

**MINUTES  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING  
NOVEMBER 7, 2002**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Present:** Robert Coleman-Senghor, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Bernie Goldstein, Bob Karlsrud, Rick Luttmann, Robert McNamara, Elizabeth Stanny, Karen Thompson, Art Warmoth, Steve Wilson

**Absent:**

Ruben Arminana, Noel Byrne, Susan McKillop

Meeting began at 3:08pm

Rick Luttmann presided as Acting Chair due to Noel Byrne's absence.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

R. Luttmann: Adding one more item, Discussion of the Faculty Retreat.

**R. Luttmann: Agenda approved as amended**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**R. Luttmann: The minutes are quite extensive.**

R. Coleman-Senghor: Could I ask that we put the approval off until next meeting because there are a lot of glitches. And I would like to send to Carol - in fact what I think would be useful as Carol was trying to capture all this back and forth, what would be useful for us is to see if we could get an electric copy and put in stick-outs or additions as appropriate.

C. Tamagni: The wording is directly from the tape.

R. Coleman-Senghor: It is a question of how you hear things and how they are heard.

C. Tamagni: Ok

K. Thompson: Everyone edit the minutes themselves and then send to Carol?

R. Coleman-Senghor: It would be more fruitful to use given this new technology that we have by offering her some assistance. I am trying to find a way to not spend as much time on approving minutes in the Executive and Academic Senate meetings.

R. Luttmann: Steve, please work with Carol to fill in the blanks in the minutes. Minutes should not be per-vatum

Carol to send out in e-copy of the minutes and members will edit (with color type) and resend minutes to Carol final correction.

**CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED:** None

**REPORTS**

**CHAIR OF THE FACULTY - (N. BYRNE)**

Not present

**PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY - (R. ARMINANA)**

Not present

**PROVOST/VICE PRESIDENT - (B. GOLDSTEIN)**

The Senate had asked me, last time to put together a matrix of all new hires. Tenure Track Recruitment Status (Bernie briefly guided the committee members through this handout).

B. Karlsrud: How much salary is coming out of the temporary faculty pool. Wonderful to have all these new positions, but I am curious as to how much

B. Goldstein: Doesn't say exactly.

R Luttmann: If you look on the column Dept/Title, some of them show the converted part-time. Mathematics, No. 12.

B. Goldstein: Growth position converted from part-time are listed there. Example, No. 23 Mathematics.

B. Karlsrud: But I don't know how many dollars came out of the part-time to the conversion pool. Does that mean all of the \$48,000 are from

R. Luttmann: I don't think it has to do with money, I think it has to do with essentially the source of the position. New position, replacement position, person retiring.

S. Wilson: Now the converted part-time, are you planning to convert existing part-timers or displacing them?

B. Karlsrud: It is a displacement, unless the person is hired.

A. Warmoth: Not only that but, it is taking lecturers from some department to fund full-time faculty in other departments. In some cases.

R. Luttmann: Before we leave this topic, perhaps I can mention to the committee the conversation you and I had earlier today regarding diversity. As you know we are in the process of making a major effort to increase diversity on campus. One of the concerns is to try to get a more diverse faculty because it seems like a necessary step in order to make students who are minority feel more comfortable on campus. Right now, the only reference on this sheet (handout, Tenture-Track Faculty Positions, 2003-2004). Bernie and I were talking about trying to find language, the would have to pass legal muster, but that we would actually put

into each position announcement that would give us a legal basis for saying that we are trying to recruit to this position in such a way that we can (several people spoke at once).

B. Goldstein: I think you have to be very careful of how you say that. There are legal descriptions.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Legal descriptions are on race. Or any of the protected classes. Ethnicity.

K. Thompson: If you look at the newspaper you can get some ideas for what is acceptable. Usually it says, women and minorities are encouraged to apply. I think that is a subtle way of saying we are trying to increase our diversity.

R. Luttmann: Also, Bernie said he has talked to specific faculty who are going to be involved in the searches....

B. Goldstein: Judith and I have already had orientations with Chairs of the Committees and tried to encourage them to look at the issue of diversity. But you have to be very careful about how you do that.

R. Luttmann: This might be an important point to mention that the Campus Climate Committee on Monday, voted to send a memo to the Provost Search Committee saying basically that it was very pleased with the commitment to diversity by the present Provost and would like to request that the Provost Search Committee place a high priority on the replacement Provost who will

---

R. Coleman-Senghor: On the bottom of this, it says Affirmation Action. Is this an old one?

B. Goldstein: It says Affirmative Action, this is the way it went out. I don't know why it went out that way.

R. Coleman-Senghor: It should not have. We can ask Judith.

(There was a power outage that effect the entire campus).

C. Goldstein: Let me go down and get my flashlight, I will also ask Judith.

B. Karlrud: Why is the AMCS replacement position is so much higher as a starting salary than the others in the same school?

R. Coleman-Senghor: The reason it is so much higher is that Dean Babula wants to see if he can get someone at the associate type. So consequently he has to figure out the range that would allow someone to come in under the associate range. That is what he is aiming for because basically that department has been practically gutted.

B. Karlsrud: So he is not seeking a chair, or something. He is trying to get a senior.

R. Coleman-Senghor: What he is attempting to do is to get someone to come in and let them have two years and then they will move to Chair. So in effect, what you will be doing is that you are promised that if you come in you get this \$48,000 and then you become Chair. The madness and the money increases.

B. Karlsrud: Is this advertised?

R. Coleman-Senghor: This is what he is aiming for.

**STATEWIDE SENATOR - (S. MCKILLOP)**

Not present

**CHAIR-ELECT OF THE SENATE - (R. LUTTMANN)**

No report other than what I had mentioned.

**VICE PRESIDENT, ADMIN. & FINANCE - (L. SCHLERETH)**

Report and request. Since the rain has begun for the rainy season. Our temporary parking lots are becoming naturally muddy and they will create a potential safety situation for students (mostly students) who are parked in these temporary lots because, naturally they are slippery and not designed for that purpose.

Interruption - Bernie returned to the meeting.

B. Goldstein: Judith thought that the Affirmative Action language was ok

Happily, in our paved parking lots, under reserved and unreserved - if you visit them you will find that they have parking spaces. The judgement is that we no longer need these temporary parking lots. So in the interest of safety, I am going to be suggesting to the President that we begin the process of closing down the temporary lots, since I don't think we need them.

B. Karlsrud: It didn't appear that way when we came onto campus today. There is no place to park. I parked in the mud.

R. Luttmann: It appears that the lots across the creek are finished, why aren't they open?

L. Schlereth: They are nearly ready to go, we are waiting for the installation of the emergency telephones before we were to open. The emergency phones are available for employees and students to use should they encounter problems. So what you are saying, if Bob is correct, and I don't doubt that he is, that we would have to evaluate what the greater risk. Slipping in the mud or not having an emergency phone.

B. Karlsrud: I have all wheel drive, but there are students stuck in the mud.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Could I suggest two things? One, since the question of newness of it is at a high period, that we open that lot, only from 8am to 2 or 3pm (daylight hours). That might be the best way to facilitate that. The other thing is to allow faculty to park in the reserved lots.

L. Schelerth: Faculty can if they are willing to pay for reserved parking price.

R. Coleman-Senghor: What risk do you want? When you are talking about risk, you are talking about money. I am talking about getting around that by looking at how we can have people from this period of time, until we have parking spaces, too allow faculty to park.

R. Luttmann: When do you expect the phone to be in?

L. Schelerth: We expect to open the lots by the early part of December.

R. Luttmann: That is quite a bit later than what was reported.

L. Schelerth: There are delays in the contractor which seems to happen in every construction project. I am not surprised. I just wanted to let you know that we are going to do something with the temporary lots. Because I don't think they are any longer safe. So I have to figure out some other kind of way.

R. Luttmann: The last plan might be worth thinking about. Open the lots during daylight hours. That is the time when you have the big crowds.

L. Schelerth: Perhaps during very specialized periods of certain days. Between 10am and maybe 2pm on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. That might work. On Mondays and Fridays there are no issues. I will take a look at that with our people to see what we can do. I think everyone will probably agree that the lots that are mud are no longer wise to use.

S. Wilson: What about opening the access on Rohnert Park Expressway. I don't think that should have much of an impact on that. Getting out of campus at 4pm is just a nightmare. All the traffic funnels out of the main entrance. The bridge is ready and the streets are there. It would relieve the traffic congestion.

L. Schelerth: You are absolutely correct. Once we are able to open the North Entrance, I think it will greatly relieve traffic. But before we do that, we want to make sure that the appropriate signage for stop signs etc. are installed. And I have asked for that to be done. But the road is not stripped yet. We are working all those issues. I think that in 30 days all those issues will resolve themselves.

The other item, I think this is the correct thing to do but I am looking to the Executive Committee for advice. It relates to the fact that we have a Blue Paper Policy called the non-discrimination policy which was created by the campus years and years ago when we established a non-discrimination policy. Then it was revised in response to a requirement from the Office of Civil Rights, several years ago. What has happened is that the non-discrimination policy, as it is

written, and its procedures that are contained within it, are no longer in conformity with the State of California law as put forward by Prop. 209. And secondly, each of the collective bargaining agreements for the various units, CSU, CFA, all the units. Have specific procedures about what you do if you feel you are discriminated against. The procedures in the bargaining agreements are not always consistent with the procedures in the Blue Paper Policy. So there is a dilemma. The office Blue Paper is in conflict with 209 and the Bargaining Unit. So we sought advice from the Chancellors office. They told us to come into conformity with 209 and the Bargaining Agreements, because they are the overriding document. Which causes a problem with our Blue Paper. So we have written the Blue Paper, more or less taking the procedure away from the

\_\_\_\_\_ since they are contained in the bargaining agreement and made the Blue Paper consistent with 209. I technically cannot do a great deal of consultation on this statement, because generally it is contained in the elements of collective bargaining. But since the Blue Paper was originally crafted at a different time, and maybe collective bargaining did not even exist. I thought it would be good to pass this policy to as many other groups as we can. So I think it is Elizabeth's committee that I would like to send it to, from the point of faculty. We have already transmitted it Unit 3. It is potential a moot policy. If you have issues with it, because that is the current view of the bargaining process. But I think because the Senate was involved, years ago in the creation of the policy, that it would be good if they had a chance to look at it too. I thought that the FSAC was the appropriate group to take a look at the policy. If they have an issue with it, I think they would communicate it to Unit 3. Then Unit 3 would officially come back to us and say, "we don't like this part". Because I cannot really negotiate the policy outside of the bargaining agreements, if you get my drift, without endangering the non-discrimination labor practice, which we are trying not to have happen. So, I think I should just transmit a copy of the policy to Elizabeth, but if you think that is not the right way - then tell me.

R. Luttmann: No, I think it is a Senate matter. And FSAC would have jurisdiction over it. However, there is a subcommittee of FSAC called Academic Freedom Committee (was Academic Non-Discrimination Committee).

Tape interruption.

L. Schelerth: I don't think that there is anything strange about the revisions. The bargaining agreement is pretty reasonable and the Blue Paper Policy is pretty, I cannot imagine anyone having an issue with it.

D. Stanny: Just for clarification. The revised policy that is coming to FSAC \_\_\_\_\_ has it already been \_\_\_\_\_.

L. Schelerth: It is tricky because there are many unions, and there has to be one policy. We have written the policy pretty much to say, in keeping with the language of 209. Which is a very simple set of language that we cannot really argue with 209. We have incorporated the procedures by referencing the various bargaining agreements. So we have tried not to give one policy to the trade union, and one for the APC unit, it is tricky these days.

R. Coleman-Senghor: I think that this is an example of when the Senate needs to simply step away from this. We have no force here, other than to be informed. We can be informed as a collective bargaining issue.

We should step back from this since this is a collective bargaining issue and I think we would only muddy the waters. We do have faculty representatives here and we have no force or power in this instance. There are other issues that were adopted from 1972 and 1974. And I think that to send it over to FSAC other than just as in inform document, is to waste FSAC's time, because FSAC as absolutely no force.

L. Schelerth: I have another policy that I want to get to when I am done with this one that is similar. But I think I agree with you Rob. Because if FSAC were to come back and say we don't like certain things, then I would have to work with the general council to recraft it and then send it back to FSAC as a change as well all the other unions. As you can see it can become very, very confusing. And I think that 209 and bargaining have taken this out of our traditional ways of writing a policy of this type. There is another one on smoking which I coming that is similar. I want to inform the Senate that I am doing this so that it does not come as a surprise.

R. Luttmann: I guess my view is that you may have little authority on this but I think we can still take a look at it and see if there are concerns. Elizabeth has concurred on behalf of that committee.

S. Wilson: There are practical reasons for soliciting faculty input in these type of things, even though we don't have any authority.

R. Coleman-Senghor: So we understand that this document is being referred to FSAC for its commentary? That is an entirely different stance then referring it to action.

B. Goldstein: PG&E is working on our power outage and is recommending that we adjourn the meeting since the campus is being closed.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Can we continue for 30 more minutes?

Agreed.

L. Schlereth: As a courtesy item, I will transmit my document to Elizabeth via email.

**CHAIRS, STANDING COMMITTEES:**  
**R. COLEMAN-SENGHOR**

**A. WARMOTH**

**K. THOMPSON**

## **E. STANNY**

### **BUSINESS**

#### **STUDENT AFAIRS COMMITTEE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE BY-LAWS**

R. Luttmann: At our last meeting, Student Affairs had proposed some by-law changes. Three of them were minor. But we asked the S&F committee to take a look at that. S&F did look at it last Tuesday and has no problem with it, so I propose that this to forward to the Senate. And I would even be prepared to suggest, if everyone is in agreement since these changes are rather minor and received unanimous approval by S&F, it is certainly a candidate for a Consent Item for the Senate Agenda. Karen, you should be prepared to answer questions, but we don't actually debate it.

Karen to give Carol a revised document.

#### **REPORT OF THE SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE**

R. Luttmann: There was an initial memo inspiring the Senate Budget Committee to meet with Provost Goldstein. That did take place, the Budget Committee met again on Tuesday and revised the memo a bit. Subsequently it was revised again by email and the copy that you have before you, which is eligible in this light, represents the revisions. So, I suppose this can go ahead to the Senate. This doesn't request any action by the Senate, so it is essentially a Report. I will suggest that Andy be invited to make the report.

A. Warmoth: I have a couple of minor quibbles, but I will send them to Andy.

#### **APPROVAL OF THE SENATE AGENDA FOR NOVEMBER 14, 2002**

Under Business, "Staff Representative Election Update". Carol, that is not really a business item, I think it can be done under my Report.

The other items, No. should be Resolution on Academic Planning.

No. 3, GE Substitution Policy and No. 4, Faculty Emeritus Policy are both up for second readings. Did I hear a rumor regarding the Resolution on Academic Planning?

A. Warmoth: The EPC and the APC agreed that they would like to process the feedback from the last Senate meeting before we have a second reading on the Resolution for Academic Planning, so we are asking that the second reading be deferred to the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. And the GE Substitution Policy, Paul Draper is requesting a Time Certain during the first hour.

R. Luttmann: Is there any objection? Why don't we give him a Time Certain of 3:15pm.

On all of these, please put a sponsor.

R. Luttmann: The only thing I wanted to talk about today is the Faculty Retreat. This is something that may have slipped through the cracks. Should we discuss this now? We also talked about an Emeritis dinner, but that can probably wait until early Spring. We really need to get going on the Retreat. We need to think about the topic etc.

A. Warmoth: There are a couple of things I would like to put on the table. One, at this point working in collaboration with the GE Subcommittee, we are hoping to have a draft of a report on the GE Situation in time for the Faculty Convocation. There are basically two elements at this point. It has become clear that there has been a lot of assessment already on GE, we want to pull all that together in a kind of synopsis of what is there and to engage the faculty in some sort of brainstorming in some things we could be doing with GE. We are not saying that there is something we should be doing, but we want to put out some creative possibilities for the faculty. So I would like to get that on the agenda at some point. And the other thing that has come up is the School of Social Sciences will be doing a retreat on Academic Planning during that time frame. It might be useful for all of us to take that time to do some thinking about their curriculum in relation to the liberal arts and sciences mission.

R. Luttmann: Very good, but remember that we did have a convocation last year on GE.

A. Warmoth: This would basically be a follow up to that information coming out of that convocation. We are not asking to go over the same ground but we do want people to know that something has come out of that experience.

R. Luttmann: There might be some objection by members of the faculty, perhaps they might think we are over-emphasizing GE.

A. War moth: We can make this available to the Schools, if they want to talk about it they can. Or they can talk about something else.

R. Coleman-Senghor:

K. Thompson: One of the things we talked about early in the semester was, the need to improve communication. Possibly what the Senate does to all faculty and get more people involved so they know what the issues are as faculty. And also, communication in terms of representing faculty issues on this campus, more accurately perhaps. We talked about this at the beginning of the semester but never really touched it again.

R. Coleman-Senghor: Iniatitives

**ADJOURNMENT at 4:00pm**  
**(Power outage due to rainstorm - the entire campus was closed for the evening)**