

## Executive Committee Minutes

5/2/02

**Present:** William Poe, Noel Byrne, Peter Phillips, Catherine Nelson, Bernie Goldstein, Rick Luttmann, Sam Brannen, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Art Warmoth, Tim Wandling

**Absent:** Ruben Armiñana, Phil McGough, Susan McKillop

**Guests:** Robert Girling, Steve Orlick

Meeting began 3:05

**Approval of the Agenda** – proposed additions to the agenda were: President's communication with SCOE re: Spring Break, Long Range Planning, SBC Questions re: SFR's and budgeting, and Education department reorganization. **The amended agenda was approved.**

**Approval of Minutes - Approved**

**Correspondence Received:** None

## REPORTS

No reports

## BUSINESS

**Recommendations from Robert Girling – attachment - TC 3:10**

R. Girling presented two proposals to the Executive Committee. The first was a proposal to create a leadership course at SSU that could be part of the GE program. The reasons for a leadership class in GE he argued is that many students will have leadership positions after graduation. He noted that a course in leadership is offered through the student union for Associated Student service. The course he was proposing would reach those students who were not interested in student government, but still interested in leadership. As an interdisciplinary course it might be taught by different instructors each year. It would not be owned by a particular department. He sees it in Area E upper division GE. W. Poe noted that normally curriculum changes go through EPC. R. Coleman-Senghor stated that such a course would need to be housed in a school, go to a curriculum committee, etc. And we need to open a space for innovation. N. Byrne voiced support for the idea. S. Brannen questioned whether students would sign up for if they are not interested in Associated Students. He also pointed out FTES issues. R. Girling argued that this is precisely the issue. We are worried more about FTES than education. B. Goldstein stated he would like to work with faculty to develop these issues. R. Coleman-Senghor noted substantial issues here. A committee should not propose courses, faculty should propose courses. R. Luttmann asked how should

we proceed with this? R. Girling stated that the Senate can instruct a committee because the Senate created the committees. A. Warmoth commented that to ask the Senate to take a position for specific course is not a good idea. Perhaps an ad hoc committee of folks who want to do it could develop it and then go through the appropriate committees. W. Poe argued that we should not single this course out. C. Nelson commented that this would set a dangerous precedent to go top down. The Senate does not instruct faculty to teach any course. R. Coleman-Senghor noted that there was nothing in the Senate constitution to give the Senate the ability to create courses. **R. Coleman-Senghor moved to take the item off table and refer it back to R. Girling.**

## **Second**

### **Vote on motion – Approved**

R. Girling agreed to work in whatever way the Executive Committee recommends.

R. Girling explained the second proposal by commenting that he had a very good experience with a faculty retreat on teaching in the past and would like to see another one. S. Brannen pointed out that some teaching strategies do not cross disciplines and he would rather see departments do this. W. Poe suggested that the committee ask FSAC to look at it and develop a proposal. R. Girling suggested trying it out a faculty retreat and evaluate the experience. B. Goldstein stated that the Chair of the Faculty could have the theme of faculty retreat be such a conference. **The matter was referred to FSAC.**

R. Girling also noted to the body that an online discussion of the master plan is available on the web at <http://www.democracy.org/camp/ab/participation.shtml>. R. Luttmann suggested he send the information to Senate-Talk.

### **SFR research from Steve Orlick – attachment – TC 3:30**

S. Orlick presented his material on SFR's at SSU. The data came from Cal State LA's website. S. Orlick walked the body through the charts and graphs which showed SSU with high SFR's compared to the entire CSU system and similar size campuses. S. Orlick argued that there are three ways to bring SFR down – 1. Water down majors by putting more faculty in lower division classes; 2. Quit diverting so much money from Academic Affairs and put it in faculty position for lower division; 3. Don't grow without faculty positions to take care of the growth.

Numerous questions were raised concerning the issues raised by S. Orlick's data. These are noted below:

L. Schlereth asked which measure SFR or Average Class Size is most important in terms of student learning. P. Phillips asked how many lecturers relevant to the student population do we have. R. Coleman-Senghor suggested that we need an exhaustive list of explanations/causes. And to determine how many dollars we get and how many we have to have that will help us do our mission. L. Schlereth noted that in 1989 –1991 there was a significant increase in SFR and asked for the

cause of this. R. Coleman- Senghor stated that at that time there were massive budget reductions and we were told we were going to lose faculty positions. We were trying to avoid layoffs and those positions were never brought back. L. Schlereth asked why SSU didn't recover when the rest of the CSU did. N. Byrne responded that faculty were not replaced at SSU.

B. Goldstein brought additional material to the meeting that he handed out to the body. He discussed the data and pointed out that 60 new faculty positions were added in the past three years. He inherited a significant budget problem of a \$500,000 deficit on his arrival. He worked closely with Larry to pay it back. He noted that the majority allocation of growth money goes to instruction. We often put it into things faculty have asked us to, such as sabbaticals, instructional equipment and travel. Now those are built into the budget. SFR's have been pretty flat the last 10 years. He has asked the Deans to come up with ideas to reduce SFR especially in lower division courses. We still need to talk about what the optimum SFR is. He is willing to work on the process.

R. Coleman-Senghor requested that for 1988 to the present we determine how many faculty we had then and have now as well as part time faculty. What were our allocations in 1988 and what are they today. With this in mind we can go to the next questions about how are these teaching resources distributed throughout our programs. We have a responsibility to bring rumors to an end and create a common discourse about allocations between the administration and faculty.

**R. Luttmann suggested that the Senate Budget committee take it from here. This was approved. R. Coleman-Senghor requested comparative data from the Provost's office. This was approved.**

## **Education Department Reorganization**

It was determined that the Education Department Reorganization proposal needs to go to EPC. If unanimously approved by EPC it would go to the Senate as a consent item.

## **Regalia rental**

In the short time remaining, Peter Phillips asked what the cost is of regalia now and what profit it taken by Enterprises. L. Schlereth replied that 40%-60% profit is taken by Enterprises on regalia rentals. The hoods were noted as the most expensive item.

## **Senate Agenda – attachment**

1. Recognition of Katie Dunn
2. Report from Elizabeth Martinez - attachment
3. From EPC - EMT report - second reading - attachment

4. From SAC - Resolution Regarding Recruitment – second reading - attachment
5. From FSAC - Ranking policy statement - second reading - attachment

R. Luttmann requested Senators discuss EMT report questions on Senate-Talk.

**ADJOURNMENT 5:00**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*