

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2729-06/EX (Rev)
January 26-27, 2006

Amendment to the Constitution

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) recommend to the faculty of the CSU the following constitutional amendment regarding Senate membership.

Article II

Section 1. Membership

a) The elected members of the Academic Senate shall consist of ~~elected campus representatives apportioned as follows:~~ two senators per campus plus an additional senator from each of the seven largest campuses apportioned on the basis of FTEF. ~~a minimum of two senators from each campus plus one additional senator (for a total of 3) for each campus whose FTEF exceeds the average FTEF (determined by the $1/n$ fraction of the systemwide FTEF, where n is the number of campuses), plus an additional senator (for a total of 4) for any campus whose FTEF exceeds twice the average FTEF (i.e., $2/n$ times the systemwide FTEF);~~

;and be it further

RESOLVED: That this change take effect on the allocation of seats expiring in June 2006; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU underscore to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees that though its duties and responsibilities have increased, its funding has remained constant; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU underscore to the Chancellor and Board of Trustees that senators without additional support have done yeoman service in carrying forward the work created by LDTP, IMPAC, more FTES, EAP, developing campuses, joint doctoral programs, more faculty and the independent Ed.D.

*RATIONALE: At the present time, the Academic Senate CSU consists of 58 elected Senators and one Emeritus/Emerita Senator, designated by the Emeritus and Retired Faculty Association, for a total of 59 Senators. The change would reduce the number of **elected** Senators to 53 and would retain the Emeritus/Emerita Senator (who does not receive assigned time), for a **total** of 54 Senators. Five campuses received a third Senate seat in 2002 (Chico, Fresno, Los Angeles, Pomona, San Luis Obispo). These third seats would be those reduced under this change.*

The number 53 was chosen as the size of the Senate to reflect a natural break-point in the number of full-time equivalent faculty (FTE/F) between the San Francisco and San Luis Obispo campuses. In Fall 2005, the most recent data available, the San Francisco campus had 1,156 FTE/F, and the San Luis Obispo campus had 929 FTE/F.

The other provisions adopted in 2002 are not affected. They include:

- *A provision that added an Emeritus Senator,*
- *A provision that stated explicitly that the immediate past chair is not counted as part of a campus delegation if he or she does not otherwise hold a seat, and*
- *A provision allowing the Executive Committee to "...resolve issues concerning the implementation of this section." The latter include, according to AS-2546-01/EX (November 1, 2001), "the timing for the creation of new seats, determination of annual reapportionment procedures, establishing staggered elections for new campuses, assuring that any reallocation of a seat occurs at the conclusion of a term of office, etc."*

If this resolution passes, the constitutional change, as per our constitution in Article VII, Section 2, will require "...a majority of the total vote cast in a system wide referendum and a majority of the votes cast at each of a majority of the campuses." Amendments, according to Section 3, "...become effective upon ratification by the faculties of the campuses and approval of the Trustees."

The history of the Senate's budget problem and its expansion is detailed in the report sent to Senators before the January ASCSU meetings from the Ad Hoc Task Force on the Senate Budget, made up of Senators Anagnoson (Chair), Buck, Cook, Edelman, and Hood. A majority of the committee recommended that the Senate return to its size of 2001.

The Senate's structural shortfall is approximately \$100,000 of the \$1 million total budget for 2005-06. The Senate's budget has been roughly constant since 2002. Once the new Senators added received assigned time in 2003-04, the Senate has operated with a substantial shortfall.

Of critical importance is the promise the Senate made when the Senate expanded in 2002. The item presented to the Board of Trustees on July 16-17 states in part as follows:

"The Academic Senate understands that the expansion of campus representative and the emerita/emeritus member would be accomplished without an increase in budgeted resources. The Academic Senate Executive Committee intends to accommodate the proposed amendments through reductions in member travel and/or release time assignments."

The language stating that the extra Senators are apportioned "on the basis of the highest FTEF" is the old language from prior to 2002. This language places

a cap on the size of the Senate, reducing its size from the present 59 to 53 elected Senators, plus the Emeritus representative, or 54 total. The reduction of five Senators should provide the Senate with the funds needed to close most of the structural budget gap.

The provision, stating that two seats for every new campus brought into the system raise the cap, is designed to expand the Senate as new campuses are developed. The provision is also designed to prevent the cap from causing two of the larger campuses to lose their third seat when a new campus is added to the system.

The provision requiring that the change be effective on the seats expiring in June 2006 is designed to make the provisions effective for the 2006-07 academic year.

Approved – March 9-10, 2006

Apportionment, 2002 Rules, 2005 Rules, and Exec's Proposal

01/25/06

	FTEF Fall 2005	2002 Rules	2005 Rules	Exec's Proposal
Campus				
Maritime	69	1	2	2
Channel Islands	148	2	2	2
Monterey Bay	213	2	2	2
San Marcos	308	2	2	2
Sonoma	381	2	2	2
Stanilaus	395	2	2	2
Bakersfield	401	2	2	2
Humboldt	414	2	2	2
Dominguez Hills	445	2	2	2
East Bay	544	2	2	2
San Bernardino	650	2	2	2
Chico	747	2	3	2
Pomona	842	2	3	2
Los Angeles	849	2	3	2
Fresno	886	2	3	2
San Luis Obispo	929	2	3	2
San Francisco	1,156	2	3	3
Sacramento	1,157	3	3	3
San Jose	1,203	3	3	3
Fullerton	1,267	3	3	3
Northridge	1,277	3	3	3
San Diego	1,336	3	3	3
Long Beach	1,430	3	3	3
Emeriti			1	1
Totals		51	59	54
Average:	741.2			
Twice avg.:	1,482.3			

Apportionment, 2002 Rules, 2005 Rules, and Exec's Proposal				
01/25/06				
	FTEF Fall 2005	2002 Rules	2005 Rules	Exec's Proposal
Campus				
Maritime	69	1	2	2
Channel Islands	148	2	2	2
Monterey Bay	213	2	2	2
San Marcos	308	2	2	2
Sonoma	381	2	2	2
Stanilaus	395	2	2	2
Bakersfield	401	2	2	2
Humboldt	414	2	2	2
Dominguez Hills	445	2	2	2
East Bay	544	2	2	2
San Bernardino	650	2	2	2
Chico	747	2	3	2
Pomona	842	2	3	2
Los Angeles	849	2	3	2
Fresno	886	2	3	2
San Luis Obispo	929	2	3	2
San Francisco	1,156	2	3	3
Sacramento	1,157	3	3	3
San Jose	1,203	3	3	3
Fullerton	1,267	3	3	3
Northridge	1,277	3	3	3
San Diego	1,336	3	3	3
Long Beach	1,430	3	3	3
Emeriti			1	1
Totals		51	59	54
Average:	741.2			
Twice avg.:	1,482.3			