

Executive Committee
Minutes
April 19, 2001

Present - R. Luttmann (chairing for P. McGough), L. Brooks, S. Moulton, J. Filp, C. Nelson, L. Furukawa-Schlereth, A. Merrifield, M. Dreisbach, V. Garlin

Absent: P. McGough, S. McKillop, S. Heft, R. Armiñana, B. Goldstein

Guest: Elaine Sundberg, Katharyn Crabbe

Meeting began 3:05

Approval of the Agenda - changes to the Agenda – add Student Grievance Procedures – M. Dreisbach as well as Barbara Kelly settlement. Change order of the agenda to 1. 120 Unit BA degree, 2. Academic Calendar, 3. Possible Emeritus Faculty Dinner program, 4. Student Grievance procedures, 5. Resolution on Target enrollments, 6. Senate Agenda, 7. Barbara Kelly settlement. **MS Approved**

Approval of Minutes - One change on page 7, capitalize Peter and add his last name – Phillips. **MS Approved**

Correspondence Received: none

BUSINESS

1. 120 Unit B.A. Degree – attachment – Elaine Sundberg T.C. 3:15

E. Sundberg – The Board of Trustees did approve a change in Title 5 which reduces the number of units for the BA from 124 to 120. This happened last fall. At that time B. Goldstein approached me to see how we might do this on our campus. What I proposed was to contact Department Chairs and pose a series of questions regarding moving to the 120 unit BA for their majors. Such as: can you move to 120 units, how would you accomplish it, if you can't, why not. We've received information from the Chancellor's office encouraging all departments to change to 120 units, but if a department needs higher number of units they need to justify why. Clearly BS programs need to be more unit intensive. B. Goldstein suggested we take a look at our 51 pattern of GE, and perhaps change it to 48. There was an idea to suggest that the GE subcommittee look at that and give recommendations. Then San Francisco State passed their resolution. They state that they would begin graduating students at 120 units as long as students had met all major requirements and GE requirements. They instructed A&R to extend application deadlines for graduation. Three weeks ago three students came to my office independent of each other asking this question about being able to graduate at 120 units having completed their majors and GE. People are hearing about this and we need to move on this issue to meet needs of students. B. Goldstein wanted me to bring it to you for discussion. The Deans have seen the memo that is included with your agendas, but it has not been sent to Department Chairs.

R. Luttmann - We've discussed this before. I'm confused. B. Goldstein said we were not in a hurry with this and it could be decided for each department during the program review process.

E. Sundberg - In discussions with him he seemed to favor this approach. Perhaps because of students coming in? I can't speak for him.

R. Luttmann - Our task here is to decided between two options - sending it to the senate or one of our committees.

C. Nelson - The total of elective units is not on this list? This reads as if we have to reduce our major rather than elective units.

E. Sundberg - I can redraft to clarify that.

J. Filp - It seems to me responses from departments should go to EPC and then EPC can send them on to the Senate. Ones that are not a problem could be dealt with in EPC and if questions arise they could go to the Senate. Do we have to follow other campuses?

E. Sundberg - I asked Bill Knight this and legally it is fine. If some majors are comfortable I argue for sooner than later.

R. Luttmann - The 124 units was a floor, now they've lowered the floor.

V. Garlin - Are there any major programs when added to GE that does not permit any electives?

E. Sundberg and L. Brooks - Chemistry, Computer Science.

L. Brooks - If there are programs that have a large number of electives they will take it out of there. It will accomplish this systems objectives and not ours. The total curriculum for students should not be signed off by the department. B. Goldstein says departments can get a waiver. Department may not ask for waivers. The overall educational intention would be defeated.

E. Sundberg - There is a real concern if the number of elective units are very low. We put ourselves forward as a liberal arts college. Some students actually create a minor with those elective units. It could become an issue. BS programs that are unit intensive in the major and could not go lower would be giving up flexibility.

R. Luttmann - Let me remind this body that we are deciding what to do with this - we might end up sending this to EPC.

V. Garlin - Maybe a request for waiver from a department would need to be signed off by EPC. The faculty as a whole and in departments have an interest in this.

S. Moulton - One thing to think about is that next year we will be re-doing the catalog. The senate ought to think about this. We're now being pushed to develop a leaner meaner process. We need to keep the question about what a liberal arts education is all about in the forefront.

L. Brooks - Students are not required to graduate if they reach 120 units. One approach would be reducing the number of GE units. That would give the Chemistry department relief. There is almost no way to reduce the number of units that way for a chemistry or physics department in the whole system. This issue should be discussed in EPC and all avenues addressed. Student advising has a lot to do with this. Some are advised to take particular electives for their degree or are not advised as well as they could have been.

M. Dreisbach, - This is appropriate to go before EPC. I hesitate to just have waivers go before EPC or waivers just for over the 120 unit justification. We need a bigger picture. Maybe EPC could address what is the best way to look at this. Or some ad hoc group could look at this so there was a mechanism for how each of the departments will change. So we don't just look at the ones that can't keep to 120.

R. Luttmann - Are we shortchanging students with not enough exposure to electives? Is it up to each department? If there are 12 or fewer available electives now you can't reduce it? I urge you to decide. It looks as though it is drifting toward EPC.

J. Filp - Should EPC develop a general policy? Guidelines?

R. Luttmann – The trustees decided floor is 120. They are not saying that we have to go down to 120.

A. Merrifield - I think we need to get that clarified. David Spence's intent was to lower the ceiling, not the floor. We need to get B. Goldstein to clarify this. If that's the case EPC shouldn't spend a lot of time on this, especially if it turns out that we will just lower electives

L. Brooks - We discussed this with the President and the Board of Trustees and it seemed that this was true.

E. Sundberg - In the memo to the Deans the first paragraph is pretty much verbatim from the memo from Spence. "The Chancellor's Office has further directed campuses to examine all programs to determine whether the total unit load can reasonably be reduced. The Board of Trustees recognizes that total unit requirements will not be reduced to 120 semester units for all programs, as certain specific disciplines may continue to require more than 120 units for graduation. However, for such programs justification must be provided for all program requirements that extend the Baccalaureate unit requirement beyond the 120 unit minimum." Nothing else has come from the Chancellor's Office. I will go back and see if anything else has come out. I agree with Andy's take on it. If you have a major where the elective units exceed 12, 15, 18, 20, they're going to say take the four units there and you have a 120 unit degree. For those departments I say let's just do it.

But for those programs where you have intensive majors that becomes a justification. I know Chemistry departments and Computer Science departments are not going to 120 units

R. Luttmann- EPC can develop guidelines. EPC's function is to deal with these sorts of initiatives. EPC can come forward with proposal. If total required in major and GE is low enough then we will lower it and if not we won't. This would be a typical kind of guideline we might have. I don't think the idea of reducing GE will fly.

E. Sundberg - GE could be revisited and we could still move forward to 120 for programs that it can be done.

C. Nelson - If we turn to EPC are we asking EPC to ask B. Goldstein about whether they have something in mind system-wide?

E. Sundberg - I'm happy to do that.

C. Nelson -We can revisit GE at another time. Is there a move on to reduce GE units from 51 to 48?

E. Sundberg – I don't think there is a move on. It would be appropriate to look at everything. What I would like is that if we can move fairly quickly we should do that.

V. Garlin - At what point will the 120 units go into effect.

R. Luttmann - That's up to us.

V. Garlin – There must be some accountability from the Chancellor 's Office in terms of what are we going to do about it.

E. Sundberg- I would like to see students graduate in December at 120 units. My recommendation would be to help out students that are close to graduation.

V. Garlin - Is there an issue about enrollment targets? This will reduce our FTE (reduces it 3%) - Are there issues we need to address in any way, such as budgetary implications, recruitment implications? Do we need the same number to graduate? Do we have to bring in 3% more students?

A. Merrifield - Long Beach has said if you do move to 120 units productively figures will look smaller.

V. Garlin - What is the angle for our campus?

S. Moulton – I also want to add to this discussion SB 489, the community college transfer bill. They want to set up a pilot program saying that if students finish their GE at community colleges they've finished their lower division GE no matter where they transfer.

R. Luttmann – I move that we send this to EPC with the assumption that Elaine Sundberg will get as much information from the Chancellor's Office as possible.

Seconded. No objections. Approved.

2. Academic Calendar

R. Luttmann - I also happen to be on Elaine's committee for the academic calendar.

E. Sundberg - In anticipation for YRO we've formed a planning committee and I'm chair of a subcommittee for the academic calendar. Other members are Bill Barnier, Vanessa Franklin, Eileen Thatcher, Les Adler and Rick Luttmann. Since there was a strong rumor that campuses would have to move to a common calendar we formed the committee to look at this. It was clear after our discussion that it is not going to happen in the near future. We decided that we would recommend keeping the calendar that has already been approved through 2005. When we looked at this we found sufficient tie in with summer to build summer sessions and we're not changing the calendar in any way and at least for next three years we will have inter-session. Eliminating inter-session represents a loss of revenue to the campus, departments and schools. Plus it benefits students. Then we had the issue of the Caesar Chavez holiday. K. Crabbe suggested looking at having spring break coincide with the Caesar Chavez holiday. For people with children this puts us out of compliance with school districts. Sonoma County public schools religiously take the week after Easter as their break. It is set by each school district. Our current guidelines state that we shall match the practice of public schools and in no case end our spring break later than April 15th. This passed because it was felt that pedagogically to have spring break so late in the semester was not appropriate. If Easter falls before the 15th we would follow Sonoma County schools. We did not want to tie it to the Caesar Chavez holiday. In 2002 spring break does coincide with the Chavez holiday and it meets Sonoma County public schools holiday. This also happens in 2005. The two years it doesn't work are '03 and '04. We also don't match Sonoma County public schools in those years either. Our recommending to move spring break back one week to coincide with Caesar Chavez would work because we are already out of sync with Sonoma County public schools.

R. Luttmann – I'd like to add as member of this committee that first we thought we would change the guidelines. 1) A lot of people have members of household who go to Sonoma County public schools, and 2) Eclipsing Chavez we can solve on an ad hoc basis for the next few years. I ask us to calendar this at senate.

A. Merrifield - This conversation is borderline obscene. It reminds me of the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday and Ronald Reagan. To go through great machinations to make this work leaves a bad taste in my mouth.

E. Sundberg - I agree with you. I don't know why we get this day off. School children don't get the day off and do a half-day about Chavez. I will need to go back and do a count of instructional days to see how we can accommodate Chavez and spring break. We may have a singleton Monday or a final week that goes from

Tuesday to Friday. I feel this is an interim measure to maintain what is an approved calendar.

R. Luttmann - We have to decide what we will do with this issue. If some of you will oppose it in the Senate. . .

L. Brooks - We didn't create this problem. The day you have a holiday and have to make up is not a holiday.

A. Merrifield - It is not a holiday for faculty but it is for staff. We may need to make the day up. Maybe we should send it back to the committee and have it reworked - what would be an alternative?

R. Luttmann – We could send it back to see what would be involved if the Senate rejects this.

S. Moulton - In the fall semester we have Thanksgiving and then come back for two weeks and leave again. So the point about not having spring break late in the semester doesn't make sense. This may be an opportunity to go back to the guidelines the Senate created.

M. Dreisbach - Those are guidelines; we don't always follow them. We ought to revisit our schedule. Starting on a Wednesday never made sense to me.

L Brooks - I move to refer it back to the committee it came from to reconcile the issues brought up in this discussion.

R. Luttmann – We are very up in air about YRO, and this is an ad hoc solution for next four years.

Seconded. Approved.

3. Possible Emeritus Faculty Dinner program - attachment

L. Holmstrom – I have brought a revised version of the program for the dinner and would like your feedback on it.

After discussion it was decided to invite Yvette Fallanday and Dan Markwyn to speak at the dinner. Certificates for the Emeriti can be placed at their table setting.

4. Student grievance procedures – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach – We have an interim policy in place. At the time it was passed SAC was asked to continue to look at the policy. Some of the things we changed were that the contact office was specified as HR rather than Student Affairs. We brought it in to alignment with the grade appeal policy and cheating and plagiarism. We use the same people on the same panels. We've relaxed and tightened timelines. We

changed the number of people on the board and for the hearing. Those are the major changes.

V. Garlin - What remedies are available? What remedies can the committee recommend as final action?

R. Luttmann - Isn't that hard to say?

V. Garlin - What limits are there on remedies? Can they ask someone to publicly apologize, etc?

M. Dreisbach - In the policy it does specify that the findings and recommendation have to be within a certain time. One can consult with an attorney about recommendations to see if they are legal.

L. Brooks - Appendix B asks for remedies sought.

M. Dreisbach – Remedies were not in old policy and we did not add that. Under final action section 12 the President will accept the recommendation of the committee unless and then specifies specific circumstances. So that's the only real specification in this policy.

J. Filp – Victor's questions are important but I'm not sure we can answer it due to the wide variety of grievances that exist.

M. Dreisbach – A grievable action is defined.

V. Garlin - What if a student alleges that a faculty member has insulted them and wants an apology?

M. Dreisbach - The Board determines whether the act is grievable. That is the first definition of a grievable act. First they try to have an informal resolution, and include the student grievance coordinator if helpful. If no resolution then it goes to the formal procedure.

V. Garlin - Many campuses and society in general are returning to an insult and apology model. I'm wondering if this policy should accommodate this.

C. Nelson – This may be along the same lines as Victor. I'm wondering if SAC has considered intended disciplinary action against faculty, etc. Is there a conflict between remedies and those? If it is not intended to create disciplinary action there may be concerns about what is considered a disciplinary action.

L. Schlereth – I don't think it will be accepted if it comes to President. It states he will accept the recommendations but he will have to consider collective bargaining agreements and other risk management issues. He would have to determine if goes against the MOUs.

M. Dreisbach - In our work we worked with existing policy. So that is something that is in it. We did not make a change to that. We read it as - what is the sense of all this work if the President can just change it? The President can discuss it with an attorney

L. Schlereth - Our current President will not be comfortable with this and I will advise him against it. Stating "you shall do this" limits his authority.

M. Dreisbach – Not only is the policy in place, it was revised a year ago. This policy is hardly ever used. It is very infrequently that it goes to the formal process. There have been student grievances that were settled at the informal level. It is a very significant change if the President can change it all.

L. Brooks – (to L. Schlereth) Where did you read shall?

L. Schlereth - Page 8 section 12 first paragraph.

M. Dreisbach - What that's saying is the final action is not coming from the committee.

L. Brooks - As far as I see it he may accept reject or modify. Don't see how he doesn't have an out.

L. Schlereth - I take it back.

S. Moulton - This is an established policy that he signed on a year ago. I commend the committee. The summary is very helpful. I think it is ready to bring to the Senate.

V. Garlin – The language originally came out of the Chancellor's office. The president will have sufficient space here. I agree that it is a good revision. I wish faculty members had the same grievance procedures.

M Dreisbach commended Laurel her design of the flow chart.

It was agreed to send the Student Grievance procedures to the Senate.

5. Resolution on Target Enrollments – R. Luttmann

R. Luttmann - Is there any objection to sending this resolution to the Senate? I brought this up as the issue came out of a VPBAC meeting. My main concern is to bring this issue to the Senate for the Senate to go on record for this view.

A. Merrifield – I propose that we send it to the senate for a first reading.

V. Garlin – Could you attach a rationale? It will help the discussion on senate floor.

R. Luttmann - Not sure what else I would say beyond background.

Seconded. Approved.

6. Senate agenda – attachment

Admissions Report – Katharyn Crabbe

First Reading: Resolution on Target Admissions – R. Luttmann

First Reading: Student Grievance Procedures – M. Dreisbach

Senate Agenda Approved

K. Crabbe – For my admissions report at the Senate I would like clarification on what the committee would like to have in the report.

S. Moulton – I'd like to know about the possible impact of 6% cuts across the board statewide and how that might effect admissions

V. Garlin - I'd like to know the yield rates this year. Also information about the policy about deposits. This policy seems to be blurring the distinction between Academic Affairs and A & F.

K. Crabbe - We did change the procedure this year.

V. Garlin - I'd also like to know the numbers on our pool. How are we coming on our commitment and a discussion of the refund process. Is this having an impact on yield?

K. Crabbe – Thank you for that clarification.

7. Barbara Kelly settlement

V. Garlin – (to L. Schlereth) Regarding the Barbara Kelly settlement. I understand that the university has made a considerable settlement. How will that be paid or what parts of the budget would be tapped to pay for it.

L. Schlereth – We have not made a decision about how this will be funded. I don't comment on HR matters in public.

V. Garlin - Will it be paid out of campus funds?

L. Schlereth - I talked with B. Goldstein - we have not come to closure on this. It will not be paid from the risk pool to which the university belongs for settlements over \$100,000. We have on our campus our own risk pool of \$100, 000. Due to the magnitude of the sum it could not be paid from the risk pool.

V. Garlin - So the campus will have to pay the whole thing?

L. Schlereth - Yes. We just don't know how yet. I can talk about it in broad general terms.

R. Luttmann – Isn't this like the \$750,000 for utilities?

L. Schlereth - Yes, but we don't usually bring these kinds of things forward at SSU.

L. Brooks – The issue with the custodian was in the newspaper.

L. Schlereth - That came from the risk pool. If a claim is above \$100,000 then it proceeds to risk pool management. I'm not comfortable getting into employment relationships. The Provost's office will be making an announcement soon. All parties are pleased with how things have turned out.

L. Brooks – We're really only concerned about how this affects our budget, because of the tightness of the budget.

L. Schlereth - There is a pool for deductibles. This one will not go to risk pool due to the nature of the arrangement.

R. Luttmann - If we see there is some kind of cost after B. Goldstein gives his announcement, we will ask for that.

REPORTS

Chair of the Faculty - (P. McGough)

No report

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

No report

Provost/Vice President (B. Goldstein)

No report

Statewide Senator - (S. McKillop)

No report

Chair-Elect of the Senate - (R. Luttmann)

R. Luttmann – I just wanted you to know that Structures & Functions is considering changes to the Constitution and By-Laws. If you have any comments let me know. We meet again a week from Tuesday. Also please be advised that the Senate meeting will be in the Harvest Room next Senate. Next year we will meet in SCH 1121.

Vice President, Admin. & Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)

No Report

Chairs, Standing Committees - (Moulton, Filp, Dreisbach, Heft)

EPC

J. Filp - Next Thursday EPC will have a first look at EMT's program review. Some members of the Executive Committee may want to be here for that.

ADJOURNMENT 5:15 pm

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom