

Executive Committee Minutes
February 3, 2011
3:00 – 5:00, Sue Jameson Room

Abstract

Agenda approved. Minutes of 11/4 & 12/2 approved. Chair Report. President Report. Resolution on Creating a Diversity Stakeholder's Exploratory Committee approved for Senate agenda. Revisions to the RTP policy approved for the Senate agenda. One faculty member for emeritus status approved for Senate consent calendar. From EPC: Request to revive the University Program Review subcommittee referred to Structure and Functions. By-Laws: Change to Article III, Section 2 – Representative Proxies approved for Senate agenda. Question regarding membership of Excellence in Teaching Award committee. Faculty Governance Reassigned time for '11 – '12 approved. CFA Report. Statewide Senator Report. FSAC Report. EPC Report. Provost Report. Senate agenda approved. Questions for the Provost.

Present: Richard Senghas, Elaine Newman, Ben Ford, Jennifer Mahdavi, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Saeid Rahimi, John Wingard, Maria Hess, Margaret Purser, Ruben Armiñana, Susan Moulton, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Andy Merrifield, Catherine Nelson

Absent: Kelly Estrada, Sam Brannen

Guests: Alex Boyar, Steve Wilson, Barbara Lesch-McCaffry, Janet Hess, Sharon Cabaniss

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 11/4 & 12/2 – Approved.

Chair Report – J. Wingard

J. Wingard noted that the University Retreat went well and that the posters from the Retreat were off to the Rohnert Park Community Center.


President Report – R. Armiñana

R. Armiñana reported that the campus was close to the target and that it was a relatively rich semester. He noted the average unit load had increased. He then spoke about the future budget issues. He noted that there were some differences of opinion about the percentages, but the best scenario was that the CSU would be reduced by \$500 million. He said it could not get better; it could get worse if the extension of the taxes was not approved. He thought if the initiative made it for a special election ballot, it could pass, but politically, there may be trouble getting a special election. If a special election did not happen, then it would have to go through the typical initiative process in November and by then half the fiscal year will be over. He said it was very challenging and he would be delighted to be

proved wrong. He said the net cut would be approximately \$380 million. For SSU, the cut would be around \$8 million. He said the options to deal with the cuts are limited – no student fee increase was in sight, the target will remain as the current year and currently, there are no furloughs in the mix. He said furloughs were temporary measures and these were permanent cuts. He noted that the furloughs last year reduced the expenditures by \$5 million. He passed out a chart, which showed State Allocations for FTES and Enrollment in the CSU in FTES from AY 99-00 to AY 11-12. This showed the pattern of state spending per FTES over that period of time. The gap between how many students were enrolled in the CSU in 10-11 and state funding was very large. In 99-00 the gap was very small.

CSU The California State University
WORKING FOR CALIFORNIA


State Allocation and Enrollment



FTES in 2010-11 is budgeted enrollment rather than actual

The second chart he passed out represented how much was being spent on each student.

**Declining State Support Forces More
Reliance on Student Fees
(in 2011 Constant Dollars)**



He said that in a ten-year period there was a loss of approximately \$1700 per student. He said the chart shows that the composition changes radically and the support changes radically. He noted that higher education was weighted higher for personnel costs as opposed to capital costs than other industries that might have to deal with this issue. He said they would be talking about how to achieve these cuts in the coming months given the parameters, such as making target. He thought it created significant changes in how the university was organized to meet that target. Then he announced that the faculty and ASI have been contacted for members for the Provost search committee and he hoped the search would be completed by the first of June.

A member asked who makes the decision about whether we keep the same target or reduce it. The President said the decision was made by the Chancellor's office that was informed by the Department of Finance on behalf of the Governor. He said he had no negotiation power and encouraged the dismay of the faculty be expressed to the Governor. The CFA President said the CSU would be getting more money than in '09-'10 and argued that it was a 4% cut to the total CSU budget which was significant. There was some discussion about percentages regarding the budget and factors which make the percentages difficult to agree on. The President said it was much more challenging than 2009.

Resolution on Creating a Diversity Stakeholder's Exploratory Committee – B. Lesch McCaffry, S. Cabaniss and J. Hess

B. Lesch McCaffry provided a brief overview of the background of the resolution. She noted that J. Hess brought the concern about a women's center to the Senate Diversity Subcommittee and the SDS reworked it to be more about gender. She noted the issues were programming for gender issues for all students and individuals who can assist students in connecting with campus resources and off campus resources. She noted that 60% of students on campus were female. 1 in 4 students at college campuses experience some issues about body image including anorexia and bulimia. 27% of students by the time they reach their senior year had experienced date rape and only 5% report it. The resolution was looking for sustainability and streamlining efforts. They had visited other diversity committees for feedback. They hoped this committee or workgroup would move the campus forward instead of waiting a year and a half. She listed the committees and administrators they had met with. She said they hoped that the resolution could be on the Senate agenda. There were some questions. J. Hess stated she thought this was an exciting opportunity for community building. There was discussion about the role of Counseling and Psychological Services. A member raised the concern that the major question from the Senate might be: why create another committee.

Approved for Senate agenda.

Revisions to the RTP policy – R. Senghas

R. Senghas introduced the item. A cover memo was included that listed all the changes. He said nothing substantive was being changed. They were only trying to bring the policy in line with the CBA and clarify current language that appeared to be problematic. They had also set up the policy to be easier to read by adding a set of definitions at the beginning and putting a calendar in it. A member noted a few typographical errors. A member gave feedback on the section on qualitative and quantitative assessments for candidates. A member asked about the terms reappointment or retention. The CFA President noted that union legal said both terms were meaningless. It didn't matter what it was called, it meant the same thing. R. Senghas noted that a Senator had asked for the policy to be out earlier than the Senate packet, so he would do that. A member noted that, in the self-assessment of teaching portion, it was physically impossible for candidates to address all the items in 5 pages. R. Senghas said he thought URTP just wanted them to be as short as possible because they had received some that were 70 pages long. He said the department committee could write a more substantial document.

Approved for the Senate agenda.

One faculty member for emeritus status – Approved for Senate consent calendar.

From EPC: Request to revive the University Program Review subcommittee – E. Newman

E. Newman described why EPC wanted to revive the University Program Review subcommittee. She noted that departments go through an arduous process during program review and that EPC had not been able to review any so far this year due to the regular business of EPC and she thought it was a disservice to the departments that EPC was not able to review them. She also thought that EPC's process with program reviews was nice, but was not useful for a larger view for planning. EPC thought a university level committee should provide university level feedback to Schools or Curriculum Committees for academic planning. She asked the Executive Committee to refer previous language for the University Program Review subcommittee to Structure and Functions. She thought that the new committee should decide for themselves how to figure out the best way to handle program reviews. A member argued for the benefit of larger views of program reviews. She recommended that someone on that subcommittee should be related to a graduate program. A member argued that program reviews did have affects on the departments.

Approved to refer to Structure and Functions.

By-Laws: Change to Article III, Section 2 – Representative Proxies - B. Ford

B. Ford noted that this by-law change had been before the Executive Committee previously and was set back to Structure and Functions with the instruction to look at proxies for all members of the Senate. He said that committee chairs were already dealt with in the by-laws and that since the lecturer senators were at-large and elected by all the faculty, it was legitimate for lecturers to have any eligible member as a proxy. Thus, the change was the same as before.

Approved for the Senate agenda.

Question regarding membership of Excellence in Teaching Award committee – L. Holmstrom Vega

L. Holmstrom Vega noted that a previous recipient of the Excellence in Teaching Award was due to serve on the EITA committee who was now a Dean. She asked if there was any issue with that. Several members did mention concerns and thought that it was a committee of peers judging the award and an administrator was not appropriate.

Faculty Governance Reassigned time for '11 – '12 – J. Wingard

J. Wingard introduced the item. He noted that he had a discussion with Provost earlier in the semester and they had agreed that the number of course releases would remain the same, but would not automatically be 4 units per course. They had looked at the unit load in the Schools where people were receiving reassigned time and 60% of the courses were 4 units and 40% were 3 units, so faculty governance reassigned time should reflect that balance. The EPC chair passed

around a list of duties of the GE subcommittee chair to as a rationale for units for the GE chair.

Approved.

CFA Report – A. Merrifield

A. Merrifield provided an update on bargaining. He said that there had been no discussion at bargaining about furloughs. He noted that the Chancellor and other administrators had talked publically about furloughs and layoffs. CFA thought that was irresponsible since they were bargaining issues and that the Chancellor's office was scaring employees. He said they had a side letter agreement on the FERP that it will be same as it is now unless there is an imposition of a contract. He noted that the proposals from the CSU so far were directed toward making it easier to dismiss faculty, to reduce costs and to centralize power in the campus Presidents. He said that whatever the cuts were specifically, they were horrible. He noted that this time there was some indication from the Governor that the cuts should be allocated somewhat. He discussed his understanding of the political situation in Sacramento regarding a special election to extend current taxes. He announced a meeting in Santa Rosa regarding state employee pensions. There was a question about SSIs and whether they were self funding. A. Merrifield said the position of CFA was that they are self-funding.

Statewide Senator Report – C. Nelson

C. Nelson reported on the recent Statewide Senate committee. She said the Faculty Trustee Nominating committee had selected their choices for faculty trustee that the Senate will consider at their March meeting. From those, the Senate can choose up to four faculty to recommend to the Governor. Each faculty chosen by the committee will give a brief statement and their vitae will be available for the Senate to review. They passed a resolution asking the Chancellor to come up with statewide guidelines for online courses. Another resolution up for a first reading was regarding the standardization for student response systems (clickers) as they vary considerably in price and style. The Vice Chair of the Board of Trustees visited the Senate and said that the financial obligation of students needed to be more equitably distributed. He was concerned about students that were struggling financially. He also said that he thought efficiency would not solve all problems in the CSU.

FSAC Report – R. Senghas

R. Senghas announced the recipients of the Goldstein Award this year: Anne Goldman and Kathy Charmaz. He noted that SAC had sent them the class attendance policy. From FSSP, they are receiving priorities regarding scholarship and research and FSAC hoped to work on the disruptive student policy this semester.

EPC Report – E. Newman

E. Newman gave an update on the GE reform in Arts & Humanities. She said the GE subcommittee was not able to have all the courses approved due to learning outcomes that stressed written and oral communication in large classes. She said there were conversations on-going. She noted a bulk of courses had been approved for GE and another group had been approved as experimental for this semester only. She said freshman coming in the Fall will be under the new GE pattern. She discussed the paperwork that needed to be printed and how the new pattern would be indicated in the catalog and online. She thought the GE reform was in great flux.

Provost Report – S. Rahimi

S. Rahimi noted he was pleased about the President's decision to search for a permanent Provost. He thought leadership during the coming turbulent financial times was crucial for Academic Affairs. He reported on the enrollment numbers. He said the average unit load for freshman and sophomores was 15. He said he had started an enrollment management and planning group and process that was tested during this registration. This process helped them navigate through the issues and they brought in courses that students really needed. He said the target was being met. He thought the new process was very successful and would present it to faculty governance soon. The Chair asked the Provost about the current faculty hiring processes and if those would be affected by the budget issues. He thought the hires were from departments that had desperate needs. The Provost responded that although there was a hiring freeze, certain positions were going forward that evidenced a great need and some of the faculty hires were such positions. What he had learned the day before that he had not known was that the campus still had to reach the 7474 target. He said he had no intention of reversing any searches, but he had told the Deans that everything was on the table. The campus had to meet target as the consequences of not doing that were unthinkable. He said the searches were the last in his mind. A member asked for standard deviations to be given when reporting average unit loads. A member asked about the status of the wait list in PeopleSoft. L. Furukawa-Schlereth noted he thought the waitlist function would be available for Fall registration. A member asked about the process of hiring for the Vice Provost position and whether there was a job description. The Provost said the committee would be convened soon and they would be looking at the job description. She said that the Graduate Studies subcommittee noted that no one on the search committee was from a graduate program and they would like to make a presentation to the committee. The Provost offered to visit Grad Studies to hear what they had to say. A member asked about the computer refresh program for faculty. The Provost responded that it was moving along as reported.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – John Wingard
Correspondences
Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes – 11/18; 12/9 – emailed

Faculty member eligible for Emeritus Status - attached

BUSINESS

1. From SDS: Resolution on Creating a Diversity Stakeholder's Exploratory Committee – First Reading – attached – S. Cabaniss TC 3:30
2. Revisions to the RTP policy – First Reading – R. Senghas – attached TC 3:45
3. By-Laws Revision: Change to Article III, Section 2 – Representative Proxies – First Reading – B. Ford – attached TC 4:00

The Statewide Senator and Chair of FSAC asked for times certain for their reports.

Approved.

Questions for the Provost

A member asked about departments being able to have a Mac laptop. The Provost said the procedure was for faculty to go through their department chair and the Dean with special requests.

The Chair announced he would be in Long Beach at the next meeting.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström Vega