

Senate Executive Committee Minutes

4/15/04

3:00 – 5:00 Sue Jameson Room

Present: Catherine Nelson, Noel Byrne, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Robert McNamara, Brigitte Lahme, Melanie Dreisbach, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Robert Coleman-Senghor

Absent: Ruben Armiñana, Eduardo Ochoa, Phil McGough

Guest: Tim Wandling

Approval of the Agenda - #4 was deleted from the agenda as the presenter was absent. *Approved.*

Minutes of 3/11/04 - *Approved.*

Chair's report

C. Nelson reported that on the May 6th meeting of the Senate the Vice Mayor of Cotati will be a guest. She informed the body that R. Luttmann had resigned from the Senate and relayed that he resigned in a short email to both her and M. Dreisbach. There was some procedural discussion about holding an election for his position. Holding an election was referred to Structure and Functions. She reported that the Associated Students Senate passed a resolution opposing Governor Schwarzenegger's budget cuts to higher education. Among other things the resolution asks the Governor to make education a priority and that eliminating state support threatens California's Master Plan for Education by diminishing accessibility, affordability and quality of higher education. Dean Leeder in the School of Social Sciences asked her to announce the New Student Convocation for Fall semester will be on Tuesday, August 24th from 11-12, faculty meet at the loading dock downstairs at 10:45 and walk over to plaza at the Information Center, have a ceremony and pizza and drinks afterwards. She noted that the minutes are in a more abbreviated format. Discussion items are not always identified by who says them. This is for two reasons. One to conform more closely with Robert's Rules of Order and secondly, to help with ergonomic issues that affect Laurel when she does so much typing of minutes. She asked for comments on the minutes. She asked that sometimes it will be important to note who said what. The body agreed to the abbreviated format. An email has gone out to Chair's of Standing committees with information about assigned time for next years Chairs. She noted the plans so far for a party on April 24th for the Executive Committee. There was a meeting in Sacramento on April 1st for Senate Chairs. Her full report will be given to the Senate. The two major issues discussed were the transfer pattern and excess units. David Spence, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs made an interesting comment on reassigned time. He was asked specifically if the Chancellor had ordered 35% or 40% in state supported reassigned time for faculty. Spence said there was not formal directive to that affect, but he would be disappointed if assigned time when up in these budget times.

Strategic Planning Draft from Academic Affairs – C. Nelson

C. Nelson said that this was in the packet as we promised to get it to the Senate as soon as it was done. A. Warmoth and R. Coleman-Senghor have both recommended that this be formally referred to the standing committees for comment and review before it goes to the Senate. She noted the community meetings that have been set up for campus feedback on the work so far - Tuesday, April 27th 11:40-1:00 in Darwin 2 and Friday, April 30th from 1:30-3:00 in Stevenson 1002.

Staggered Membership Terms on APC and EPC – M. Dreisbach

APC and EPC asked Structure and Functions to look at staggered terms. Structure and Functions came back with a unanimous plan to be put before the Executive Committee for inclusion on the Senate's consent calendar. She discussed the specifics of the committees and presented the recommended staggering. **Approved for the Senate's consent calendar.**

APC report

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that APC has looked at the General Education Pathway and is making a positive recommendation that the Senate engage in and adopt the Pathway resolution. APC's document will go to EPC first. APC looked at the 120 unit limitation and this will have an enormous impact on campus especially with respect to the School of Education. He noted that an arbitrator recently ruled that faculty teaching summer school will have to be paid at the rate of their regular salaries. This will have a tremendous impact on Extended Education and more importantly a retreat from teaching summer courses and the impact that will have on the curriculum. It is worth taking a careful look at what that impact would be. They have also been discussing the Strategic Plan and the Long Range Plan and the place of disciplines in the Strategic Plan statement. Some members feel it does not particularly highlight the role of disciplines with the consequence that it will have a lot to say about being a liberal arts campus and the relationship between disciplines and inter-disciplinarity on campus.

C. Nelson noted a side amendment between CFA and CSU regarding summer sessions that will let this summer session go forward as usual. 2005 is questionable. The consequences are not clear on this campus other than that the back pay for the last three years would come out of the School of Extended Education and that may have impact on the money Extended Ed gives back to departments for courses that are taught by faculty in different departments. There is also a question whether faculty will have to be paid the state rate if the campus does not accept YRO money.

EPC report

E. McDonald reported back on the withdrawal policy question the Executive committee referred and in general faculty engagement in enrollment policy changes. EPC drafted two resolutions which are undergoing radical changes. Katharyn Crabbe will be at their next meeting to discuss the issues. They also looked at the Emergency General Education Core Substitute policy that was put forward by Bill

Babula. The resolution said all Schools should put forward proposals to the GE subcommittee a package of all GE substitutions in order to spread FTE issues out over a broader range. This came from the English department having 3 courses in the C2 requirement that because of the reduced number of faculty next year they wouldn't be able to handle the student load, so this would give students more choice. EPC did not approve the proposal, but did approve the specific courses for substitutions the School of Arts and Humanities had proposed to solve that problem. In general, the committee thought the proposal was too broad.

It was asked if anyone had spoken to K. Crabbe about student withdrawals showing up in Peoplesoft for faculty. E. McDonald said EPC was working on it.

FSAC report

E. Stanny reported that they reviewed the Conflict of Interest Policy brought by Tony Apolloni and Eileen Warren. They are still working on the Course Outline Policy.

SAC report

B. Lahme reported that SAC continues to look at the Advising issues. They had asked the Provost to communicate their concerns to the Deans and the Deans to Department Chairs and they are now getting those reports back. They have heard from three Schools. The Associated Students have been meeting with the Senators in each School and they have come up with issues that they see in their Schools. We will pull all of that together and make recommendations. Some good things have happened. K. Crabbe has been sending out emails to all the students reminding them of advising. The Advising Center is having workshops. The second issue was telling us that recently the freshman class is full. Enough students have turned in their enrollment deposit. The test GPA index used to be 2900 and now it is 3400 for students coming to SSU. One concern SAC has is about the make up of the freshman class next semester for diversity. They will ask Gustavo Flores to come report on that. They also are looking at the withdrawal issue. In the schedule of classes the W drop date now for next semester is September 21st. After that you need a compelling reason and it defines compelling and non-compelling reasons. SAC is wondering who made that change. The University Standards subcommittee is looking at it too. There is some reason to believe that it might be related to a Title V change.

Proposal regarding the word "consultation" in Senate documents – T. Wandling

T. Wandling brought to the committee a resolution to add "d) fiscal policies related to the first three areas broadly and liberally defined" to the Senate's constitution section defining the purpose of the Senate. He stated he was more interested in the concept than the language. This language mirrors language in HEERA. He noted there has been a lot of contention over the phrase consultation and parameters of consultation on the campus. He thought the phrase "joint decision making" is a powerful phrase to introduce into certain documents. He understood that the ultimate fiscal authority rests with the President. But there is room to distinguish then between consultation and joint decision making. For example, we are consulted

at the PBAC, etc, but there might be a another way for the Senate to indicated that they are doing a joint strategic project. With this language, it might improve the buy-in at the faculty level for some of the present strategic initiatives. He is not in favor of micro-managing the budget. He noted that at the Senate the President has said that the budget is not the purview of the Senate. Yet we all know the intimate interactions between budget and curricular matters. He recommended the body encourage strategic thinking. He thought that the Senate has every right to do that and needs that articulated in the Senate's constitution. He supported being able to advocate specifically on curricular matters, such as for a department or School.

C. Nelson said there are three issues here. The word consultation in the Constitution and relevant policies be replaced with "joint decision making and consultation." Add "d) fiscal policies related to the first three areas broadly and liberally defined" to the Constitution Article I, Section II. The third proposal is for Structure and Functions to look at the language in the Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters policy that specifically prohibits faculty members from acting as representatives of their Schools or departments. C. Nelson reviewed the procedures to change the Constitution.

Discussion Points:

It was moved that the item be referred to Structure and Functions. Second.

- It was suggested that the first two proposals be sent to the Senate so that they can be considered for a Fall Constitutional vote. The speaker did not support the motion to refer.
- The Chair-Elect noted that Structure and Functions is already looking at the Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters policy and doubted it would come to the Senate this semester.
- The Vice-President of Administration and Finance noted that substantial legal interpretations need to be made because it is being tied back to a particular piece of legislation that related to human resource matters and fiscal policies related thereto. It would be important to understand the legislative intent.
- The proposer of the Constitutional amendments stated that he thought that it would be a stronger document if it had the support of the President.
- There was discussion about the appropriate interpretation of HEERA in this context.
- It was noted that the language proposed was for the Senate's Constitution and about what language is appropriate for that body and what it expects consultation to be.
- It was clarified that the President approves the Senate Constitution and any amendments.

- The proposer said his original suggestion was to send it to Structure and Functions and encouraged everyone to read HEERA as an entrée into the discussion about involving us more strategically in fiscal matters on this campus.
- There was a question whether Structure and Functions could deal with the Constitutional questions this Spring.
- The Chair of Structure and Functions said preparing a Constitutional ballot would not take long. Working with the President's office to come to a greater understanding and agreement - that's more involved. She and the Chair have discussed this issue with the President and she didn't see that it would be signed by the President if put through now. It needs research. If HEERA is viewed strictly as employee relations that will detract from our rationale. She argued it would be advisable for the faculty to come to an understanding about it and if we are in agreement with it, have meetings with the President as she didn't think he would jump right on board with this.
- It was suggested to work on the blue paper policy – Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters – first.
- Structure and Functions is working on that policy and have thought there might be a preamble in it defining consultation.

The motion was amended to include the T. Wandling's suggestions for the policy on Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters for Structure and Functions consideration. No objection.

Vote on Proposal regarding the word "consultation" in Senate documents referred to Structure and Functions - approved.

Endowed Chair Policy – R. Coleman-Senghor

R. Coleman-Senghor said that monies have come to the university from the Graton Ranchero Indians of \$1.5 million for an endowed chair in Native American Studies. It will be housed in the Humanities department. There is a search committee going, a POA written, but there is no policy for endowed chairs on this campus. As he looked around other universities he found policies at many other CSUs. He listed the issues that the policies addressed: conditions under which an endowed chair would be established, issues of the appointment, periods when the chair would be occupied, annual reporting of the chair, discontinuation of the chair, support for the chair, etc. He saw a discrepancy between the POA and the amount of money that could be generated. His figures showed that if we get 5% of \$2 million annually that give us \$100,000. If the chair is a senior chair, the salary would have to be between \$83,000 and \$100,000. We only have \$1.5 million. We don't have enough money to pay for the position out of the endowment. Where does the money come from? The only other source he knows is the general fund. He wants to know if we have a policy that is going to guard against endowed chairs drawing on general funds to support them. He argued that general funds should not be used to support endowed

chairs. The money issue alerted him to the need for the policy. He had models from other institutions.

It was suggested that the idea for an endowed chair policy be referred to FSAC.

The Chair suggested that perhaps the School of Arts and Humanities and the Provost could make an agreement for this particular search. She agreed to talk to the Provost about the funding for this particular endowed chair position.

There was agreement to send the item to FSAC.

Question for Vice-President of Administration and Finance

The speaker thanked the VP for his presentation at the budget summit and asked about the beautiful tables out in the quad – were they a gift to the university?

The answer was that the furniture was paid for out of Enterprises money.

Talk has come up around the building - that students being faced with gigantic classes next semester and reduced sections, the concerns about their favorite faculty lecturers getting laid off or not hired back, there is concern about the symbolism of the new furniture.

The VP said he would raise the issue in the Campus Reengineering Committee. Enterprises routinely replaces furniture or equipment that is outmoded. The tables out there were literally falling apart. We routinely re-carpet the residence halls in the summer. There is a routine upgrade that happens. Whether that is a good thing or a bad thing. . .

The issue of R. Luttmann's resignation was raised. Concern was raised that as to what we are or are not doing as a faculty that would have one of our members resign. A feeling of loss was expressed for the Senate as whole and that he should be encouraged to return.

What to do about his resignation was discussed. **It was decided that the Chair would communicate to R. Luttmann the committee's sincere chagrin about his resignation and would welcome him to reconsider his resignation.**

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson
Correspondences:

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes

From S&F: Staggered Membership proposal for APC and EPC

BUSINESS

1. Lobbying and Use of Appropriated Federal Funds policy – Second Reading – E. Stanny – attachment
2. Policy on Copyright Ownership – Second Reading – E. Stanny – attachment

Adjourned

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom