

Senate Minutes

December 13, 2001

Abstract

Agenda and Minutes approved. Consent items of Computer Science Curriculum revision and Global Studies Concentration in Asian Studies approved. Diversity Vision statement approved. Three resolutions from the Senate Budget Committee presented. Resolution regarding Development Office divided. First resolved tabled. Second resolved failed. Presentation on the Green Music Center from Bernie Goldstein, Jeff Langley and Floyd Ross. No reports.

Present: Rick Luttmann, Noel Byrne, Phil McGough, Peter Phillips, Susan McKillop, Victor Garlin, Wanda Boda, Debora Hammond, Catherine Nelson, Dale Trowbridge, Derek Girman, Robert Girling, Edith Mendez, Gillian Parker, Heather, Smith, Heidi LaMoreaux, Leilani Nishime, Perry Marker, Raye Lynn Thomas, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Gerryann Olson, Scott Miller, Steve Winter, Sunil Tiwari, Tim Wandling, Steve Wilson, Birch Moonwomon, Helmut Wautischer, Bernie Goldstein, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Remy Heng, Susan Moulton, Art Warmoth, William Poe, Michael Litle

Absent: Renee Deorsey, Susan Garfin, Ruben Armiñana, Travis Tabares, Laura Sund

Proxies: Liz Thatch for Duane Dove

Guests: Philip Beard, Leslie Deming, Elaine Sundberg, Jim Stewart, Albert Wahrhaftig, Judith Hunt, Katharyn Crabbe, Barbara Lesch McCaffrey, Rose Bruce, Richard Gordon, Jean B. Chan, Joann Feldman, Les Brooks, Jim Meyer, Steve Orlick, Laxmi Tewari, Floyd Ross, Bob Worth, Elaine Leeder, Linnea Mullins, George R. Quarles, Christina Richie, Lance Plaza, Jeff Langley, Lynne Morrow, Veronica Daube, Greg Tichava

Meeting began 3: 05

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Rick Luttmann

R. Luttmann - I will skip over my report as I did most of it on Senate-Talk. We have a lot to do tod

Correspondences: None.

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda -*Approved*

Approval of Minutes - *Approved*

Computer Science Curriculum revision - *Approved*

Global Studies Concentration in Asian Studies -

L. Nishime - What was the rationale for including Asian American Studies in an Asian Studies program?

S. Moulton - Singh recommended your courses.

L. Nishime - In other tracks is there a American component?

P. Beard - This is the newest of four concentrations. We have Latin American Studies, International Economic Development and Central European Studies. These use a number of courses all over campus. Another one in the works is for Environmental Studies and Planning.

L. Nishime - Does the Latin American include an American Diaspora element? I wonder if Asian Studies is different from the others.

P. Beard - It probably is, I can't quite remember.

J. Stewart - The rationale is the opportunity to learn more about Asian cultures represented in the United States.

L. Nishime - A suggestion is that you might want to call it Asian Diaspora Studies. There is a lot of worry in the Asian Studies community between Asian Studies and Asian American Studies.

P. Beard - Asian Diaspora studies. The concentration is not about Asia in the Diaspora, but a collection of courses about Asia.

J. Stewart - Would you feel more confident if these courses were eliminated? This is an extension of Asian Studies that would not be represented otherwise.

R. Luttmann - Any other questions? Any objections?

Approved

BUSINESS

Diversity Vision Statement - second reading - attachment

R. Luttmann - I was unable to be here two weeks ago as I was in San Diego attending a conference on diversity. We did a presentation on how we developed the diversity vision. A handout has come around for you called *Evolution of a Diversity Vision* by Bernie Goldstein. Both Chuck Rhodes and Larry Shinagawa contributed to that. Larry had an excellent power point presentation and I've contacted him about presenting it to the Senate, if possible, the first meeting in spring. I want to clarify a couple of things based on my reading of the minutes. It should be very clear this is not the end, but the beginning of working toward diversity. Here in my notebook I have a proposal for 16 steps to go through to bringing diversity to a community. The vision is step one. There is a lot to go through after this. Second, there were several versions of the statement. The Executive Committee looked at all of them and decided to send this one to Senate which is not say the Senate is restrained in any way. This is for a starting point and seems to represent the best consensus. At the last meeting other versions were available. I did invite comment from people on Senate-Talk. I only had one response.

L. Nishime - Debora and I worked on an amendment to the statement. (*This was passed around*) Two amendments actually. We're concerned there is not much discussion about academics. We talked before about diversity in the classroom as well as the student population and the connection between the classroom environment and campus environment. We tried to be careful about academic freedom. We are hopeful we phrased it in a way that there would be support for programs that are dedicated to diversity but are not proscribing this.

D. Trowbridge - It seem putting that word in there limits it in a way, not sure how that relates to rest of sentence.

E. Mendez - I would agree and support what they are trying to do. But I agree with Dale. We want not just academics but we want the entire campus climate to support diversity.

R. Luttmann - There seems to be more support for amendment two than one. I think it is unwise to stress academics too much in the statement.

W. Poe - I'd like to hear further from Leilani.

N. Nishime - When we were thinking about this, part of the motivation was if the second amendment was too forceful for people, then they may choose the first amendment.

V. Garlin - Perhaps this could be met by adding a word or two to the first bullet. "And reflects the commitment of the university" - would that meet your concerns and meet concerns about limiting.

D. Hammond - Leilani, I'm wondering if the second amendment passed, would that be sufficient?

L. Nishime - Can we consider them in another order?

No objection.

R. Luttmann - Let's look at amendment two.

S. Wilson - Is this a good place to put auxiliary support for diversity issues? That is extremely important to minority communities that we really are seriously concerned about diversity.

V. Garlin - Steve, do you mean by that Admissions & Records recruiting?

S. Wilson - Recruiting and retention, yes.

V. Garlin - Auxiliary means our auxiliary services like Enterprises, maybe different words would work.

S. Miller - I suggest we need another amendment here. I don't want to dilute Deborah and Leilani's argument.

W. Poe - I support what Steve is saying but it belongs as another item rather than including it in this item.

M. Little - A vision statement is the highest level of abstraction. Out of it would fall implementation of all kinds. It doesn't need to have additional riders to follow through with the vision of various implementations.

S. Miller - I call the question on amendment

Vote on amendment two - *Approved*

L. Nishime - I will withdraw amendment number one.

P. McGough - I saw in the minutes Victor's suggestion about changing "academic family" to "university community." I think that is an excellent suggestion.

No objections - *Approved*.

Vote on diversity vision statement as amended - *Approved*.

Sonoma State University Diversity Vision Statement

We at Sonoma State University strive to create a campus climate in which the will to build trust among people – and groups of people – is widely shared, and opportunities for enhancing diversity and a sense of community are encouraged and supported. We stand committed to fostering and sustaining a pluralistic, inclusive environment that empowers all members of the campus community to achieve their highest potential without fear of prejudice or discrimination.

We strive to build an exemplary educational community characterized by:

- an intellectual environment that is both challenging and nurturing,*
- encouragement and support for curriculum and pedagogy dedicated to diversity issues,*
- a commitment to social justice and equality,*
- a respect for human diversity,*
- and a genuine appreciation of how the many differences among us enrich a liberal arts and sciences university.*

We encourage every member of our university community to embrace the underlying values of this vision, and to demonstrate a strong commitment to supporting, retaining, and attracting students, faculty, and staff who reflect the diversity of our larger society.

Three resolutions from the Senate Budget Committee - first reading - attachments

R. Luttmann - We have two new items of business today. We have three resolutions from the Senate Budget Committee. One deals with the Development Office, one with the 1.4% payback, one directed to state government.

C. Nelson - Briefly I would like to give you a sense of the context within which the Senate Budget Committee developed these resolutions. We all know we are facing substantial budget issues and perhaps substantial issues in the coming year. We have a 1.4% give back for this year and potentially 5-10% next year. Perhaps in January we will know more. This has caused a lot of conversation among the faculty, broad and deep conversations

about this are going on in every department and every school. Between faculty and faculty, and faculty and deans and everybody else. Given that context the Senate Budget Committee thought it was a good time put forth some resolutions that seem to reflect communication about what was emerging within the faculty and to give the Senate the opportunity to discuss these issues. The first resolution recommends that the University reconsider the \$100,000 search for the Vice President for Development. The second recommends that the marginal cost formula not be used for budget cuts. The third recommends to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees that however regrettable it is, that the CSU limit access as tool for the budget crisis. Accepting potentially 5% to 10% budget cuts with an increase of students is going to be virtual impossible, something has to give. The Senate Budget Committee thought limited enrollment might be a good way to do that. We hope this leads to an engaging and engaged discussion not only between faculty, but between faculty and administration. This is the absolutely essential dialogue we need to get through this.

W. Boda - Speaking to number one. There are a lot of different issues in this resolution. If they pay for the search out of their own budget, then the second resolve you don't need at all. There are too many things in the present resolution. If they pay for it what do we care how they do it. But for development, you are going to get what you pay for.

P. Phillips - Regarding contracts with the firm doing the recruitment. Perhaps our CFO can answer this. I would like to know the name of the firm, their location and something about how that firm was selected.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – The name of the firm is Henrick Struggles. They are an executive search firm and have their headquarters in Atlanta, but that is not fair to say it is the headquarters of the corporation. How they were selected? I have less knowledge about that. I believe it is the reputation of that firm. It was the view of the President along with the Chair of the Committee to use them.

P. Phillips - Have we used this firm before?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – We have used three firms in the past. We used another for the President search. Typically you don't use the same firm over and over.

P. Phillips – So it was not put out to bid.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - No, \$65,000 for this type of search is appropriate in the world of searching for Vice Presidents.

P. McGough – The title of resolution doesn't really make sense.

R. Luttmann - The title was put on by our secretary and is not part of the resolution It concerns me that a clause that was added into last paragraph seems to have disappeared. It stated pending implementation of preceding clause. The presumption was that if the suggestion made in first resolved is not adopted then second clause would be used.

R. Coleman – Senghor – I heard correctly there would be no amendments?

R. Luttmann - Yes, I'm just correcting the text.

W. Boda – It needs that to be a logical sentence.

V. Garlin - I move to waive the first reading.

Second.

Vote on waiving first reading on first resolution – *Approved.*

R. Luttmann - Would you accept the amendment I proposed for clarification?

P. McGough - Could you change the title of this?

R. L. Thomas - In the last sentence there is little open endedness with current budget crisis. I don't know if the committee talked about that and especially meant this fiscal year.

C. Nelson – The time frame under consideration is for a year.

R. L. Thomas - Maybe change it to current fiscal year. The current budget crisis of the current fiscal year.

N. Byrne – If I understand correctly it is referring to 2001-2002 year? In my concern when I made the suggestion for an interim Vice President, what I had in mind is that it appears that the budget crisis will extend beyond the current fiscal year.

Second.

N. Byrne – I speak in favor of a broader framework and it seems this would work in subsequent fiscal years.

R. L. Thomas - The language is not that clear.

H. Smith- I think it is nice to have clarity. I would make this recommendation, even if we didn't have a budget crisis.

Motion to add language of current fiscal year.

S. Wilson - How much did it cost to hire the current development person?

H. Wautischer – The numbers are striking, \$65,000 to search for a development person. I agree that we get what we pay for. I'm concerned that searching for admin personnel is far beyond the cost for faculty. What is the rationale for the discrepancies?

T. Wandling – I call the question.

Vote on amendment - *Failed.*

M. Little – I think that the whole thing works well without the last paragraph.

P. McGough - Since we have the head of development here can we ask for the impact if this was enacted by the President?

J. Meyer - The funds are all restricted. Where do we take the money - from endowments? This is a university position. The foundation is a separate organization that manages the funds.

R. Coleman-Senghor – The development office has always been paid out of the general fund.

P. McGough - Is that true of all CSU's?

J. Meyer - Some take a percentage off the top. If we did have that here it would have a chilling effect on contributions. How can you tell a donor that if you have \$10,000 for equipment, but have to tell the donor you have to give \$10,700 to cover costs, it doesn't go over well. It has a negative impact on giving. Another thing is to avoid the gift tax.

L. Brooks - Jim, do you think this head hunting firm would significantly increase getting a good candidate to replace you?

J. Meyer - I have no experience whatsoever on that.

L. Brooks – I address my same question to the Vice President for Finance.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – It's so hard to say. What a head hunter brings to the table is that they find people who are happy and good at their jobs and they're supposed to go out and seduce them and bring them out of the woodwork.

L. Brooks - Can they guarantee that?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - Well, they can't guarantee it. If you look at the Chronicle for Higher Education you can see how many people are using firms. You see it more and more.

L. Brooks - So we're looking for a person who may be persuaded to leave where they are. Then they could leave here too.

P. McGough – There are four faculty on the search committee. President Armiñana before he came here was a development officer and had never hear of Sonoma. Cal State Northridge recently had search for Vice President for Development and it has failed.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I move to strike entirely the first resolved. It is an institutional change. If we want to take that on, then plan for another discussion. It would strengthen our asking for an interim director. It does not speak to our existent institutional structure. Now the cost is borne by the general fund.

Second.

P. Phillips – This is probably the most important part of the motion. We were shocked by the amount of money. We support development to secure an endowment for its costs. It would not impact this campus and would be beneficial for the campus. I speak against the motion.

V. Garlin - Jim and I have had this conversation. We have an honest difference of opinion about how to approach donors. When they are meeting donors Jim and the President had to make campus more attractive to donors by saying all money would be used for the purpose designated and charging the cost of this activity to the general fund. Ruben wanted that to be a full faith argument. I do not agree. Most donors generally understand that this is a process that is expensive and has to be paid for. Only the most unsophisticated donor would expect this is a costless activity. People we solicit know very well this is costly and I put it to you most understand. I understand the need for that. They need to understand that if it doesn't come out of their contribution it comes out of state resource allocated for educational purposes. I don't really see why Development in the CSU cannot be funded out of funds they raise. Particularly in this particular circumstance where we need every dollar we can lay our hands on for instructional activities on this campus. I do understand Bob's concern.

R. Coleman-Senghor - This makes no sense given our structure. We don't have a development office that has sufficient funds to carry out a search. We need to have a discussion and make a recommendations in the future.

R. Luttmann - We've reached our time certain.

P. Phillips - I move to extend 10 minutes to vote on this topic.

Second.

Vote to extend time - *Approved*

T. Wandling - Bob's position has merit. The question on the second resolve can be resolved today. Once we consider Bob's motion, it is my intention to divide the question.

D. Hammond - I call the question on the amendment.

Second.

Vote on closing debate - *Approved*

Vote on R. Coleman-Senghor's amendment to strike the first of two resolved clauses. - Approve = 10, Opposed = 19, Abstain - 1 - Motion Fails

T. Wandling - I move to divide the question. Let's take the first resolved clause and consider it at another time and vote today on the second clause.

Second

Vote to divide the question - *Approved*

T. Wandling - I move to table first resolution.

Second

No objections.

R. Luttmann - So we strike the words we added before and go back to the original version. Any objection?

W. Poe - I would like to know the status of the contract. What is the cost of if we default on a contract already signed?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - I know the contract has been executed and substantial work has been completed. I don't think it would help.

R. Girling - When was the contract enacted?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - About 6 weeks ago.

P. McGough - It's possible if we renege on our part we may owe money.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - A substantial amount of money.

J. Chen - I'd like to find out the purpose of the resolution. If we ask the President to hire an interim vice president we will lose the momentum of fundraising. The body may want to reconsider at another date charging the funding to development. You cannot decide in the 5 minutes we have. Hiring an interim director is the wrong way to do this. We need someone committed to raising money. Maybe they would raise money for instruction too. The \$65,000 we don't have control of, but the \$35,000 we might not spend. We may just spend \$10,000.

W. Boda - Even if we recommend this to the President he doesn't have to do it, right?

T. Wandling - I call the question.

Vote on second resolve clause - Approve = 10, Opposed = 15, Abstain = 5 - Fails.

R. Luttmann - On to our time certain.

Green Music Center presentation - B. Goldstein, J. Langley, F. Ross - T. C. 4:00

(Presentations were not taken down via minutes, but were provided to the Senate office electronically.)

B. Goldstein - SSU's primary mission is liberal Arts and Sciences. Our task is to strengthen and balance our liberal arts and sciences curriculum. So, just as we are studying the feasibility of improving the teaching of science by remodeling Darwin, we are also talking about improving the quality of our music programs in the venue of the Green Music Center. I want to respond to one of the practical questions raised legitimately about this endeavor: "What is the justification for a world-class arts performance center at a University that enrolls 115 majors?" Answer: Only counting the number of music majors does not provide an accurate picture of student demand for SSI music programs. Many ensembles and survey courses are largely made up of non-majors and community members enrolled through Open University. Matriculated students are only one student constituency. The Green Music Center's "continuous workshop" would be host to a number of summer youth programs. Other students of every age, interest, and experience can participate if desired. Student interest in music programs remains high. This is especially true of African Americans and other groups from varying backgrounds. All

SSU departments stand to gain from the creative use of this facility. Now, I invite Jeff Langely to continue the presentation.

J. Langley - We're going to talk specifics today—about academic program, about how we propose to use this center, about staffing, and about governance and decision-making.

I have one preliminary point to make.

This semester's 40th Anniversary Schulz Library panel discussions have dramatically underscored for me just how much the University and the community surrounding it have changed in these past forty years. Many of you know that better than I do.

The Green Music Center and all the values it's come to stand for have captured the imagination of that community in ways you may not realize. Until you've attended one of its fundraising receptions, or spoken about the Center to local Kiwanas clubs, and tourism boards, and parents with kids, you can't know the excitement and good will that's been generated out there for this project—by people who have the means and the will to make it happen.

It WILL happen.

In no small part because this university's reputation in our community is better than it's ever been—not ONLY because of the good job we're doing with our students, but because increasingly we're seen as the cultural and intellectual hub of the region.

If you find difficulty embracing this idea—that this Center, though all about the University, is BIGGER than the university—then perhaps its most promising opportunity may never connect with you. Yes, the Green Center has education, our students, the quality of our campus climate at the heart of its mission, but just as importantly, it's about connecting with and engaging local citizens outside our walls. By providing a gathering place, a showcase, a forum for displaying our artistic and intellectual wares, it will bring us to them, and will attract them to us—and with them their abiding support.

People out there want in—here. They're curious; they want to participate in what we have and what we do. They want richer lives. They want us to open up, be more accessible. And they will come and are already coming as the Green Music Festival and Lifelong Learning and Greenfarm and the Jack London Lecture Series have all shown us.

These are new programs and they'll all operating on a whisper, a prayer and a shoestring. None of them are sapping resources from the General Fund. They're all self-sustaining or nearly so. They're all understaffed and yes, everybody's exhausted and concerned about that. But they're burgeoning nevertheless.

STAFFING is the issue. It quickly followed by the annual cost of PROGRAMMING. We know one thing for sure: both will be meager at first, particularly given the budgetary realities facing us.

Ideally, staffing would be driven by programming.

So we begin with **how the Center will be used**. I'll include some projections Floyd and I have generated for a realistic first year that is only slightly stepped up from what is already taking

place. Though we don't claim to have all the answers, or the prescience to predict every detail of how this will go, we have done our research. We know a lot about the territory we're entering.

- The Green Music Center will be used as a rehearsal and performance venue for SSUs music and dance ensembles. We project 30 free student concerts, and 24 paid concerts the first year. Plus daily to weekly rehearsals to prepare for all of these. This constitutes a large part of Music's instructional program and these uses alone could keep the Recital Hall used to near capacity—and the big hall at least partially utilized—from day one during the regular academic year.
- The halls will be used for Performing Arts faculty and guest artist concerts and performances. We project 27 such events the first year.
- The big hall will be used for rehearsals and concerts of the Santa Rosa Symphony, for which the Center will serve as artistic home. The Symphony will rehearse and perform 7-8 annual sets of 3-4 concerts each—one set per month (including rehearsals) from October thru May. The Symphony's regular season will also include a few special concerts and chamber music concerts. Plus the Symphony's Youth Music Academy's concerts. We project that rehearsals and performances for these events will require 80 annual days of use, mostly in the big hall.
- Both halls can be used for play, prose and poetry readings by the Departments of Theatre Arts, English, Hutchins, California Studies, and other departments of the School of Arts and Humanities. And for lectures, panels, gatherings, conferences and special presentations by students, faculty and staff from all departments and programs on campus wishing to use the facility. We modestly project 38 events in these categories, not including summer conferences, Summer Orientation, YRO and other activities yet to be identified.
- For summer concerts and events of the Green Music Festival, which currently include 2 symphony events, one jazz event, a chamber music weekend, a Youth Festival Weekend, plus new events for other campus venues such as the Art Gallery. Still in its infancy, this current level of Festival programming will utilize 13 days at the Center.
- For 2003, the Festival is planning sponsorship of a 2-week intensive choral workshop with Chanticleer, its registered participants residing in our residence halls. There have also been discussions with the Berkshire Choral Festival that has proposed using SSU as a residential site for two week-long choral workshops that would enroll 250 adults from throughout the country, each workshop culminating in a performance in the main hall. If staffing can permit these two choral workshops to occur, they alone would require nearly full use of the Center for a total of 4 weeks in the summer.
- The Center will be used for Greenfarm programs—in their early incarnation, 7 not-for-credit arts programs and educational instruction for youth and 3-day workshops for teachers. Ives Hall is currently being used to near capacity to house these programs which run from late June through July. When possible, these programs would move to the Center.
- It will be used for concerts and events presented by Associated Students. We project 12 such events for a first year of operation.

- For rentals by local groups and performance ensembles, a key source of revenue. We project 25 rentals of the main 1,400 seat hall the first year, and 20 rentals of the Recital Hall.
- Both halls will be used for professional recordings by musical artists wishing to rent the facility for this purpose. Though a considerable potential source of revenue, we have not yet factored this into a first-year plan.
- When funds become available primarily through private fundraising, a year-round presenting season of guest artist/performers and writers/thinkers/lecturers will be offered. For a first year, we project a modest 8 concerts and 18 lectures, most of these probably not big names.
- All of the above is subject to the challenges of scheduling. Always, we'll need to balance our core mission of education with the necessity to remain financially solvent and at the same time be fair and equitable to all constituencies.

Is there a real demonstrated need for this Music Center? Is that need sufficient to utilize the facility at or near full capacity?

Yes to both questions—the Recital Hall could be used now at or near full capacity, staffing permitting. The Large Hall would probably experience moderate use in the early years until such time as programming funds permit an expanded and varied presenting season of guests artists and lecturers.

- Unlike the Person Theatre, this facility will allow for a relatively rapid turnover and a high volume of usage—IF technical staffing permits. Venue preparation will mostly involve stage reconfiguration, audio setup, and the movement of chairs, music stands and instruments.
- Performing Arts has for years had a serious shortage of rehearsal space for its ensembles and productions, which has, among other things, limited the use of the Person Theatre by non-Performing Arts constituencies. Music ensembles currently utilizing Ives Concert Hall (Room 119) would move to the GMC Recital Hall, thereby freeing up 119 for a much-needed rehearsal space for Theatre Arts.
- Even with only a very modest presenting season of guest artists and lecturers in the early years, given the current needs of the University (all constituencies), the Santa Rosa Symphony, the Green Music Festival, rentals and the many youth programs, summer residencies and conferences anticipated, there is no doubt that the Center's facilities would experience heavy use from the outset. With its current performances ensembles, residencies and youth programs, the Performing Arts could by themselves make near to full year-round use of the Recital Hall now. It is expected that the Large Hall will have some dark nights in the early years, but this will change as programming funds become available and the demand for rentals and general campus usage increases—again, adequate staffing permitting.

Floyd Ross will now speak about staffing needs to support such a first-year plan.

F. Ross - The CPA staff performs heroically year after year in support of the instructional programs in performing arts. They also support many other campus department activities and programs that use our venues. They historically work an enormous number of

overtime hours in order to support the instructional programs during the academic year. But, even they have limits. They cannot take on all support functions associated with the addition of the Music Center. We have made projections of what we believe the first season with the Music Center might look like and we have begun to identify those areas where we will need to augment the CPA staff. Larry has already addressed these areas of support and how they might be funded and I would refer you to his comments. I would like to expand a bit more on some of what V.P Schlereth has already said.

- Where feasible and practical, synergies have been identified for existing CPA support staff in areas of piano maintenance and tuning, classroom accompanist, and promotions. However, we have an immediate need for backfill for Floyd Ross to handle those day to day details that he cannot cover any longer yet are necessary to support the instructional programs in Music and Theatre Arts. In addition, the current CPA technical support staff who build scenery and props, handle theatrical lighting for productions, and maintain the systems in Person Theatre and our other theatre related venues cannot take on an additional venue without additional help. Finally, our ticketing and box office structures can no longer provide the level of support and service required of our existing programs which use multiple venues simultaneously, both on campus and off campus.
- We have begun to identify areas of responsibility which must be handled by new positions in order to support not only the existing instructional programs but also the additional demands made by other users of our venues from on campus as well as off-campus and as we anticipate opening of the Music Center.
- The CPA currently manages five venues spread between three buildings around the campus. With the Music Center we will add three additional venues. We use multiple venues simultaneously and must staff the venues and activities accordingly. That will be the case with the Music Center as well.
- It has been the tradition with the CPA staff that we all must wear multiple hats in order to cover all of the needs of our programs. This will be true of new positions as well. Existing and new staff members will support ALL Performing Arts and none-Performing Arts activities in ALL of our venues, including the Music Center.

- For example, Floyd's backfill person would be the following position with these duties and areas of responsibility:

Production Manager

- Production Coordination
- House Management
- Patron and Artist Services
- Volunteer Coordination
- Facility Scheduling

Additionally, the following positions and responsibilities would be needed:

Ticking Services Manager

- Single ticket sales
- Web sales
- Group sales
- Subscription sales
- Systems administrator

Instructional Support Services Manager

Sound/audio/PA/video support

Lighting support

Systems maintenance & operation

Theatrical/acoustic systems

Stage management

Each of these areas of the operation will need to be augmented by support staff positions as necessary and financially feasible as well as by student employees, administrative interns, and volunteers.

Based upon our projections for programming, we believe this outline represents a bare bones plan for support of existing instructional programs in performing arts as well as what is needed to provide the desired support for ALL activities held in our existing and projected venues.

I am estimating that these new costs represent between \$400,000 and \$500,000, maybe more, maybe less, depending upon the actual instructional and programmatic uses generated by the academic programs of the campus. Once again, Larry has already outlined in his presentation how these costs might be covered from a variety of sources. As an example, we could project the following possible revenue streams:

Facility Use Fee	\$185,000
SRS Technical Support Fee	\$ 40,000
Administrative Services Fee	\$ 45,000
Facility Rental Fees	\$125,000
Ticket Transaction Fee	<u>\$ 50,000</u>
	\$445,000

These figures do not include ticket revenue that would be used for direct programming costs for artists and production expense.

J. Langley How are we funding existing Green Center programs? How will we fund new programs?

- Several Music Center programmatic pillars are already in place, all funded entirely by outright gifts and donations, endowments, public and private grants, and corporate and private sponsorships and underwriting of concert and lecture series and events—and by contributions by existing programs operated and governed completely independent of the University—as is the case of the Santa Rosa Symphony and some of the Greenfarm-affiliated programs.

—Greenfarm, a consortium of arts education programs in the North Bay, opened its inaugural season this past summer with five programs (2 to 6 weeks each) for youth and 2-3 workshops for children and public school teachers. The season culminated in a three-day weekend festival of youth performances. Eventually, Greenfarm will foster and facilitate year-round educational offerings for learners of all ages, often as non-credit supplements to the concert experience (open rehearsals, master classes, pre-concert lectures, etc.). Greenfarm has been awarded a \$100,000 endowment from the Hearst Foundation. One of its programs, Summer Arts for Youth, was awarded a \$25,000 grant from the De Meo Foundation.

—The **Green Music Festival** just completed its second summer of concerts and events which last year included two symphony concerts under the stars and a jazz event. Plans for summer 2002 will build on this with a chamber music weekend in late July. The Festival was awarded a \$15,000 grant from the Sonoma County Community Foundation that will be used to develop its programming and broaden its audience base.

—In addition to its orchestra and chamber series, The **Santa Rosa Symphony** boasts a sizeable youth Music Academy which includes four youth orchestras, a wind ensemble and a jazz band. All of these ensembles will be resident at the Green Center. The Santa Rosa Symphony is and will continue to be governed, funded and managed completely independent of the University.

- New programs and, ultimately, a varied presenting season of guest artists and lecturers will be funded by ticket revenues (normally covers 60% of costs); private contributions; endowments established for specific programming purposes; Center, Festival or program sponsors; corporate and private underwriting of series and single events; private and government foundation grants; and alliances with other presenters that will allow for discounted artist fees through multiple bookings.
- As regards a presenting season: many believe that our core mission might best be served by programming that contracts emerging regional artists and writers/thinkers with an interest in teaching and interacting with students and audiences, that these guest artists and lecturers might contribute more to the Center (short-term *and* long-term) than a prestigious roster of famous names and celebrities—and for a lot less money.

Do we expect the Music Department to grow appreciably as a result of the Center's construction and will incremental allocations accrue to it?

- The Music Center grew out of a fundamental need for a quality rehearsal and performance venue for music, most particularly choral music. Evert B. Person Theatre is a proscenium theatre intended for dance, drama and opera productions; its acoustics are not appropriate for orchestral, chamber or choral music. Even at their current size, there is a serious shortage of available rehearsal space for SSU's drama and music programs. Moreover, significant renovation is seriously needed throughout much of Ives Hall.
- Some enrollment growth is likely; the Music Department wants to grow and flourish as much as other departments do. We're addressing recruitment efforts like never before, and developing our performance ensembles because we understand perception is influenced by what people hear and see when they attend a concert (play or dance recital). But, realistically, growth will come gradually over a period of years. New buildings do not in and of themselves attract students; quality programs and faculty do. Programs and curriculum take time to develop.
- The growth of *any* department has to be considered within the context of an academic plan for the entire campus, as determined by the Provost after appropriate consultation with various established academic committees. Music is willing to play by the same rules as everybody else.
- Additional allocations may or may not be forthcoming. If increased enrollments justify such allocations, and if the President, the Provost, the Academic Planning Committee, and the Vice-President's Budget Advisory Committee decide it is in the best interest of the University to grant them, the Music Department hopes it will have every opportunity to grow and prosper.

What is the justification for a world-class arts performance center at a University that enrolls only 115 music majors?

- Tallying the number of music majors does not provide an accurate picture of student demand for SSU music programs. Many music ensembles (not to mention survey classes) are largely made up of non-majors (as high as 50%) and community members enrolled through Open University. The number of majors has held steady (around 115) for the past fifteen years. Though these numbers are not what they were 25 years ago (here or anywhere else), student interest in the arts remains high. This is particularly true for African American and other minority students.
- Matriculated SSU students are but one student constituency that will make use of this Center. For some time, SSU has been host to a number of summer youth programs, now organized under the banner of Greenfarm. Other students of every age, interest, level of experience, and range of ambition will use the Green Center to cultivate those diverse interests.
- The Green Music Center's "continuous workshop" will serve as a bustling cultural hub for lifelong learners of every definition from Sonoma County, the North Bay region and beyond.
- Numbers of majors should not be the sole criteria for measuring a program's success. SSU's jazz program, small relative to others like it, has consistently won first prize in Bay Area jazz festivals for years now.
- All departments and programs of Sonoma State University stand to gain from the creative use of this facility for public forums, gatherings and presentations of various kinds, and from the increased visibility the Center will bring to all academic disciplines of the University. We're limited only by our imaginations.

How will programming decisions be made?

Both the Green Music Center and the Green Music Festival have an Executive Director and an Artistic Director. The four directors report to the President through the Provost and VP for Administration and Finance, and will have ultimate programming decision-making authority GUIDED BY:

- 1) The Center's and Festival's missions and a core set of values:
 - Educationally focused— serving a broad constituency of SSU students and faculty, but extending beyond the campus to Sonoma County and the North Bay region.
 - Committed to a multidisciplinary approach to the presentation and exploration of music, art and ideas, one emphasizing a quality, up-close, interactive experience. Many believe that lesser known emerging artists and thinkers might provide a more suitable programming niche and would contribute more to our educational vision than would prestigious rosters of big name performers and celebrities.
 - AIM HIGH—i.e. present/explore work and ideas of worth, importance and quality.
 - REACH WIDE— embrace the broadest definition of quality; i.e. be inclusive, embrace diverse traditions, cultures, and tastes.
—audience driven/friendly;

- not solely a training ground for prodigies;
- not only about classical music;
- honor the past, look to the future.

- Rooted in a local, regional, and *western* perspective.

- 2) A very real pressure to be a solvent financial operation.
- 3) One or more programming advisory boards or committees.

Currently a sub-committee appointed by Structures and Functions is exploring the feasibility of a University-wide lecture series on the campus (or some consortium of independent series) and is devising a plan for how such a forum might best be organized and sustained, if deemed feasible at all. Among the questions being considered: could there be any advantages to integrated marketing and/or fundraising efforts, or to coordinated scheduling that seeks to avoid conflicts with competing events, either on or off campus? Readings, lectures and symposiums will be an important part of Green Center programming.

A Greenfarm Advisory Board made up of SSU Performing and Visual Arts faculty and staff, Santa Rosa Symphony board and staff, Festival staff, and recognized arts educators from the local community has been appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Provost. This Advisory Board will develop supplemental arts education programming at the Green Music Center—programming primarily intended for non-matriculated students (youth, teachers, lifelong learners, concert audiences, summer program residents, etc.). The Greenfarm Board will make periodic reports to the Academic Senate on its programs and activities and will seek the Senate’s advice and input. (For-credit programs will be administered by the Departments of Performing Arts and/or Extended Education observing official protocols for curriculum approval and reporting.)

The need for one or more programming advisory committees has been acknowledged and discussed. Everyone agrees that SSU faculty, students and staff should be represented on whatever advisory structures are ultimately put in place.

The Green Center will be an elaborate mix of programming activity organized around a structure still in its early stages of formation. Different areas and types of programming will serve different constituencies and will consist of performing artists, visual artists, and scholars/speakers/lecturers in a whole host of disciplines, each requiring a different expertise in the advise it seeks. There will be student programming, community programming and professional guest artist programming. There will be programs for our matriculated students and there will be programs—both for-credit and not-for-credit—for non-matriculated students: pre-college youth, teachers, lifelong learners of all ages. Though part of the University, the Green Music Festival has its own presenting season, its own artistic director, its own sponsors and donor base, its own financial challenges and constraints—and the makeup of its advisory structure will have to reflect these unique needs and differences. Given their need for considerable outside support through fundraising and ever-present pressures for box office revenues, many of the above will require fundraising and marketing expertise in addition to programming.

It is unanimously agreed that appropriate advisory structures must and will be established as the needs present themselves, and as time allows for these vitally important pieces of the Center’s governance to be formed and put into operation.

Until such time as these advisory structures are put into place, and to advise the Provost on their formation, Bernie is recommending the immediate appointment of a special Ad Hoc Blue Ribbon Committee on the Green Music Center. Made up of students, faculty and staff, this committee will provide significant input on a wide range of matters relating to the Center's academic programs and activities.

(This handout was passed out to the Body.)

GREEN MUSIC CENTER PROGRAMMING PROJECTIONS **First Season Projection of Events & Activities**

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Number of</u>	<u>Est. attendance</u>	<u>per event</u>	<u>Extension</u>
	<u>Academic Year</u>	<u>events</u>		
Faculty Jazz Concerts	3	400	1,200	
Faculty Chamber Music Concerts	8	350	2,800	
Faculty Vocal Recitals	2	350	700	
Presenting Season Guest Artists w/workshops	8	1,200	9,600	
Bach Choir Concerts	6	800	4,800	
University Chorus Concerts	4	800	3,200	
Chamber Singers Concerts	4	250	1,000	
Faculty Concerts (various)	6	300	1,800	
Dance Concerts	3	400	1,200	
Early Music Concerts	4	250	1,000	
CPA Special Events	3	700	2,100	
Free CPA Concerts (ensemble & student concerts)	30	150	4,500	
University-wide Lectures	18	850	15,300	
Associated Student Productions Concerts	12	1,000	12,000	
University-wide Concerts (ICC, BSU, Depts.)	8	850	6,800	
University-wide Events (conferences, meetings)	12	1,000	12,000	
Rentals of Concert Hall	25	1,200	30,000	
Rentals of Recital Hall	20	300	6,000	
	176	116,000		

Music classes (day and evening) currently scheduled in Ives 119 will be moved to the Green Music Center and will use both the Concert Hall and Recital Hall for direct instruction.

<u>Santa Rosa Symphony Regular Season</u>				
Subscription Program Sets (8)	32	1,400	44,800	
40 days of rehearsal during season	40			
Special Concerts (non-subscription)	4	1,200	4,800	
	76		49,600	
SRS Music Academy Concerts	4	500	2,000	
	4		2,000	
<u>Summer Season</u>				
Festival on the Green				
Independence Day on the Green	1	7,500	7,500	
Midsummer Night on the Green	1	5,500	5,500	
Jazz on the Green	1	3,500	3,500	
Chamber Music at the Green	2	500	1,000	
Greenfarm Events	8	300	2,400	
	13		19,900	

Residency Workshop Programs:

Chanticleer Choral Workshop, 40 participants for two weeks, two concerts in Concert Hall.

Berkshire Choral Festival, 250 participants in each of two week-long sessions with culminating concert each weekend in Concert Hall.

Other Activities

Summer Conferences, Summer Orientation, YRO activities as well as other activities yet to be identified could be scheduled into the Music Center as requests are made.

In addition to scheduled classes and performances, there will be a full compliment of rehearsals, technical set-up and change-over associated with these performances and all activities presented in the Center which will be incorporated into the overall use of facilities schedule.

B. Goldstein - It is my desire to engage the Senate in discussions that can lead to the development of high quality academic programs in the venue of the Green Music Center. Until such time as the advisory structures (described by Jeff Langely above) are put in place, I am recommending the immediate formation of a special Ad Hoc Blue Ribbon Committee on the Green Music Center. Structure and Functions will be asked to appoint the faculty members. We will request that the AS nominate a student and the Alumni recommend a member of the Alumni. Details as to membership are to be worked out later. The Committee will be advisory to me on a wide range of matters relating to the Center's academic programs and activities. It will operate using an approach similar to the Faculty Housing Committee as it works with Larry Schlereth.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for the opportunity to address the Senate.

R. Luttmann - The floor is now open for questions for the presenters.

P. Phillips - Thank you for your presentation. It has been a practice on campus for Person Theatre and Warren that on-campus groups can use the facility for free, except for tech support. For the new Cooperage, however, on-campus group have to put out \$450 dollars. I see in here fundraising \$300,000 in use fees and rental fees. I hope and encourage that you build in to both the Concert Hall and Recital Hall for on-campus groups to them without a use fee. If that would be possible I really hope we could do that. It would make it much more usable by the broader campus community.

J. Langley - I support that.

V. Garlin - A person would have to have a heart of stone not to be moved by your presentation, Floyd and Jeff, and I thank you both. I thank Bernie also for coming. What's of interest to me is that the scope and scale of this project is unprecedented. In the history of this institution we have never been asked to participate in a project of this magnitude. The more you talk the more enormous it is in relation to the size of our institution becomes apparent to me. Art mitigates the suffering that is the human condition. We need to support it. If we don't no one is going to. A project of this size has an enormous amount of risk and uncertainty. It's merit is not what is at issue here. Everyone around table recognizes the merit. What is at issue is whether given the nature of our institution and its size and its source of funds, can it at this particular time bare the risk and uncertainty and where can we find ways to reduce or mitigate those uncertainties that doesn't threaten the rest of the programs, programs which are central and core to the institutional mission. We can't have high SFRs and a successful music center. We only have three sources of revenues - state money, tickets and income from endowments. Person Theatre has an endowment which underwrites potential losses. At the present time the general fund remains the underwriter of this project. What this means is the general

fund will have to bare the cost, the losses, should they occur. Larry said he would not permit losses. My knowledge of business says you can say you won't permit it but if you have losses they have to be met. I would like to know how the inevitable risk and uncertainty and operational losses are going to be met without endangering the general fund. If I can be reassured that other programs are not being mortgaged I would feel much better about the Green Music Center and sign on to the vision. The vision is not what's at issue here.

J. Langley - Unfortunately it is not a risk free world. The arts programs that we do now are all doing just fine and they are doing just fine with money from the outside. The Green Music festival - all of the money paid for programming and mounting have been raised by private sponsor contributions and ticket revenues. Typically the benchmark is 60% of source funds is from ticket revenues, so we've got 40% to make up. We are doing pretty well. Green Farm received a \$25,000 grant from the De Meo Foundation and the Green Farm has an endowment from the Hearst Foundation and a number of people have contributed to little things like the barbecue. The Arts do that kind of thing all the time. Private contributions and endowments, we need to develop. It is going to take time to do that. I mentioned sponsors, underwriters. The symphony does this all the time. Santa Rosa Symphony is not in the red. Through contributions, underwriting and grants they are doing just fine. We are going to have the same challenge. Other institutions are succeeding. San Francisco Symphony as well is not doing bad. We are ok at the scale we're operating at right now.

V. Garlin - That's not the scale you're talking about.

J. Langley - It's what I'm talking about for the first year. We're counting on the Santa Rosa Symphony and rentals.

F. Ross - The 140 I mentioned is just performing arts events. This list includes other than performing arts such as if Peter Phillips does his Project Censored event in there. Academic instruction is included in this list of 176. It represents what comes from instructional programs.

J. Langley - Money for these events is already accounted for. Growing beyond here, this is the challenge, even if we don't venture out - we can make the same good use of the facility with what we've got. I think we've got a jewel here that will serve us. A lot of people with means will see to it beyond what we have here. That's the fundraising category.

W. Boda - Do you see competition for this? I found out last week about the Copia Center in Napa. It's funded by the France Ford Coppola Foundation.

J. Langley - That's not competition. It is going to make the whole Sonoma region an arts destination.

W. Boda - But we're drawing funds from very small area. They are doing big fundraising. You can see it at their website. www.copia.org

J. Langley - I believe the rest of the world sees this as northern California wine country. I see the Luther Burbank Center partnering. The more arts we have happening, the more we will be an arts destination.

S. Wilson - I commend you on your tremendous amount of community support. Do these performances include gamelon concerts?

J. Langley - It will sound great in there.

S. Miller - I value your presentation as well your commitment and I'm dazzled and I want to be dazzled, but I wonder how much of the dazzlement is related not to being dazzled but by conditions on campus. We are a very poorly funded state university and I'm trying to get my brain around SSU as it is and the gem as we now envision it. It must be part of the University to succeed. I try to image how the whole institution will work. In the research you've done, are there similar institutions that you've been to where there is a facility or relationship with a facility like this and how does it work and how can it be made to work so that the jewel is not dragged down to be more mediocre than we want it to be and the university does not suffer in the contract.

F. Ross - I have gone to a number of other venues from Carnegie Hall to Universities. I've been to SLO and Davis is building a new performing arts center. For example, SLO's performing arts is very different from what we are doing here. It's called a road house. It is on the circuit between Los Angeles and San Francisco for Broadway shows and concerts. They've built a multi use hall, we're building a concert hall. By their admission they are not integrated in to the academic program. We will be using ours for instruction. They have an enormous faculty, and a large campus, but there they basically brought their performing arts department under one very large roof. It's different, it's different at any institution. Williams College in New Hampshire has a performing arts center more like Person Theatre. I haven't yet seen anything like what we're doing. I love the idea that we are different. I'm not sure there is anything else quite like this. What enriches this project so much more is that we are a university and we are blessed to have the Santa Rosa Symphony in residency here, where our students can go and sit and listen to a rehearsal. I do think that we have come together on our campus and this makes us unique.

J. Langley - The idea of relationship with the facility. That 's such a good question. Before I came here I was at a theme park. That was all about customer service and making sure the place was clean. I was also going to talk about the relationship with environment and the property. One thing that excites me the most is this is going to put our creek center stage. I'm so impressed by the landscape designer, how he's made the commencement lawn center stage. How we treat our visitors and provide a good food experience will be the major challenge.

S. Moulton - An overwhelming presentation. I had hoped to hear more about curriculum and I'm not sure where curriculum was in all of that. I'd like to see an outline of the existing program and where it's going relative to courses in the majors. A quick survey of the class size summary shows music has been in slow decline in the last few years. Some kind of report that addresses curriculum and enrollment aspect of the project.

J. Langley - That's the very thing we are thinking about.

R. Coleman-Senghor - How are you going to use the curricula to achieve outreach? It was a very innovative move to bring gospel music here. Why is it we can't get any kind of business structure? In performing arts you can run a show. If it is a success you extend the show and if not you close the show. You're stepping outside the academic models. What is acceptable risk? Do we have a mechanism to close off risk when it reaches a certain point?

R. Girling - That Person Theatre is still not adequately staffed raises a red flag. How will that be addressed? On your statement you have attendance for ninety-six events with a thousand or more people. The only event I've been to that had more than a thousand people is graduation.

F. Ross - Are you counting seventy-six symphony performances? They are coming here already sold out. We will be collecting something from those tickets. They are looking at adding a fourth concert to each set. The Green Music Center seems to have driven up ticket sales.

H. Wautischer - Are there any plans for a nationwide search for the Executive Director?

F. Ross - I hope we will wait until I retire.

J. Langley - A really important part of the process, the design process, basically through that process Floyd has personally guided all of us through every step of this project. He's been extraordinarily detailed using his extension experience through all his years here. We are entering a crucial new stage, the construction phase, and Floyd's work there will be critical. Floyd will help us transition between the designing and the construction. His work has been stellar in this area to this point. That is the main reason why Floyd is the Executive Director.

R. Luttmann - Thank you for coming.

REPORTS - no reports

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)
Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs - (B. Goldstein)
Vice President/Admin. and Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)
President of the Associated Students - (R. Heng)
Chair-Elect of the Senate - (N. Byrne)
Statewide Senators - (S. McKillop, P. McGough)
Chairs, Standing Committee - (Moulton, Warmoth, Poe, Little)

R. Luttmann - I want to remind you all that convocation is on January 23, the faculty retreat meets on January 24, and classes begin January 28th. Our next meeting is February 7th, 2002.

Items from the Floor - none

Good of the Order - none

Adjournment 5:40pm

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom