

Executive Committee Minutes

November 20, 2003

Sue Jameson Room 3:00-5:15

Present: Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Karin Enstam, Rick Luttmann, Ruben Armiñana, Elizabeth Stanny, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Robert McNamara, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Eduardo Ochoa, Phil McGough

Absent: Elaine McDonald

Approval of the Agenda – E. McDonald communicated to the Chair that the Jazz concentration in item 3 should be deleted. Resolution regarding the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan added to the agenda. MSP

Approval of Minutes – amended on page 6. *MSP*

Chair's Report

C. Nelson reported that the presentation on the Green Music Center has been scheduled for December 18th which will take about a hour and 15 minutes of the meeting. Richard West the chief financial officer of the CSU will be on campus at our next Senate meeting December 4th and she will be sending a letter inviting him to join us in the Senate for about 15 minutes as that is what might fit into his schedule. Perhaps we could talk about the budget, the multi-disciplinary teaching building, faculty housing. Also Marilyn Dudley-Flores has agreed to go to the all chair's meeting in December in place of C. Nelson. She asked if there is any interest on the part of the Executive Committee in having the Senate consider a resolution in favor of Proposition 55, the budget accountability act. The Statewide Senate has passed a resolution on that and as soon as it is available she will bring it to the committee to consider.

Emeritus Policy – E. Stanny

E. Stanny stated there has been a slight change in the Emeritus Policy under procedures that at the beginning of each semester a list of eligible faculty for emeritus status will be generated. This was in response to a request that some faculty were not eligible for emeritus status for an entire year. She spoke with Bill Houghton who had no problem with that. **It was agreed to put this on the consent calendar for the Senate.**

Excellence in Teaching Award – E. Stanny

E. Stanny stated that the only change is that in the second paragraph the funders of the awards will be indicated by name. This was at the request of Mark in the Development Office that these people wanted to be recognized. One is a foundation and one is fund. **It was agreed to put this item on the consent calendar for the Senate.**

Establishment of new minor in World Music and Revision of the Geography major – E. McDonald

C. Nelson informed the body that E. McDonald was unable to attend the meeting. E. McDonald had emailed that the attachments were pretty self-explanatory. The Music department is talking about establishing a World Music minor as part of what they see as a core component of their liberal arts mission. There are no cost or enrollment implications on required courses offered on either a regular or rotational basis. R. Luttmann said he's heard rumors that Laxmi Tewari will be retiring and Gardner Rust has already retired and he wonders how they are going to mount a serious ethnomusicology program without those two people, and considering the university's ability to hire new faculty is temporarily stalled, he wondered who would teach the classes. R. Coleman-Senghor argued for the item to go on the consent calendar. He had been at the EPC meeting when it was discussed. This program is not tied to an individual. They have two new hires and this program is being designed around an ethnomusicology program which is not limited solely to India, but is an integral part of their mission to open up their programming to other areas of influence within the core of their offerings in the Music department. R. Luttmann suggested that the Chair invite knowledgeable people from the Music department to be at the Senate. **It was agreed that the New minor in World Music be on the Senate's consent calendar.**

C. Nelson directed the body to the Revision of the Geography major. The main motivation seems to be revising the concentrations to better reflect the present character of the department and the field. It was her understanding there were no financial or curricular implications. R. Coleman-Senghor noted it was unanimous at EPC. He also suggested that if people are invited to be present at the Senate for consent items, it be universal, not selective. R. Luttmann pointed out the need for clarification in the document about choices involved in taking courses and the tracks within the concentrations. There is too much that has to be inferred. He thought the outline needed more signposting. R. Coleman-Senghor noted that the prior page describes briefly what they are doing. N. Byrne commented on R. Coleman-Senghor's suggestion that people be invited universally to the Senate for consent items. Since they are not there to defend the proposal, but rather that it has become clear in our discussion that there might be a need for clarification, it is legitimate to at least alert them to that circumstance. He thought all programs that wish a change have the opportunity to be present as it is deliberated at the Senate, but we don't have to expressly invite them. In fact, the Music people could decide not to be there. P. McGough said that the changes needed for the Geography proposal were minimal and would not take Geography much time to do. R. Luttmann noted that usually proposals such as this are presented with the old and the new so people can see how much they are changing it. R. Coleman-Senghor said the body could approve the substance and give recommendations on how to guide the reader through the substantive issues. **C. Nelson said she would email the request to E. McDonald to pass on to the Geography faculty. It was agreed that the item be on the Senate's consent calendar.**

Posting Grades - PeopleSoft or rosters

C. Nelson stated that Richard Whitkus emailed and asked that the Executive Committee revisit the issue of faculty posting grades on PeopleSoft or using a printed roster turned back into Admissions and Records. He is concerned faculty will be expected to use PeopleSoft without having had the chance to debate whether it is appropriate and he wants the Executive Committee to consider this item for an upcoming Senate agenda. R. McNamara asked if the minutes were available for the meeting when that came up as it was just for that semester. E. Ochoa said his understanding was that we had to move to using PeopleSoft for posting grades. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said it is an academic decision. PeopleSoft has the capability for faculty to enter grades, but he thought it was a decision being made by ESAS. N. Byrne noted that the issue was also brought up that lecturers are not paid to do anything beyond teaching and at that time there was a request for lecturers to undergo training, which in effect would be on their own time. R. McNamara noted that there were issues concerning faculty who did use rosters and having Administrative Coordinators posting grades which was illegal or something. R. Armíñana strongly disputed that the lecturers job is only to teach. They have to grade and they have to post the grades, and hold office hours. He wanted to make it very clear we are not violating the contract. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said the training is not actually how they enter the grades, which is pretty easy, the training is to make sure that everyone who has access to confidential data understands their responsibilities under California and Federal law with respect to safeguarding privacy. But the way PeopleSoft is now emerging much of the confidential information about students is masked. So faculty are not going to see information that would be considered private, so he thinks the training for lecturers can be radically streamlined so that it can be provided to them on a handout. But they still must follow the law, of course.

M. Dreisbach read the original Senate resolution to the body: RESOLVED that the Academic Senate of Sonoma State University recommends to the administration of Sonoma State that faculty be "requested" instead of "required" to use PeopleSoft software to enter their grades for the Spring semester 2003. The Senate further recommends that faculty have the choice to use PeopleSoft to post their grades or continue the past practice of posting grades to a roster. Approved, 20 in favor, 3 abstentions. After some discussion, the body felt it was a non-issue. R. McNamara suggested that R. Whitkus be advised that he could bring a resolution if he so desired. E Ochoa noted that the issue with lecturers and confidentiality training will be dealt with this semester. R. Coleman-Senghor asked if there were computers for lecturers and E. Ochoa responded yes. **It was decided that the Chair would communicate to R. Whitkus that the Executive Committee would not be recommending the item for Senate's consideration at the next meeting, however, as a Senator he has the right at the next meeting to request that the issue be put on the agenda.**

Minutes regularly by email – R. McNamara

R. McNamara asked why don't we do that? For the full Senate we did read our minutes by email and he didn't hear it put anyone out too much. He ventured to say

there are a good number of people who don't read the minutes, but if you do read the minutes anyone can print them out. He's thinking of resources, efficiency, workload for Laurel and is it really necessary. Could we not review our minutes online and if needed, print it out. Of course, print it for the Chair and for the record. He wanted to see if we might put that forward and adopt that. M. Dreisbach said she likes to have a hard copy and then we are running into ink and paper costs, she couldn't print out the minutes last sent. R. Coleman-Senghor said there were two issues: who will carry the cost and in terms of cost and labor we could save a great deal in terms of production. He thought that the body should look at getting Senate materials electronically. R. McNamara clarified he was not talking about attachments, just the minutes and not just the Executive Committee, but the full Senate. He's making an assumption that we could get it in a format that everyone could open up. In terms of the cost issue being shifted to departments, he had thought of that and he thought that might be an argument no, but he wondered how many would be printing them out. One of four of us at the meeting had printed them out and we shared them at the meeting. He would find it more efficient to record as files on his computer rather than piles of paper. P. McGough would strongly support a motion to that effect. L. Holmstrom observed that transcribing the minutes takes more time and depending on what other work there is in the Senate office, it can be hard to get the minutes into the packet. This way the packets could go out as required and people would have the minutes before the meeting. **C. Nelson suggested and the body agreed to try this for a trial period for the rest of the semester with the Executive Committee and the Senate minutes and announce it to the Senate.**

Resolution regarding Academic Affair Strategic Plan – N. Byrne

N. Byrne stated he was asked to bring this to the Executive Committee. It's entirely possible that it is moot and Provost Ochoa would be in the best position to make that assessment. It has to do with the Strategic Planning process that currently occupies us and he was asked that the product of these efforts be brought before the Senate and that be subject to Senate evaluation, review and approval. R. Coleman-Senghor asked who the author of the resolution was. N. Byrne said it was Peter Phillips. R. Coleman-Senghor argued that it was entirely inappropriate and that P. Phillips has the right to bring it up as an issue. If it is brought up at the Senate, R. Coleman-Senghor would consider it an affront to the Academic Planning Committee. APC is the body of the Senate that is supposed to look at these issues and we have already looked at them and will be presenting a letter to the Provost in the context of Strategic Planning in which we acknowledging the process going on, lending our support to that process and at the same time mapping out a way in which that process can be dovetailed and integrated into the on-going process. That discussion about how to do that took place over a three week period and was deliberated on by APC. He does not want to see it in the packet and said P. Phillips could bring it from the floor. P. McGough argued that we've asked if someone wants to bring a resolution to the Senate they bring us a copy before. If it is going forward, it resolves that the Academic Senate approve the final documents. We can't resolve that we approve them, we may disapprove them, so he needs to change the language. R. Armiñana noted that the resolution was inaccurate in stating that the Strategic Planning process was seeking to change the mission of SSU. N. Byrne said

that those observations were on the mark. P. McGough asked the two Chair if they weren't intending to bring it to the Senate anyway. C. Nelson said yes. E. Ochoa said it was going to come to the Senate in one way or another. They had not mapped out that part of the process. He's much more in tune with the line of thinking R.

Coleman-Senghor outlined that this approach. R. McNamara asked would that be the normal procedure otherwise? Would it go to APC and then the Senate? When would the Senate get a chance to comment on a long term Strategic Plan. APC's work goes to the full Senate otherwise, correct? R. Coleman-Senghor said yes. He further stated that this planning process was initiated by the Provost. The Chair of the Faculty is co-chairing this process. This is not a university wide strategic planning process, it is a division wide process. It is looking at the mission of the Academic Affairs division. As far as evaluation, Provost Ochoa came to us very early on with his idea of initiating the Strategic Plan and in discussion with him, we talked about how that plan, at any stage, would find its way to APC. Not to approve, APC is not going to approve or disapprove. APC will look at it and respond to it. Then it will go to the Senate. APC is a reviewing body. N. Byrne agreed with the adjustments suggested. It sounded that the procedures anticipated are consistent with the adjusted resolution. It sounded like it was moot. E. Ochoa stated his thinking was that we needed this kind of plan to help him and guide him in making ultimate resource allocations within the division. So in that sense it's a working document to allow him to make decisions. That was his motivation, however, because of the nature of the decisions that we're talking about and the fact that it's the academic core of our mission as a university certainly he hoped the Senate, once the product was finished, would review it and endorse it. Given the fact that we've been collaborating, Senate leadership and the administration, in crafting of this plan, it seems to him that would be the logical conclusion to the process. N. Byrne said that he thought what E. Ochoa and R. Coleman-Senghor were arguing was that the resolution was moot. No? R. McNamara said it needed to be brought up at the Senate in some form because the spirit of it is legitimate and the spirit of it is to have the Senate be involved reviewing this document. He didn't know that it was clear that it was going to come before the Senate. Would the procedure still be that APC reviews it and then sends it forward to the full Senate or would the plan be that it's done and it goes to the full Senate to be reviewed and commented on, to pass a resolution or whatever the Senate decides to do. He thinks before we dismiss the resolution the process needs to be addressed. R. Coleman-Senghor said if it is not moot then it is redundant. Redundant because all you need to do is read the charge of APC and its responsibilities. This document basically says APC is not doing its job and he says APC is doing its job. The document is not ready. It is filled with inaccurate statements and he is not prepared to see it go forward to the Senate. P. McGough asked the Provost what kinds of decisions the Provost is referring to when he talks about the Strategic Plan guiding him. E. Stanny said the resolution is asking the Senate to have the opportunity to review and potentially approve, whereas the Provost is saying he wants the resolution to say review and endorse. That doesn't seem to leave very much room for comments that would actually have an effect on the document. N. Byrne stated that the resolution did not intentionally impugn or criticize the work of APC which is extremely important and highly regarded. Yes, the resolution is poorly worded and would require adjustments as have been noted. Personally, he would have no problem bringing this forward with the changes suggested here and he would note that we are in a position if we so chose to

incorporate those changes and bring it forward now. **M. Dreisbach moved that the body not bring this forward to the Senate because of all the problems that have been discussed. Second.** N. Byrne said he opposed the motion if the intent was that the issues raised by the resolution not be brought forward to the Senate, if the intent in its current formulation it not be brought forward, he has no objection. R. McNamara said he would not support the motion. He thinks if the document is corrected, it can go forward. The spirit of it is a member of the Senate is asking that a resolution come forward that the body can express what its desire is. It can go through the proper channels, that can come out in the debate, but its giving the Provost the opportunity to respond to the resolution. **P. McGough suggested as a compromise that the Executive committee request the Provost at the next Senate to address the role of the Academic Senate in reviewing the Academic Affair Strategic planning process and then give Peter Phillips an opportunity to bring a better worded resolution after the Provost has explained what the role of the Senate will be. It's a substitute motion.** R. McNamara second. **M. Dreisbach asked to withdraw her original motion in favor of the substitute. There was no objection.** R. Coleman-Senghor said the body could continue to undercut the authority and effectiveness of your committees. You have been in the body before when people have brought items that should have gone to the affected committee and we have said we have to go through this process of referring. There's nothing that stopped Peter from discussing with him the questions he had. This is speaking to why we need to have this substitute motion. APC has a statement to the Academic Strategic Planning committee on the AA Strategic planning initiative. Three weeks we worked on this to make sure we had the right tone. We write "The Academic Planning committee supports the purposes and efforts of the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning committee to enhance the effectiveness of campus level planning by broadening the participation of various stakeholders in the process. APC also supports a planning model that begins with missions and values and proceeds towards strategies and objectives. This support is based on the assumption that the work of AASPC will incorporate and build on the Academic work of APC, EPC and the GE committees and other faculty governance bodies over the past few years and currently." His point was that putting this resolution before that makes the people who have been working on this appear as if they have not been speaking or thinking about these issues. N. Byrne said that his understanding was that the issue before them was not the resolution, but the rather a request by this body that Provost Ochoa address the Senate regarding the matters P. McGough as identified. And subsequent to that if P. Phillips wants to bring forward a resolution, he has that choice. He argued for the motion. **M. Dreisbach called the question. Second. Vote on calling the question = 7 yes, one abstention from Robert Coleman-Senghor.** **Vote on the substitute motion – voice vote passed, one no.** R. Coleman-Senghor requested that the report from APC be the first report that comes up on the agenda and he will call on Provost Ochoa as APC Chair to talk about the process that we're engaged in and the discussions he has had with APC about how he is going to bring his work forward to the Senate. He asked this to protect the integrity of APC. **No objection.**

President Armiñana report

R. Armiñana reported that the Governor Monday night withdrew the five nominees for members of the Board of Trustees who had not been confirmed. Governor Schwarzenegger has asked for three concurrent special sessions, one deals with SB 60 which is the vehicle license for illegal immigrants, the second is workmen's compensation reform and the third is to put on the March ballot a bond for \$15 billion general obligation bond for deficit reduction and attached to it will be a constitutional amendment that will impose spending caps and allow the Governor to exercise a number of mid-year reductions in the future without legislative approval and to set mandated reserves in the budget. He is not asking in the special session for any fiscal matters. The Governor has also said that he has asked the legislature that between now and June 30 to reduce the budget by \$2 billion which is in a way the backfill of the vehicle license fee. In order to get something on the March ballot it would require action by the legislature around December 5. We shall see if that happens. His guess is that the Governor will get the repeal of the license fee for illegals, he will get the March general obligation bond with spending cap and he will get significant parts of the workmen's compensation, but not all because no body knows what all means. Workmen's compensation is very complicated. If he does not get that the Governor will go directly to the people via television and challenge the people to declare the legislature incapable of action. R. Armiñana believes money is being collected at this moment to prepare for that. This Governor is different from any other Governor in the nation who has the ability to do that. Let's assume all of that happens. That \$15 billion is the \$13 billion in this year's approved budget that we were going to go for borrowing. Somehow the Governor and the Legislature forgot that there is a statement in the legislature that you cannot engage in general debt for the state over \$300,000, it has to go to the voters. Already the \$2 billion dollars for pension bond, instead of paying it with cash, it's paid with debt, has been declared illegal by a court because of that statue of that \$300,000. So the \$13 plus the \$2 billion for pensions makes \$15 billion. Because of politics, it is interesting to hear some people who were most adamant about this plan are now saying don't borrow it. "Don't borrow it" means major cuts and/or tax increases. Let's assume that all of this happens and the voters in their wisdom vote for the bond, in the next year's budget 04-05 you would have another \$15 billion dollar deficit, roughly the same we had this year. If that were to happen, next year's cuts would be of the same magnitude as this year's. Roughly for Sonoma State \$5 million without any growth money. The big variable here is economic growth. These numbers he gave the body were based on assumptions about economic growth of the LAO and the Department of Finance that they agreed on. There's a report from the Chapman University Center for Economic Research which predicts the deficit will go down to only \$2 billion next year. He hopes they are right, but has the feeling they may not be. That's where we are. These are difficult numbers to understand. There was good article in yesterday's LA Times which he shared with the body.

R. Luttmann asked about the second phase of the Green Music Center which it is hoped would be financed out of a bond issue that will be voted on next March, Prop

57. Did the President have any comments on the impact on the prospects for that bond given the Governor's plan to put this other bond on the ballot. R. Armiñana responded technically the education bond at this moment is on the March ballot. There is some conversation among the people who put that bond on the ballot, it might be worth pushing that bond to the November ballot. There will be, in the next week or so, some polling that will be done on this issue. That poll will guide the decision. There is concern in the marketplace of the ability of the market to absorb so much bond at one time. The key to the Governor's bond is the spending cap. E. Stanny asked what percent of SSU's total budget is the 5 million? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said a little bit less than 10%. P. McGough asked about mid-year cuts. R. Armiñana said at this moment there is no vehicle for a mid-year reduction. It's not in the charge of the special session. The Governor has called for this \$2 billion in budget reduction. Mr. Burton has said we won't come with it, you have to bring it up. At this moment if he sends it in, it will be during his January budget submission time which by that time for higher education, it is too late. We are making the case that literally it is too late as the students are already in class.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked the President to speak to the building that's going up and the partnership of financing - he still has the question about what role will we as faculty and students have over the configuration of that building with respect to our needs, because the rationale being put forward is FTES. What are the constraints upon faculty in terms of shaping both either the location or the uses of that building. R. Armiñana responded the faculty will not have any say so on the location. The location is in the Master Plan. The faculty will have probably nothing to say in terms of the overall costs, X square feet that translates into X millions of dollars. That also translates roughly in to so many square feet which translates into FTE. There's a formula. The faculty will have something to contribute in what goes in there.

R. Luttmann asked R. Armiñana to speak more about the spending caps he referred to. Would that be part of the bond vote or would there be a separate vote? R. Armiñana responded it would be a constitutional amendment separate from the bond vote. R. Luttmann asked what kind of spending caps are being talked about. R. Armiñana said it is not clear yet. The Governor said he would not accept the bond without the constitutional amendment on the spending caps. Getting the Republicans there will be the spending caps. Spending caps are extremely difficult to drop and very difficult if not impossible to maintain in times of affluence because everybody tries to figure out a way to go around the spending caps. That has been the history in the Federal Government and in the State Government. We have had spending caps in some sort or another. They only work for short periods of restraint, as soon as you have a lot of money you tend to spend it. The spending caps are clearly part of the deal.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated he understood about the issue of the building and its location, the building that was approved is not the same building. R. Armiñana responded yes. Specific drawings are not done in a Master Plan. The site was approved in the Master Plan and it was further approved this afternoon for this building by the Campus Planning Committee. R. Coleman-Senghor stated his concern was how it is the faculty contributes with respect to exploring issues, the academic impact, of any kind of facility plan, so he's looking to see where we can

share in a conversation. He noted that basically the President said to us last time at the Senate is that there would be a possibility of discussions about the configuration. R. Armiñana responded internal, not external. R. Coleman-Senghor said that would be an important discussion to have.

Provost Ochoa report

In the interest of time, Provost Ochoa passed.

P. McGough asked the Provost for an example of the kind of vision and mission and what kind of cut it would lead to. Are we talking about academic programs, departments, schools? E. Ochoa responded that he does not have as definite an idea as P. McGough might fear. What he is looking for is some consensus or some support for the process whereby we have arrived at certain priorities for the university that will make us lean in certain directions more than others. P. McGough asked for an example. E. Ochoa said for example, suppose we develop a strategy in this process to explore identifying appropriate graduate programs to move into a self-support track. That might be a strategy for lessening the pressure on the general fund resources. To have that sort of strategy endorsed would make it much easier and would make him more comfortable with moving forward with something like that. Another thing that is emerging in our discussions now is that it seems our graduate programs have primarily a regional orientation whereas we draw undergraduate students from the entire state and possibly beyond that. If we decided to go with that trend, then that would lead us to focus our graduate programs to meet specific needs in the region as opposed to build programs or lend a lot of support to departments that might want to build a graduate program of national standing, for example. Instead we would try to achieve national excellence in the undergraduate program. Things like that.

Statewide Senator report – P. McGough

P. McGough reported there was a Statewide Senate meeting last week and there was a resolution passed on a fee policy that the Trustees will consider in the next couple of months. There was also a resolution passed on the recognition that quality is being eroded with the budget cuts. When the minutes appear, he will put them on Senate-Talk. He will try to work on a summary.

Chair-Elect report – M. Dreisbach

No report.

Vice-President of Administration and Finance report – L. Furukawa-Schlereth

L. Furukawa-Schlereth reported that the Campus Planning Committee recommended to the President if the due diligence proves successful that we recommend to the Board of Trustees that we accept 3500 acres of land in Mendocino county for the School of Science and Technology as a research facility. That might be a useful topic to put on the Senate agenda and show the video, so Senators can get a sense of that. It is an exciting thing to see. The committee recommended to the

President also to begin the process of removing the eucalyptus trees along the perimeter on Cotati Ave and Petaluma Hill Road for safety reasons. Richard West has been invited to campus on December 4th and the agenda we have going for him is we really want to talk to him about faculty/staff housing. He's been a strong advocate of our initiatives. He will hopefully be meeting with the Faculty/Staff housing committee. We wanted to talk to him a bit about the multi-discipline academic building. And then give him a tour of our student housing, which he was instrumental in helping us get approved, which he has not seen. As well as the Salazar renovation for which he was helpful getting us resources for that question and we'll probably review with him the PeopleSoft implementation since he is the Executive sponsor of that project for the system and we have a pretty good story to tell there. L. Furukawa-Schlereth thought R. West would like to at least say hello to the Senate. He is a member of this faculty. But he doesn't often get to participate. But L. Furukawa-Schlereth didn't think he'd have more than 5 or 10 minutes.

N. Byrne asked what the cost is of the land in Mendocino County and how is it financed. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that it is a gift and it comes with a million dollar endowment to support operations. R. McNamara stated he heard rumors today about mid-year cuts. Should we not be so panicked about that? Our department is calling a meeting about how to deal with it. R. Armiñana responded there is no basis at this moment to assume a mid-year cut. Could there be? Yes, there could. Might be end of the year. How much? When, where, unknown. At this moment we do not have an indication that there will be a mid-year cut.

R. Luttmann stated that in regards to the visit from Richard West in the past when we've had visitors from the system here we've had the opportunity to meet with them as an Executive Committee. He would strongly support that if it can be arranged. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that it cannot be arranged and that it is not an official "state" visit. He called Richard as a colleague and asked him to come up and work with us. It's not an official visit to the campus in the sense that some of the others are.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked regarding the Campus Planning Committee approving the building, was there any discussion of the impact on academic plans. L. Furukawa-Schlereth believed that Jason Spencer raised questions and he believed Chief Johnson raised the question earlier today about making certain that the people traffic patterns are taken into account. We indicated we would certainly be very sensitive to those issues as the actual specifics of the plans of the building unfold. R. Armiñana said those are the questions that get answered after you get the building on the list and approved by a bond issue. There is a year for that set of planning, and that's when the architects are hired and those conversations impact how the building is configured internally. R. Coleman-Senghor stated as a former student of architecture for two years, one of the things you also do is you begin with the position of what kind of use this building will have, what kind of people will be involved in it, what kind of social events will take place, and the rhythm of the building. That is even before you begin to do anything. He understands that this is a process and you have to go out and seek money, but the tie in between the funding issue and the contour of building, in terms of its utility, is something he really would like to have an exploration of. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said it occurred to him at one

of the meetings it might be helpful for him to talk a little bit about the way CSU's do buildings. He thought many of R. Coleman-Senghor's fears and concerns would be greatly alleviated. That exact process will happen. We will spend easily seven months in chit chat about those very issues with the architects.

C. Nelson asked to extend the meeting to 5:15. No objection.

E. Ochoa responded to the concerns R. Coleman-Senghor raised. If one were to start with a blank slate and was not constrained by considerations of opportunity for funding, one would start asking the question, if we are going to have FTE space and faculty office space, where in the various footprints in the Master Plan would it make the most sense to put them. Unfortunately, we don't live in that ideal world. So what we have instead is we have an opportunity to leverage private dollars to get a building on the list that could be used to address some of those space needs. Given that, there wasn't any need to question this particular building proposal at this time. The issues of how the space will be configured given the constraints, that will be addressed later in great detail. P. McGough stated he thought R. Coleman-Senghor made an excellent point and it would be wonderful, since this possibility may exist, that the Strategic Planning process somehow think about what this incredible opportunity might best fit in with the academic mission. The people who do most of the discussion are not by necessity the academic people, the academic people are teaching classes. This is really important because of its distant location. If there's vision of bringing it into the academic mission, he thinks it will be a great success. He thinks the earlier people start thinking and dreaming about it the better.

APC report

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that the committee has been looking at the utility of the multi-disciplinary academic building and issues of impact on academic planning. We are also moving forward in our discussions about support for the GE committee and its work with respect to changes in GE. We've looked at Residential issues and will be making some suggestions. They are looking forward to the WASC report and their participation in that report, either statement they will make and how they will arrive or be in the report or trying to take an alternative route making sure that the Senate's voice is heard with respect to the state of SSU on the issues that were raised in the WASC report.

FSAC

E. Stanny reported that they reviewed the Grants and Contracts policy today. Tony Apolloni and Eileen Warren presented it. There are a few tiny changes they will make. She was not sure where it would go next. **It was determined that it would come to the Executive committee at its next meeting.**

SAC

K. Enstam reported that SAC spent a couple of weeks reviewing and then approved the FERPA policy, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. She passed out copies, she was not sure what happens to it now. It was brought to the committee by

Kathryn Crabbe. They worked with her to revise it. They've been discussing having only an electronic catalog and not a paper form. Both the faculty and students on the committee are concerned about that, so they've asked Kathryn Crabbe to come back so we can address our concerns with her. It was determined that a narrative was needed for the FERPA document and that it would go on the agenda as an information item. P. McGough asked how a student indicates that they do not want their information released. K. Enstam responded that it will be available in PeopleSoft for students to check they don't want any information released. The student is then responsible for changing that if they want at a later date.

R. Coleman-Senghor raised some questions about advising. He stated it is horrendous now. He thinks of himself as tech savvy, but it is cumbersome to advise people in terms of what we presently have. He asked for a committee to look at the fact that we no longer have a schedule of classes and that advising may be more encumbered and we are encouraging faculty and students to be more engaged and here is a task which the technology at its present stage does not bring about a positive gain. It was noted that SAC has a subcommittee on Academic Advising. K. Enstam said that advising currently was SAC's main issue for the rest of this semester and next semester, both the difficulties with the online catalog as well as a student referendum about issues of advising and we're talking about how to increase advising effectiveness. There is already a committee dealing with that, Student Affairs, as well as the Academic Advising committee.

Senate Agenda

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

 Approval of the Agenda

 Approval of Minutes

EPC: Music Department curriculum changes; Geography revised concentrations.

FSAC: Excellence in Teaching Award revision; Emeritus Policy revision

Information Item: SAC endorsement of FERPA policy

Special Guest: Richard West, Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer of the CSU. **T.C. 3:05-3:15**

BUSINESS

1. From APC: Long Range Academic Plan – Second Reading – attachment – R. Coleman-Senghor **T. C. 4:30**
2. From S&F: By-Laws change regarding replacement of officers –Second Reading – attachment – M. Dreisbach **T. C. 5:00**
3. Resolutions regarding Lecturers:
 - a. From FSAC Resolution on Lecturer's on Senate Compensation – Second Reading - attachment – E. Stanny **T. C. 4:10**

- b. Constitutional Amendment changing lecturer eligibility for voting and service to 6 WTU's – First Reading - attachment – S. Wilson & B. Moonwomon – **T. C. 5:15**
- c. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3.10 of By-Laws; Replacement of Lecturer Senators – First Reading – attachment – M. Dreisbach
- d. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3 of By-Laws regarding election of Lecturer Senators - First Reading - attachment - M. Dreisbach

Meeting was set to be from 3:00 to 5:30.

Adjourned 5:15

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom