Minutes of the Meeting of November 18, 2003

Members Present: Cal Caplan, Denise Fleming, Karina Garbesi, Liz Ginno, William Langan, Julia Norton (Chair), Hank Reichman, Jeffery Seitz, Steve Ugbah, Alison Warriner, Donald Wort

Members Absent: Norma Rees

Visitors: Carl Bellone, John Charles, Stanley Clark, Susan Correia, Linda Kinrade, Michael Leung, Dick Metz, Glenn Perry, Bob Strobel, Joe Zelan

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S (Ugbah/Garbesi)

   Norton wanted to add an item after #13, as a possible charge for COBRA, as well as #4a FAC Subcommittees.
   The agenda was approved as amended.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting on October 28, 2003
   M/S (Seitz/Warriner)

   Warriner noted that we need to correct the spelling of Zajac under #9, and under #11, 2nd line, change “lecturer’s” to “lecturers.” Norton will also provide some more non-substantive changes. Reichman asked to delete the line that begins with “Statewide Senate has a committee ...” in #10. Also, change #11 to delete the last sentence in the first paragraph which begins with “Rees commented that an earlier suggestion ...” and change “constituting” to “convene”, also in #11. Fleming will send an email to clarify the changes to her statements recorded under #9.

   Minutes approved as amended.

3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair
      - The President’s party on December 2nd is the same day as our last Fall quarter Senate meeting and she urged all to attend. On January 16th there will be a joint COBRA and Layoff Committee meeting and the President would like as many ExCom members to attend as possible for the discussion set for either 10 or 10:30am (Friday, 1/16/04 in the President’s Conference Room).
      - John Sepolen is working with Fullerton, and perhaps San Marcos, about online ballots/voting. Norton attended the CIC, FDEC, and GE Subcommittee meetings.
      - M/S/P (Langan/Warriner) moved that FDEC have a standing time for their meetings, 2nd & 4th Wednesdays, 2:40-4:50.
      - More than half the faculty voted in the Fall election and the results were handed out.
      - Honorary Degree Committee is seeking nominations for commencement speaker. Wort noted that Dr. Sally Ride was nominated.
      - Proposition 55, the bond act; we received a request from Bob Cherny (Chair, Statewide Senate) to put the resolution to the Senate.

   B. Report of the President: no report
C. Report of the Statewide Senators

-Caplan reported that at the November 13-14 meeting that there was a letter from Beverly Young that is supposed to clarify teacher preparation requirements to all deans and chairs of all subject matter program. He went on to say that there were 2 resolutions which dealt with teacher preparation programs: (1) *Articulation of agreements for multiple subject integrated teacher preparation programs: Guidelines for formation of regions* – this specifies how regions serviced by CSU campuses interact with community colleges in the area facilitating the parallel development of multiple subject teachers*, (2) *Integrated teacher preparation framework for articulation: Principles for implementation* – this is a set of guidelines for facilitating correct academic paths at the community college level that will transfer efficiently to a CSU campus in the region*. Another resolution was made in support of Prop 55. CSU student tuition and fee policy resolution took a 2-hour discussion and asked for a clear definition of costs of instruction and its inclusion in and accountability of any change in fees. A report will be coming (*A review of the California State University Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) in 2002*) from the ASCSU.

-Reichman noted that there were 6 resolutions that got a waiver in the meeting and that most felt that was because of the urgent budget situation that the CSU finds itself in. One issue is that the Chancellor’s budget asks for salary increases as well as back money owed to the CSU when the legislature asked him not to include these items in his budget request. The Statewide Senate applauded the Chancellor’s stance which basically informs the legislature what base budget the CSU needs to support its teaching role. CSU & CFA are close to an agreement in bargaining for this year (Article 41.3 of the CBA = bargaining language in a time of inadequate funds) and they have provided for a year and a half of no bargaining so that we can work together to gain support for the Trustee’s budget.

-The Statewide Senate ExCom sent a letter to the Board of Trustees with their stance of Meisenhelder’s appointment/unappointment.

-Another resolution passed on the SLR (*Acceptance of principles and procedures of the 2003-2004 Supplemental Report Language*) which was to ensure that campuses conformed to budget principles and language in the document and to impress upon the Chancellor’s office to ask that local campus administrations follow the language as well.

-Passed a resolution on privacy and the right to read and urged the U.S. “Congress to move expeditiously to correct defects in the USA Patriot Act that threaten civil liberties of students and faculties who use libraries and computers.”*

-Another resolution was passed to make sure that there was joint governance in terms of programs and program changes; another to protect work assignments of temporary faculty; another resolution was passed to protect graduate students hired as teaching assistants when it is part of their program versus being hired as lecturers when teaching outside of their program. -SB 1467, which CSU interpreted as saying that faculty could no longer work as independent agents, was corrected by SB 41.

-Bob Cherny & Kathy Kaiser will be visiting campus in either March, April, or May.

-Ugbah asked if there was a formal resolution in support of the Chancellor’s budget; Reichman answered no, but there was an understanding that we would all work together to come up with a strategy to take to the legislature and that the Chancellor needs to remember to work with the different constituents of the Budget Advisory Committee. He was asked if there would be a mid-year cut and Reed reported that he and West have a bet on this – Reed says yes, West says no. Caplan reported that the Chancellor did receive applause from the floor of the Senate for his budget request.

* Taken from Notes from Plenary Sessions by Brent Rushall, Rayford Boddy, & Thomas Warschauer, provided by Cal Caplan.
D. Report of the ASI Representative

Ugbah reported that he attended the ASI meeting and that the ExCom representative will have a permanent place at their future meetings. The meeting was informative, but there were no issues of faculty concern.

4. Appointments

Reichman reported that ALSS is still asking for nominations for a replacement for Pat Radin. There were no nominations for a temporary replacement.

4B. 03-04 FAC 1, Memberships of the FAC Subcommittees for 03-04

Norton would like to hold off on voting on the Outstanding Professor Subcommittee as it was incomplete and there was no urgency.

M/S/P (Langan/Caplan) to approve 03-04 PTR Subcommittee.
M/S/P (Langan/Caplan) to approve 03-04 Subcommittee on Lecturers.

5. 03-04 CIC 3, Proposed New Minor in Interactive Sculpture, B.A. in Art

M/S/P (Reichman/Wort) to put the item on the Senate agenda.

Caplan asked if ART2350 had been reviewed by the GE Subcommittee for Area F as there was no indication on the form. Norton said the Senate Office would investigate that. Garbesi asked if the new courses had been previously approved - Langan answered that ExCom does not approve individual courses which do not impact GE, but that information in the packet is for information and discussion at Senate. Langan also requested that the word “only” be struck from the Action Requested. Reichman noted that according to the dates on the proposals that the courses will be taught before the minor goes into effect. Seitz stated that he hadn’t seen ART2350 within the GE Subcommittee.

6. 03-04 CIC 4, Proposed Change in Registration

M/S/P (Wort/Garbesi) to put the item on the Senate agenda.

7. Discussion on University UIT Issues

-Norton noted that Garbesi created a very detailed and useful background report to ExCom for this item.

-Norton asked John Charles about the change from using SS#’s as campus ID numbers to a different number. Charles reported that they are still looking for the money to make the changeover; the work effort involved is huge and there is no funding for it, and they will have to take money away from something else to pay for it.

-Norton asked Charles about the CMS audit report and he reported that our campus input did go to the Chancellor’s Office to be aggregated with the entire system; Charles will make that information available to COBRA. Garbesi reported that at the UIT meeting last week that they have created another proposal to make the necessary cuts to their budget which is in addition to what she reported in her background report. Reichman made the suggestion to Charles that he find ways to provide concrete stories about the costs of fixing fires vs. having adequate support in the first place to help support the Chancellor’s budget request to the legislature.

-Charles remarked that we completed our last CMS “project” in 2001. We spend money on running and supporting what is in place; we are running PeopleSoft systems for HR and financial areas; we have yet to implement a new student system. We are doing things to augment our current student system, including online registration. Garbesi reflected that her report was written before the last UIT meeting in which more cuts are being made and that we are actively making ourselves more
and more vulnerable and seriously under funding our technology. Warriner asked, what ought we to do now? Metz noted that all divisions on campus are suffering the same budget crisis (i.e. we have half the housekeeping staff this year that we had 10 years ago). Garbesi seconded Reichman’s suggestion that we provide these examples of our technology needs in concrete terms to whoever reports to or talks budgets with the legislature. Reichman asked about the technology fee and Charles responded that he had heard that the Chancellor has verbally said that he would not be approving any new fees until all campuses ask for one. Wort asked what the cuts will be (specific services) and Charles reported that they will have to do another round of cuts for Spring and Summer. Garbesi responded that there were specific services on the block, library laptop loans, student labs, help desk hours, etc.

8. Discussion of Faculty Computers
   - Norton introduced the topic by stating that Seitz raised the issue that many faculty do not have adequate computer resources. Seitz stated that in terms of the business aspects of running the classroom, faculty now need to download files and use other resources which were once the purview of administrative offices such as Enrollment Services. Faculty need to be able to access SAILOR, PeopleSoft, DegreeWorks, transcripts from other institutions (STARSU), advising files, Blackboard, Smart Classrooms, etc., and while there is a huge investment in these systems we do so without providing adequate equipment for faculty to access them. Seitz asked if there was a policy for faculty computers. Garbesi responded that a trickle-down policy was created for ALSS. Wort noted that, in Management & Finance, they give top priority to providing their new faculty with new equipment as part of recruiting. Leung clarified that the College of Science does support new faculty by promising them a new computer of their own specifications and that the College spends from $15,000 - $30,000 per year. They could not afford a blanket policy to cover all faculty requirements as each faculty has different needs. There are departments which routinely are able to justify new equipment each year. When a faculty member has serious needs and the department does not have adequate resources, they can request the college to fund it. Norton noted that it would be helpful for departmental chairs to be informed when labs are being refurbished and a large number of computers are bought as the department(s) can perhaps tag along with the large scale order pricing to purchase new computers for faculty.
   - Seitz asked how faculty are involved in the decisions about the campus purchasing new systems as all these different systems place a larger workload on faculty, as well as departmental staff. Caplan asked about campus agreements with computer purchasing agents and Charles stated that we do have purchasing agreements in place. Caplan also noted that he and Glen Perry have been working together to get faculty trained in SAILOR/PeopleSoft/ DegreeWorks and he has found it extremely helpful to do degree checks – as long as we can get it on the screen. Ugbah asked if we have a university-wide policy on computers for faculty. Charles responded that this is completely decentralized on campus, but that we could create a centralized policy for faculty and/or staff. Ugbah recommended that we look at this more closely as many faculty buy their campus computer from their grant money. Ugbah then asked who owns the computer? Norton answered that the University owns the computer. Ugbah asked about what happens if/when a computer is stolen/lost as, currently, it is a tortuous process to get the computer replaced. Metz responded that it is up to the department to replace the computer unless it is a $100,000 computer (which is our deductible). Reichman remarked that we do need some kind of policy in place so that faculty who have advising responsibilities have adequate equipment, and he supported Norton’s suggestion that departments be notified when bulk computer buying is taking place so that they can piggyback on those orders. He noted also that putting procedures in place would also circumvent the perhaps erroneous rumor that you have to be “in the know” to get a new computer. Seitz noted that trickle down and buying in bulk is fine, but the important fact is that faculty need access to appropriate hardware/software so that they can print out student records so that you can go elsewhere and talk with a student in private (many faculty share offices).
-Langan remarked that he basically disagreed with Reichman and that the “squeaky wheel” does get better equipment. There is some money that comes to campus specified for student computers and the trickle down policy was begun because of the strings attached to this money. Leung hopes that we do not suggest a centralized system and the first approach is to justify your needs; if you are unhappy with the way your department handles equipment purchases, then faculty ought to go to their college dean. Leung also remarked that computers bought by grant money are not supposed to replace your university equipment. Garbesi remarked that we can write good policy after good policy, but if there is no money to buy computers, then, in effect, there is no trickle down policy. Charles reported that he has a 5-year old trickle down computer on his desk.

9. Revision of CAPR Charge Regarding Academic Standards
   Norton asked if there were any suggested changes to the draft charge. There were not. 10 & 11 are postponed until the next meeting.

12. Referral to FAC regarding the Bylaws amendment request from CIC
    There were no changes suggested. It was affirmed that Norton will send this forward.

13. Resolution Regarding the Academic Bill of Rights
    Just an FYI item, and Norton will send to our local legislative representatives (as a private citizen).

14. COBRA
    Will carry on discussion of COBRA via email (for lack of meeting time).

15. Adjournment
    M/S/P Garbesi/Caplan to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Ginno, Secretary