

## **DRAFT**

### **USE OF CONSENT CALENDAR CSUSM Academic Senate**

The Academic Senate of CSUSM in past years developed the practice of using a Consent Calendar to present routine matters to the full Senate. There is no reference to the Consent Calendar in the Constitution and By-Laws of the Senate. Therefore, tradition has governed what is appropriate or not appropriate for inclusion in the Consent Calendar. However, certain parliamentary rules do apply to its use:

- The Consent Calendar is presented to the full Senate prior to the meeting
- Any Senator can request that an item be removed from the Consent Calendar and included in the agenda to be brought to the floor for debate
- The request that an item or items be removed from the Consent Calendar is not debatable and does not require a vote of the body
- An item or items may not be added to the Consent Calendar by a request from the floor of the full Senate

Procedures for inclusion of items on the Consent Calendar are:

- The standing senate committee submits the item(s) to the Executive Committee of the Senate (EC) and request that they be included on the Consent Calendar
- The EC votes to include the item(s) as requested or to bring them to the full senate for debate
- Either the standing committee or the EC may request that an item or items typically included on the Consent Calendar be included on the agenda for full Senate debate

The Consent Calendar is a procedural mechanism to help expedite the work of the Senate. It is not intended to circumvent necessary debate on agenda items. Therefore, the inclusion or exclusion of items on the Consent Calendar is the exclusive purview of the Senate and its elected officers.

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS  
FACULTY SENATE**

**Resolution in Response to the Withdrawal of Susan Meisenhelder's Nomination to  
the CSU Board of Trustees**

The following is a response to Chancellor Charles Reed's perceived interference with Professor Susan Meisenhelder's nomination to the California State University's Board of Trustees.

**WHEREAS**, the Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960 stipulated that among its other duties, the CSU Board of Trustees was to appoint the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellors for the CSU system, but did not offer a reciprocal arrangement (i.e. that a Chancellor choose his or her own Trustees); and

**WHEREAS**, Section 66607 of the California Education Code stipulates that "The California State University shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefore in the appointment of its Trustees and in the administration of its affairs"; and

**WHEREAS**, Chancellor Reed's representative's outspoken personal criticisms of Professor Meisenhelder, such as CSU Spokesperson Clara Potes-Fellow stating that Meisenhelder had "used her position to discredit the university" (*San Bernardino County Sun* 6 Nov 2003) violates the spirit and letter of Section 66607 of the California Education Code; and

**WHEREAS**, the Chancellor's office attempts to unduly influence the appointment of a Trustee effectively negates the principles of shared governance upon which the CSU system works; and

**WHEREAS**, in over two decades of service to the CSU system, Professor Meisenhelder has worked tirelessly as an educator, scholar, and advocate for students and faculty, most recently through her four-year tenure as statewide president of the California Faculty Association; be it therefore

**RESOLVED**, that the Faculty Senate of California State University San Marcos object to Chancellor Reed's perceived interference in the Trustee selection process; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the CSUSM Faculty Senate express its appreciation to Professor Meisenhelder for the exemplary commitment to the CSU system and its acknowledgment that she is, in fact, a great "friend of the university"; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the Faculty Senate of California State University San Marcos forward this resolution to the Chancellor's Office and the CSU Board of Trustees.

## Faculty Role in Academic Restructuring and Program Discontinuance

**AS-2634-03/FA - November 13-14, 2003**

### ATTACHMENT TO AS-2634-03/FA

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) urge campus senates to review or develop, as appropriate, policy recommendations related to discontinuance and suspension of academic and academic support programs, academic reorganization, and dissolution or merger of departments, schools, colleges, and similar academic units; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge that any such policies embody the principles of joint decision-making and shared governance in the procedures they describe.

***RATIONALE:*** *The discontinuance or suspension of an academic program or the reorganization of academic units (departments, schools, colleges) bears directly on curriculum and affects the configuration of course offerings. For this reason, as indicated in numerous documents, faculty bear primary responsibility for the process by which any such action occurs and for the policy language affecting it. Appended are examples of such policies from several CSU campuses.*

**APPROVED - November 13-14, 2003**

## Enrollment, Budget and Educational Quality in the CSU

**AS-2632-03/FGA/AA - November 13-14, 2003**

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) reaffirm its support of the principles contained in its unanimously adopted resolution AS-2612-03/FGA, *Recommended CSU Budget Priority for 2003-2004* ([attached](#)), and endorse the remarks of Senate Chair Robert Cherny that were given at the hearing of the Assembly Higher Education Committee on September 23, 2003 ([attached](#)); and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor to limit the enrollment targets for the CSU for 2004-2005 to the number of students fully supported in the Governor's January Budget; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Academic Senate CSU urge the Chancellor's Office to work with the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst to redefine "marginal cost" for enrollment growth in the CSU in a manner that reflects the actual costs of additional students; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the CSU not increase any enrollment unless such an increase is funded at an appropriate level based on the new marginal cost; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the CSU devise an admission policy that allows for adjustments in enrollment that reflect the final state budget for that year.

**RATIONALE:** *For the last decade, the CSU has not received adequate funding from State revenues and student fees to maintain the quality of education that should be provided to those attending the CSU. The Chancellor's Office calculated that for 2003-2004, under the Partnership Agreement with the State, the CSU should have received \$12,051 per student. In fact, the CSU received only \$10,355 per student—a shortfall of \$1,696 per student. Even the \$12,051 represents only a minimum funding agreement. This shortfall in funding has resulted in overcrowded classes and laboratories, a decline in the number of tenure/tenure-track faculty, obsolete or broken lab equipment, eroded library collections and services, deteriorating facilities, and faculty salaries that fall further and further behind those at comparable institutions. This has been documented in the "CSU at the Beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century" report.*

*Much of this shortfall has been due to using a calculation of marginal cost that is woefully outdated. Again refer to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century document, specifically pages 47-49.*

**APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY - November 13-14, 2003**