

Senate Minutes Meeting 11/02/2007

Those present

D. Mielke – Chair
A. Evans
S. Jenkins
M. Sattem
L. Espinoza
J. Johnson
S. Tanner
V. Kelly
K. Watson - Secretary
J. Varon
J. Tooke
J. Woodford
D. Timmermann

Assembled a quorum at 3:04 The Chair Dan Mielke called the meeting to order

Agenda

1. AA degrees update
2. Tuition Plateau
3. Bylaws
4. EPCC
5. other?

Minutes from the Oct. 19 meeting were accepted as posted.

It was suggested to move to EPCC items on the agenda

EPCC

Moved to EPCC section of the Agenda

Course approval: FSA 423 Labor Management Relations (3 credits)

Jeff J moved to accept the new course proposal Michael S. seconded and the motion passed.

Tuition Plateau

The tuition plateau resolution from spring assembly was brought forward.

Dan read the resolution

Some questioned the timing of the resolutions implementation given the current financial situation. Others felt we should move ahead with the will of the assembly as stated last spring

The majority felt we needed more info on the impacts to load and class size.

The Senate will ask that we get an analysis of the impact with a time frame, moving forward cautiously

The Chair will request a report on the status of the tuition plateau issue. He will ask the administration for a cost analysis with receipt by Mar 1.

By -Laws

The By-Laws committee recognized the efforts of Jeff Woodford in drafting the By-Laws

The By-Laws were summarized

Recommend amending section 5 to include teaching faculty explicitly.

Article 5 section 4 how many can request a special meeting it was moved to change the language from 5 to fewer ie. 2-3. With some discussion from the By-Laws committee chair, the Senate chair suggested we keep the draft language as is and see if it works.

The By- Laws committee spoke to the issue of proxies or alternates and decided against them in the bylaws. It was pointed out that the senate can vote electronically thus eliminating the problem of alternates for the purpose of voting. It was felt that clarification, in the absence of a discussion in the By-Laws of alternates or proxies and the absence of mentioning approved methods of voting was needed. A statement on the approval of using electronic voting will be added to the By-Laws.

Behavior unbecoming would be dealt with by the constituency of the offending party.

Need to change IFS term stated in the By-Laws from to 2 years to 3 in keeping with other institutions. Need to add language for an IFS alternate.

The Senate Chair wants to add language to the bylaws that will clarify who will serve on the University Council for the Faculty Senate. **Jeff J. will add to the By-Laws**

Changes to bylaws need to happen this week for approval at the next meeting on Nov. 16th with a simple majority.

Some questioned why the quorum was set at only 10 members. It was pointed out that Robert's Rules uses a simple majority as the quorum unless otherwise specified in the By-Laws. Some felt that a simple majority was too small of a number.

The Chair suggested that we redraft and vote on at our next meeting.

Dan spoke to the problem of holding elections in the spring and the term from Sept. –Sept.

AA Summary

Jeff W. gave an AA degree summary report. *Jeff W. will email to the senate a report of his findings.*

Dan wants to review this issue for next meeting.

BART

The Chair opened discussion

Sent two letters to the chancellor with no response. The Chair's sense is that the only person capable of hearing us is Dixie.

I was felt that the most disturbing action was the arbitrary way in which changes were made to the University Mission Statement.

The Chair and the Chair of the University Council are exploring ways to have a joint meeting of council, senate and BART

The focus of the plan should be on reducing costs and increasing revenues. The existing plan does not do this. In fact, it may well result in increasing costs and reducing revenues.

Some reassigned faculty are not trained to teach in the areas of their reassignments.

The criteria listed in the BART report were not applied consistently across programs. Cuts were made in programs with substantial enrollments (e.g., Media Arts with close to 50 majors was cut), but no cuts made in programs with very low enrollments (e.g., gender studies, theatre arts).

How were the decisions actually made?

Information is needed about the efficacy of the three new "centers." There is no evidence in the report that this would result in economic savings or even improvements in service delivery.

Reassignment of some administrators to positions of VP or "dean" may be better as "director" assignments.

"Why Bart committee of administrators were exempt from cuts?" - More importantly, why were there not further cuts across the board in administration. What about cuts in other areas (besides programs and faculty)? DDE will be "reorganized," but how does this result in savings?

The academic programs took the vast majority (financially) of the cuts (see chart on back of report).

How will plan interface with accreditation report? - in several important areas, it doesn't !

What happens to the David Huber physics scholarship? - what happens to future endowments given these cuts and the negative publicity.

After much discussion the following points were agreed on and will be taken to President Lund on Tuesday at 9: 00. All Senators are encouraged to attend this meeting. The Chair will suggest that Dixie have available BART members at Tues.meeting with the Senators.

The Senate requests a more complete cost analysis of the recommended cuts with projections of the impacts. The analysis should address the impact of each cut on current and future enrollment, faculty salaries, faculty hiring and retention, etc. Again, this should be discussed, if and when we ever get an audience with Dixie/her team.

Questions for the Administration

- Mission – who changed the mission and why?
- Full Report of the Boards reaction to the plan!
- Demand a different process for these types of actions in the future in terms of letting faculty and staff know about changes!
- Why Bart committee of administrators was exempt from cuts?
- Response to the fact that the cuts will result in loss of students?
- Response to the fact that the cuts will result in the loss of good faculty?
- Ask if the 4.5mil in cuts can be made without cutting programs?
- Is the cutting of programs mandated by the board?
- Incongruity of the cuts with the mission statement and with the accreditation requirements!
- Why enrollment figures were used from last year?
- How will plan interface with accreditation report?
- What happens to the David Huber physics scholarship?

The consensus was to keep the pressure on the administration internally and not go to the press at this point. Enrollment caps exceed professional standards. We no longer meet our claimed student / faculty ratio. Our revised mission statement contradicts the accreditation team's report.

Dan wants to have a final discussion of the Faculty Senate meeting times at our next meeting on Nov. 16. He asks that we consider either Fri at 3:00 or Tues at 3:00.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm