Academic Senate Meeting
November 18, 2003

Speaker Aronson called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm. The agenda was amended to add ACIP representative Akwabi-Ameyaw and CFA President Filling under 4. Announcements. The agenda was approved as amended. The minutes of November 4, 2003 were amended on page 5, under b. fifth paragraph, change ‘Melissa’ to ‘Aronson’, change ‘shares’ to ‘shared’. Page 6, a line was left off at the top of the page “when it involves the integrity of URPT, I would agree with Ray that members with faculty…”. The minutes were then approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Akwabi-Ameyaw advised that applications are being accepted for resident director in various locations. Further, the 2004 International Faculty Partnership Seminar is to be held in Japan July 11-15. He encouraged faculty to apply. Also, applications for the Wang Family Stipends for Faculty are being accepted. Interested faculty should contact him.

2. Speaker Aronson welcomed EOIR Director Deanie Brown. Brown gave an overview of her background. She talked about the magic of Tom Young, and stated her hope she can gain trust from faculty and staff and find ways to work with all productively.

3. Filling reported the status of bargaining: a) it appears CFA leadership will support the CSU administration budget proposal; b) CFA is discussing a one-year extension of the contract; c) FERP timeline is still unknown at this time, whether the faculty member has to officially apply or just declare their intent by the end of this academic year to be covered by the current contract. d) with regards to difference-in-pay and buyback, CalPERS and CFA are continuing to talk. e) CFA and CSU administration will be meeting to make sure in case of layoffs, it will be as smooth as possible according to procedures of the collective bargaining agreement.

4. Aronson reported that at the October 9 Academic Senate meeting it was requested that a copy of the Foundation Report be kept in the Library. DUR representative Harris reports that a copy has been placed in the Library archives, box A7. Contact Ken Potts.

5. Aronson announced that applications for the Wang Family Excellence Award are due to the Leaves and Awards Committee via the Academic Senate Office by January 7, 2004.

6. The CSU Commission on the Extended University has issued a request for project proposals for the 2003-2004 academic year. The Commission seeks projects that will advance the CSU’s principal extended education objectives as set forth in the planning document, Extended Education in the CSU: A Framework for Action. Proposals are due March 26, 2004. Contact the Senate Office for further information.

7. An intensive one-month National Faculty Development Institute on “Incorporating Japanese Studies into the Undergraduate Curriculum” is being held from June 2-25, 2004 in San Diego. Deadline for applications is December 15, 2003. Please contact the Senate Office for further information.

QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

Nagel questioned in the FAC Report the mention of a survey for lecturers to see whether they feel under-represented in the Senate and asked how this came about? Floyd replied that initially the issue came to FAC from SEC after Nagel sent a request to look into the question of the addition of a Lecturer Senator. After much discussion at the FAC meeting, members wanted to know how lecturers felt about their representation in the Senate and if they felt present representation was adequate. Nagel stated the problem with this is that very few lecturers would be aware if their needs are being met because they are not in the loop. Floyd replied FAC is asking them to rate the faculty governance process itself. He offered to send the survey to Nagel for his review and Nagel replied yes.

ACTION ITEM

a. 15/AS/03/FAC—Amendment to URPTC Procedures/GF Constitution (reconsideration)
Aronson reminded Senators the original goal with this is to consider whether department chairs should be members of the URPTC. Only underlined language and strikeouts are to be considered. What is currently on the floor is the Nagel amendment.

Floyd advised that the Nagel amendment makes fairly clear what is meant by ‘administrator.’

Nagel suggested changing the term ‘duties’ with ‘assignment.’ This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Thompson spoke against the amendment saying that it seeks to solve a problem we don’t have. Secondly, this would lead to a lot of interpretation of who could be on the committee. It is secure with faculty now, via Committee on Committees. He further voiced he has an amendment that is more direct. He suggested going back to the original language and take out the part about department chairs. It would read “Department chairs and faculty members serving in administrative positions shall be ineligible to serve on the URPTC.” This language would allow department chairs to serve without having to add additional language that could add to confusion.

Nagel, stated that there was a call to amend because of faculty concern that the definition was vague. This language makes the definition of administrator clearer. Oppenheim stated that the Nagel language does not address the amount of time base a person is assigned to do administrative work. Floyd indicated he thinks there is no real issue. If there had been a problem with interpretation in the past, it might make sense to refine it, but there has been no difficulty in the past. Filling stated that things are different now because we have multiple people serving in partial administrative positions.

Vote on the Nagel amendment passed by voice vote.

There being no further discussion, the question was called.

Vote on the motion as amended passed by voice vote. This will now go to a vote of the general faculty.

**FIRST READING ITEMS**

a. **17/AS/03/FBAC—Resolution on Budget Priorities**

It was MS Sarraille/Oppenheim

**BE IT RESOLVED:** that in these times of severe budget cutbacks it is vital that the Faculty of CSU Stanislaus articulate and support its budget priorities; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** that the Faculty affirm the commitment of the CSU to public access to affordable high-quality instruction; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** that the Senate Executive Committee, the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee, and the faculty members of the University Budget Advisory Committee should serve as the Faculty's representatives in the budget planning process and should participate in all budgetary discussions and decisions from the inception of the planning process until the determination of the final budget allocations; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** that it is especially important that FBAC and UBAC play primary roles in significant budget decisions, above all those decisions involving program reductions, layoffs, or new initiatives; and that such decisions must be taken only after open and consensual processes that consider all available funding sources, the viewpoints of all affected parties, the tradeoffs between costs and benefits, and the effects on CSU Stanislaus as a whole; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** that the Faculty's major priorities for institutional budget allocations are those essential to the academic mission of CSU Stanislaus, including (with no relative ranking implied)

* no reduction in the number of students (FTES),
* no reduction in the number of tenure-track faculty (FTE),
* maintenance or reduction of the student/faculty ratio without increasing the proportion of part-time faculty,
* retention of university non-faculty staff critical to the core instructional mission,
* maintenance of the library acquisition budget,
* maintenance of academic equipment, technology and infrastructure budgets to support teaching and research, and
* support of professional development and the travel required for such development,

and be it further

RESOLVED: that the priorities above shall apply not only to AY 2003/04 but also to all subsequent academic years until further notice.

RATIONALE: Various committees and groups have input into the campus budgeting process. It is important that the Faculty have a stated, endorsed, and current set of budget priorities to inform those groups and to inform the work of faculty who are members of those groups.

Sarraille introduced the resolution. He explained that in 2001 a similar resolution was approved by the Senate and the President. But, it now seems as though that resolution is viewed by the President as obsolete. He stressed the importance of faculty having a budget priorities statement on record because of the current financial situation in California. He stated that FBAC received a lot of input in writing this resolution, trying to keep from being overly specific but also not make it too general.

O’Brien spoke in favor of the resolution, stating the SWAS passed a similar resolution. Given that we are entering bad budget times, he stressed the importance for faculty to assert their commitment to be involved in the budget.

Nagel pointed out that this resolution does not mention saving lecturer positions. O’Brien replied that the third bullet ‘maintenance or reduction of the student/faculty ratio without increasing the proportion of part-time faculty’ addresses that concern. Nagel pointed out that the second bullet ‘no reduction in the number of tenure-track faculty (FTE)’ only addresses those positions, not lecturers. Sarraille will take Nagel’s concern back to FBAC.

Filling stated his concern that if we change bullet two, we have to be very careful. It is important to make a statement about keeping tenure-track positions, or the Administration could replace them with part-time positions.

Feldman suggested a policy be established as to what the ratio of tenure-track to lecturer faculty should be. He reminded Senators that you can’t run an academic department with part-time faculty. He asked that this issue be referred to an appropriate committee. Sarraille explained that we should be able to do both; call for avoidance of firing lecturers and also call for no increase in the ratio of tenure-track to lecturer faculty.

Myers suggested the first three bullets can work together. Bullet two could be changed to read ‘no reduction in the existing number of faculty’ and bullet three could read ‘no increase in the proportion of part-time faculty.’ Changes along these lines would seem to address the concerns raised by both Nagel and Filling he stated.

b. 18/AS/03/SEC—Chancellor Reed and the Trustee Appointment Process: Seeking Responsible Communication

It was MS Thompson/Filling:

Resolved: That the Academic Senate of California State University, Stanislaus condemn the statements of the Chancellor’s Office regarding the appointment of Susan Meisenhelder as a Trustee of the California State University, and be it, further

Resolved: That the Academic Senate adjure Chancellor Charles B. Reed to remove himself and his communications apparatus from public commentary on the appointment of Trustees of the California State University and be it, further

Resolved: That copies of this resolution be sent to CSU, Stanislaus President Marvalene Hughes, to Chancellor Charles B. Reed, to Susan Meisenhelder, and to Board of Trustees Chair Debra Farar.

Rationale: Susan Meisenhelder, an outstanding member of the faculty of the California State University, was appointed by Governor Gray Davis as a Trustee of the California State University. The press has quoted Colleen Bentley-Adler, a spokesperson for the CSU, as saying that the appointment is a “slap in the face to the CSU,” as “outrageous,” and as “a blatant conflict of interest.” The statements from the Chancellor’s Office failed to acknowledge Susan Meisenhelder’s own statement that she would recuse herself from matters involving collective bargaining.
The direct, personal, public, and negative involvement of the Chancellor's Office in the process of trustee appointments is unprecedented in the California State University and will further degrade the relations among faculty, administration, and the union.

Thompson explained that former Governor Davis had appointed Susan Meisenhelder, previous President of CFA as a trustee of the CSU. After that, there were several negative comments and press releases from the spokesperson from the CSU that expressed disapproval of the appointment. He stated that as far as he knows, a Chancellor commenting on a trustee appointment is unprecedented. The faculty need to make a statement in response to these comments as well as the Governor’s withdrawal of Meisenhelder’s name. He then read a letter from ASCSU Chair Cherny to the Board of Trustee Chair Farar enumerating reasons that the Chancellor’s Office response was inappropriate, and asked the Senate to waive the first reading and to approve the resolution as a Sense of the Senate.

Filling noted that in spite of the former Governor withdrawing her name, it is an important statement to make. He stated his confusion as to why someone who had been teaching for 20 years would be a bad addition to the Board of Trustees. He stated his support for the resolution as well as waiving the first reading.

Sarraille stated that it is important we pass this resolution to assert the faculty’s role in shared governance.

O’Brien indicated that at the SWAS meeting, the Chancellor expressed indifference to the faculty’s opinion on this matter. Thompson specifically asked him about the fact that he involved himself in this matter, but received no discernable response.

It was MS Nagel/Stone to suspend the rules and go to a second reading. Motion passed by voice vote.

Oppenheim suggested the resolution also be sent to local newspapers and the other Academic Senates in the CSU. This was accepted as a friendly amendment. Peterson suggested sending the Cherny letter with the resolution, but Thompson advised that the Cherny memo was not for distribution.

Feldman stated that the resolution is too weak if we are to make an issue of it. He suggested stating overtly that the Chancellor is trying to stack the board with puppets. Gackowski stated that it is a conflict of interest for the Chancellor to have any influence concerning who goes onto the Board of Trustees because it supervises him.

There being no further discussion, the question was called. Vote on the resolution passed without dissent, with two abstentions.

c. 19/AS/03/UEPC—Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs

Aronson reminded Senators only the underlined and strikeout language is on the table.

It was MS Watkins/Sarraille:

**BE IT RESOLVED:** That the University “Policy for the Discontinuance of Academic Programs” be revised as attached

Watkins explained that UEPC was asked to look at this policy and clarify. The last time it was reviewed was 1988.

Aronson suggested fixing references to the vice president as Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Oppenheim asked if the policy would address the concerns of the Provost from last year about the process and Watkins replied that Vice Provost Demetrulias has attended all UEPC meetings where this was discussed.

Thompson noted that this issue came up when the budget worsened and the concern by faculty that programs needed to be made as secure as possible and under the say of faculty.

Sarraille suggested adding a specific mention of Graduate Council in number #4.

Stone noted that last year’s UEPC recommended discontinuing a program a previous UEPC had recommended continuing, but the College it would be housed in did not want it. This policy will not solve that problem.

Floyd asked about the meaning of the wording concerning the case where the faculty of the department requested the review and Watkins replied that the faculty could forward their request to UEPC ‘or’ they could request a special review committee. She stated that this provision was in the original document.
Feldman suggested item 3 should consider the effect of the program to the Liberal Arts mission of the University. Ferriz noted this concern would be covered under H.

Rumayor suggested adding a student to the review committee.

Ferriz questioned why item 1-e was deleted and Watkins replied the five year review process takes a long time and the old 1-e is covered by the new 1-e and the new 1-f. Jaasma advised that program review is conducted by the department curriculum committee and GC. It is already covered.

Tan suggested that consideration of EP&R 79-10 be included

Floyd suggested looking at academic program review materials as part of the review.

Thompson questioned if 1-e is by vote of the department curriculum committee or college curriculum committee?

INFORMATION ITEMS

a. Faculty in Residence Proposal

Morgan-Foster distributed an information sheet that explains what a Faculty in Residence Program is and the physical space for the faculty in residence. She talked about having an academic focused living arrangement for students. She stressed that many other colleges have faculty in residence programs. She feels that it is a good idea and there are people interested in the proposal – partly because it would involve receiving free housing. She stated that the resident faculty member would not be responsible for providing supervision of students. She noted that a committee is being formed with four administrators and four faculty that would explore the feasibility of such a program.

Aronson stated that Senators interested in serving on the committee should contact Jim Youngblom, Chair of the Committee on Committees.

Poole stated that with the budget climate the way it is, she has serious reservations about doing something like this now. How does it tie into our overall priorities? Morgan-Foster replied that it might be done with non-state funds.

Oppenheim asked what the role of the faculty member would be and would the person do a reduced teaching load? If so, there might be a cost associated with assigning the person’s time. Even if we have a budget crisis, he stated his excitement about such a program.

Filling stated that although he attended the committee’s first meeting, he is not a member. The SEC wanted more information about this proposal before they asked COC to appoint faculty to the committee.

Thompson stated that there are many unanswered questions such as: would this be done internally (faculty already here) or externally (visiting faculty)? What is the term? What is the teaching load of the faculty member? He requested this item be put on the Academic Senate agenda as a discussion item.

Sarraille stated that there is a limited amount of human kindness out there. Even if this program is supported by non-state funds, going forward with it could mean there will be less funding available for our core mission.

Ferriz said he was familiar with such a program which had a charismatic person in it. He said it was good, but not cheap. He stressed the importance of doing it right, not just to do it perfunctorily.

O’Brien said it could be good if we used it for visiting faculty, but the proposal needs a lot more work. With visiting faculty, it could stimulate research and scholarship here.

Floyd asked if there are cost-benefit analyses of such programs made at other campuses. Could we examine the analyses to see if it would be worthwhile for us to have a program. Floyd also suggested that there be a student representative on the committee.

Everett asked if there is any documentation of programs working and how it benefits students and Morgan-Foster replied yes, they are filled with glowing reports.
Gackowski saw such a program at the University of Melbourne and it brought together foreign students and faculty on an almost daily basis.

Andres suggested we look at programs that were shut down and look at the reasons why. A study from both positive and non-positive perspectives would be helpful.

Aronson stated that SEC talked about staffing the committee and felt it important there be at least the same amount of faculty as administrators and maybe more. Faculty interested in serving on the committee should get in touch with Jim Youngblom. The plan has to be developed and then it has to come back to the Senate. Thompson said it was important that there be Senate approval. Aronson agreed stating it is important for this process to have a chance to develop properly. The committee should come up with a plan, then bring it to the Senate. She asked Morgan-Foster to keep the Senate updated throughout the process.

b. **Recommended Guidelines for Departments to consider when electing an Academic Senator**

Floyd reported that this document came out of comments from last year’s Senate regarding the election of junior faculty to the Senate and the wisdom of doing that. This will be sent out with the Election of Senators memo in the Spring. The suggestions being made by FAC are not policy. This is information we already know, just in guidelines form. Hopefully departments will consider the qualities listed in the document when electing their Senator. It is important to have Senators that understands the governance structure, that will stay informed and represent their departments well.

Aronson suggested Senators take this document back to their departments for discussion. They are only guidelines. They are a way to strengthen what we are doing.

**OPEN FORUM**

None

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm.