the next few months and years will try to continuously improve their constitutions.

Johnson stated she would like to encourage faculty to take ownership of their Constitution. Some faculty have said their dean wrote their Constitution. Faculty need to take ownership like they take ownership of the General Faculty Constitution. It has to come from faculty. It is really critical that it happens.

Thompson asked if he could have the URL for the MPP Administrative Review Policy and he will send to ASNET.

Schoenly asked if there are differences in Colleges in the way policies or the Constitution can be amended? Is it the same process for all colleges? Bowman will look up and compare. Jaasma stated the distinction between policy and documents should be noted.

8. OPEN FORUM

Johnson thanked the Provost and the FDC for providing refreshments.

9. ADJOURNMENT – 3:37 pm