

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**  
September 6, 2001

Present: Rick Luttmann, Noel Byrne, Phil McGough, Peter Phillips, Tim Wandling, Catherine Nelson, Susan Moulton, Art Warmoth, Wm Poe, Ruben Armiñana, Bernie Goldstein, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

Absent: Susan McKillop, Michael Little

Meeting began 3:00pm

**Approval of the Agenda** - Added to agenda a report from Catherine Nelson on the Senate Budget Committee and Resolution for the Executive Committee and Senate to consider regarding CFA Teach-In from A. Merrifield. *Approved*

**Approval of Minutes** - *Approved*

**Correspondence Received:** None

**REPORTS**

**Chair of the Faculty - (R. Luttmann)**

R. Luttmann - Pass

**President of the University - (R. Armiñana)**

No Report

**Provost/Vice President(B. Goldstein)**

B. Goldstein - Pass for now.

**Statewide Senator - (S. McKillop)**

No report.

**Chair-Elect of the Senate - (N. Byrne)**

N. Byrne –What I can say can be included under the agenda items.

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

L. Schlereth – I'm circulating the Campus Re-engineering Committee agenda. I offer this to you to see if any of these items need to be presented to the Senate. I will not bring it to you again, but will wait for you to let me know what you need. Both the Chair, Chair-Elect and Past Chair sit on CRC. We have a retirement to announce. George Urdzik, the Director of Financial Aid is retiring. We will start a national search. This is not a position covered by blue paper policy, but because of its University wide

importance it would be good to have a professor on this committee. I ask the Chair - Elect to identify a person who may be interested. We are going to appoint Susan Gutierrez as interim director while we search. I understand that you have some questions about YRO and the financial implications of that. I'm glad to answer any questions you have on that.

P. Phillips - Is it the intention to budget for full salaries for faculty?

L. Schlereth – Yes, we would use the same salary schedule which depends on the collective bargaining process.

C. Nelson – It is my understanding that all the money to pay for teaching in the summer comes out of our base budget, that there is no money to supplement salaries in the summer. If two senior faculty teach in the summer there is no additional money to make up salary.

L. Schlereth – This is what I believe to be true. A certain number of students, 151 FTE, are currently enrolled in summer courses. Presumably those will move into state supported summer. We will receive marginal costs to offset the loss of Extended Education revenue. We have put forth a request for enrollment growth money. If we pretend that we ask for 200 FTEF, it is up to the Provost how that 200 FTEF growth money is spread. Marginal growth will come from that as well.

C. Nelson – But not this summer, the summer after. Do we indeed have enough money to pay everyone who wants to teach? There is the issue of departments not being able to afford people in the summer if they are teaching a full load.

L. Schlereth - If you assume we always teach 150 FTE in the summer and if state money were provided us, that would be 150 X \$1700, which will offset what Extended Education would pay. If it turns out to be less, I don't know, but it should work. It's tricky under YRO, but typically teachers would earn more money. It will be better for professors under state support. We would have to run some analysis on courses. Without knowing the nature of curriculum, its tricky to know. If Bernie gave me a specific curriculum I could run the numbers.

C. Nelson - Could any transition money be used for this?

L Schlereth - Transition money is available to all of campus. It is not all in Bernie's camp. Yes, it is a very discretionary pot of money.

S. Moulton - We talked about this at APC. At Humboldt, those students were distributed throughout the year and there were ancillary costs, those are things we can't predict. Now we are experiencing a downturn in enrollment. What does that predict for summer. There is a lot that needs to be discussed. We are working on an Academic Impact Report and hope to have that up soon. YRO is really problematic. Our Dean is not encouraging us to teach in the summer.

N. Byrne – It is extremely important to understand this. It is affecting our planning. Is it true that in the coming summer we will get some kind of augmentation?

L. Schlereth – There is one little wrinkle. There is some concern whether the Governor is going to fund the next phase of YRO, because they don't know what's going on with the economy. We will not teach these courses without state support. It's very murky. Ruben has advised we keep going. We will get a warning in January. If support is not there we will back up and not do it.

N. Byrne – This is important information. My understanding is that there will be no augmentation for the summer. We thought it would be taken away from spring and fall.

L. Schlereth – The governor budgeted \$16 million for YRO. This is for campuses who started this year. We will see if it works this way or if it will offset the loss.

B. Goldstein – I'm going to reiterate what was just said. It's a possibility we won't offer YRO, but we have to plan for it. We will continue planning and very wisely save this money as much as we can. If not this summer, we will next summer and we will need it for staffing, and other costs. We don't know what to expect down the road. Personally I hope we don't have it this summer. In regards to an AIR, Academic Affairs has something similar. We could share it with you.

T. Wandling – Chairs have been told we can't have all full professors teach in the summer. If there is planning at high levels, if we are growing by 150 FTE, are we going to convert that into more tenure track position? That needs to be budgeted for and would that money approximate what Extended Education has given us?

L. Schlereth - That is the dilemma. The OE kickback is the most vulnerable. That is partly why we want to hold on to that \$700,000 until Extended Ed has that money again. Money will come from marginal costs and Bernie will determine what to do, either tenure track or lecturers.

B. Goldstein - We asked the Deans to meet with department chairs and determine the need for tenure track hires and bring back proposals. We will determine what we can afford. With that growth we can to keep the 20 to one ratio. There is no finality. I want to bring this to the PBAC.

C. Nelson - Would the FTE be over and above the \$700,000.

L. Schlereth - The \$700,000 is not related to the FTE. Long Beach cooked it up, not sure where it came from.

R. Luttmann - Bernie and I had our biweekly meeting and discussed the bizarre fact that the decision was made to put summer school in the year that precedes it rather than the year after.

L. Schlereth - Summer 2002 will be part of the 2002-03 academic year.

R. Luttmann – That's the problem. We are luckier then others as we don't have to get started until late August. Summer is defined as part of the beginning of the fiscal year. It makes much more sense to tack it on at the end of the fiscal year.

T. Wandling – Yes, for faculty electing to teach in the summer in lieu of regular assignments this would avoid payback problems.

R. Luttmann - That butts another whole issue of whether credits can carry over academic year boundaries. Dean Babula comments that were reported to me are that it is always cheaper to hire lectures. This applies to the regular year and summer and their are just as good reasons for our instructors to be turned over to temporary people. We have to resist the temptation to utilize lecturers just because they are cheaper at the expense of eroding the core of permanent faculty. There is also the matter of the relatively significant number of staff who are on 10 month appointments who will have to go to 12 months. How will we afford that?

L. Schlereth – There is no sympathy at Department of Finance at the state level. When staff positions were given, the dollars came in the 12 month format. When people are on 10 months we are reaping the savings. They do have a point on staff positions. There is sympathy in the Chancellor's office. It represents a challenge. No funding is coming from the Governor on this. Though there is some logic to it.

R. Luttmann – So the bottom line is that it will be a problem. Any other comments or questions on YRO?

#### **Chairs, Standing Committees - (Moulton, Warmoth, Little, Poe)**

##### **APC**

S. Moulton – We had our meeting today as well as last week. We have a request to have some of resolutions APC made last spring to be agendized. How do you want me to do that?

R. Luttmann – Susan McKillop seemed to think that some items should be brought forward to the Senate.

S. Moulton – We talked with the GE revision group and had a lively discussion. Robert Eyler and Elaine Sundberg represented the GE subcommittee. Following on heels of articulating a planning process, it will be an on-going discussion.

##### **EPC**

A. Warmoth – I have copies of my memo for planning include GE. You indicted it would be on the agenda. I have been in touch with Bob Eyler. The GE subcommittee is interested in working closely with EPC. Here are copies of the interim program review schedule if anyone is interested.

##### **FSAC**

W. Poe – I can report that Judith Hunt brought to FSAC a concern to discuss the creation of set of standards for dealing with confidential documents in department offices. A faculty member brought forward this concern. We don't want to set a policy but want to discuss with the Administrative Managers office standards.

## **SBC**

C. Nelson – We had our first Senate Budget Committee meeting last Tuesday. We meet every other Tuesday in ST2011. Our first project is to gather data and give a report on the growth of administrators with the decrease in instruction funding.

## **BUSINESS**

### **Resolutions regarding the CFA Teach-In**

A. Merrifield – This is a short resolution, take a quick look at it. I'm glad to make a quick statement and answer questions. The only opening statement I want to make is that the campus CFA Executive Board suggested we bring this forward to the Executive Committee and the Senate. I hope it is self explanatory. It was put together by a few people very rapidly. The purpose of the Teach-In is to relate what is going on on campus and in the CSU to the education of the student. In addition to students, Stanley Aronowitz and California State legislators will be on the panels. Many have endorsed the teach-in, a multitude of organizations, employee groups, the SSU Liberal Studies Student Association. There will be one panel in the morning and one in the afternoon covering the same information. There will be a speech by Stanley and students will be on the panels and other members of the academic community and an open mike for input from everybody, not just staff, students, etc.

**N. Byrne – I move that the resolution be approved.**

R. Luttmann - Do we put it on the Senate agenda for next week? Do we as the Executive Community wish to endorse it? Perhaps first we should discuss the Senate agenda.

A. Merrifield - If no one has any questions, I will leave you to your deliberations.

**N. Byrne – I modify my motion that this resolution be brought before the Senate .**

**Seconded.**

R. Luttmann - Any objection or discussion?

*Motion was approved.*

**R. Luttmann - Is there motion to endorse this as the Executive Committee?**

**P. Phillips – So moved.**

**Seconded.**

R. Luttmann - Any objections or discussion?

*Motion was approved.*

R. Luttmann – We may need to extend our senate meeting next time to 5:30 as we have visitors and many items to discuss.

**The Body did not approve extending the Senate meeting to 5:30.**

### **Compensation for lecturers serving on the Senate**

W. Poe – I have for you a resolution adopted by FSAC today. Obviously it is good to discuss this.

R. Luttmann - What does the next to the last sentence mean?

W. Poe – That the Executive Committee should ask for more WTUs to account for this increase in Senate release time. There are things that aren't mentioned. This is compensation of lecturers are elected to the Senate. If they run as say, the social science position on the Senate they should also get compensation. We added the provision that the total a person's total assignment not exceed 15 WTUs.

R. Luttmann - Per semester?

W. Poe – Yes.

R. Luttmann - On your Senate Release Time Template handout, these are annual figures so that total would increase by 6 per year. Bare in mind we can only make a recommendation to the administration, it is not something we have authority over. It is a matter of the administration. The best we can do is make a resolution recommending this to the administration, if we wish to do so. So FSAC proposes this to go forward to the Senate. Our business is to decide is this is appropriate to go to the Senate. I remind you not to debate issues or its merits.

S. Moulton - Isn't it possible a lecturer could be in a full time position with assigned time for advising?

W. Poe - If a person is in a full time position, they would receive more than 15 WTUs. A lecturer could have 6 units spread across courses and 2 units for coordinating something. If a lecturer is elected to the Senate then this would be added to it.

R. Luttmann - Any other comments or questions? I suggest we clearly indicate that these are per semester figures. And word it resolved that the Academic Senate recommend to the administration . . .

T. Wandling – Is there a lecturer position to this body? If that is in the works, we will have to do it again.

W. Poe – Lecturers can serve on standing committees and other committees. We intentionally deferred this issues so the we could get this off in a timely fashion. That's a much more murky issue.

R. Luttmann - From this discussion we have two issues a) reserved seats for lecturers and b) compensation for other than Senate service. Until someone proposes this in a

formal way I'm not going to take it up any further. Others are free to suggest it in the appropriate forum. We discussed how it is cheaper to hire lecturers and they are teaching 25% more than faculty. If we changed this it might not be true they are cheaper.

R. Armiñana - That part of compensation doesn't belong to the Senate, it belongs to collective bargaining.

R. Luttmann - My take on it is that it is certainly appropriate for parties to bargain it. There is nothing to prevent a decision by the administration here to give compensation.

R. Armiñana - Working conditions and wages are regulated by contract. Those issues are systemwide issues, not local issues, given the collective bargaining agreement.

R. Luttmann – Well, that is some foreshadowing of how this will end up. We'll put it on the agenda for the Senate.

### **What to discuss with Statewide visitors**

R. Luttmann - I put this item on the agenda as I thought we might want to have a little discussion on what we want to talk about with our visitors next week. It seems from the flurry of emails about the 2:00 meeting for faculty of the Executive committee or the entire Executive committee it would be good to talk about it. We decided last time we would handle the matter informally by requesting administrators who are members of this body to withdraw from attending giving us an opportunity to speak to the Trustees alone. There is now some objection to that. I assume you would like to reopen this for discussion.

N. Byrne - Could you clarify the nature of the objection?

R. Luttmann - Bernie and Bill should speak to this.

W. Poe - One objection is technical. I don't think bodies such as this body get to redefine this body. If you want the faculty of the Executive committee you can do that, but you cannot ask other members not to attend. The other objection is a political point. I am far more effective if I'm willing to speak my piece in public and appear to be insecure if I need to speak privately. Things that are wanted to be said privately it will lower the level of credibility. It's a weaker position. I won't participate.

B. Goldstein - When I first heard about the desire to exclude administrators, the impact didn't hit immediately. After thinking about it, my juices started to stir. I've been a member of this group for four years. I have been very supportive of the Executive committee. I felt personally affronted, and wrote the email.

R. Armiñana - According to the Constitution of the Senate, regarding Bill's first point, if you want to pursue this, try to amend the constitution to remove administrators from Senate committees. Since I have to approve such an amendment I may be very disposed to do that and this committee would have full responsibility.

A. Warmoth – I find Bill's second point persuasive.

W. Poe – I had a conversation with Victor. Victor felt people were intimidated to speak freely and openly. Because of credibility issue, if we feel intimidated we are not using faculty leadership correctly.

R. Luttmann - Where do you want to leave this? If we don't call it an Executive committee meeting there is no problem. What would be the committee's desire?

T. Wandling - As a junior faculty member I'm persuaded by Bill's point. I assume to disagree publicly is an important thing to do. There will always be tension with such a power dynamic. I would have spoken in favor of changing this body to meet with the Trustees. Now I'm speaking to keeping the committee the same.

P. Phillips - I agree with Bill and the direction we are taking as an Executive body. I do feel with the Trustees, the Chancellor's people come from the outside want to find access. We want to have meetings without the dynamic of the power structure of the institution interfering in the free flow of communication. We may not like that, but it is a psychological and sociological fact.

R. Luttmann - The meeting is scheduled at 2:00 in Schulz 1121 and our last decision that we wanted to have this be the faculty only. I'm getting the sense we are changing that.

T. Wandling - Peter's suggestion would change that dynamic. Any faculty that wanted to meet would be a good idea.

R. Armiñana - Let me remind you that some of the administration have that rank on this committee. They are tenured faculty. You might not avoid that problem. Lots of other administrators tend to be faculty.

P. McGough - I spoke out against this at the last meeting. I think the Trustees would meet with faculty without administrators. It's just that they would want to meet all constituencies. I barely know Chancellor Reed, but in the last few years the division between the faculty and administration is growing. I hate to see this as part of this university.

C. Nelson - I propose that we change our decision and have all the Executive committee meet with the Trustees. If the body wants to meet with faculty only, the administration would support that. Shall we agree the meeting next week will be a meeting with the Executive committee?

P. Phillips - We don't have to do that. We could simply say we are arranging a meeting with the faculty at 2:00 and any faculty member could come.

R. Luttmann - Yes we could do that. By the way we could also do both, but it might be difficult to arrange with the Trustee schedules.

W. Poe – You need to consider what you want to accomplish. If you have a structured review of issues you want to discuss with the Trustees then you are better off scheduling it as an Executive committee meeting of the Senate. If you want the Trustees to hear disparate concerns from individual members of the faculty, then invite faculty to

a meeting with the Trustees. It won't be the same thing if it is the Executive committee or the faculty at large.

P. McGough – The Trustees hopefully will visit on a regular basis. I ask you Dr. Armiñana. I don't think it makes any difference. It's good for them to meet with the faculty. It might be good idea to create peace.

R. Armiñana – I do not have any objection to that. The request I received was a meeting of the Executive committee of the Senate with the Trustees. I don't have any information that Trustee Tsakopoulos is coming, my understanding is that Pierce and Caldera will be here. Therefore I brokered the request I received. Glad to do it different if that is what I receive. Not a problem, it is a problem when a change of direction at last minute implies a change in the constitution that has not been adopted by the faculty and approved by the President.

P. McGough - When Trustees come they have the opportunity for meeting with the faculty. What would that look like? You as host would say there is an hour before the Senate for an open to meeting with faculty. Anyone else that wanted to show up would be welcome.

R. Luttmann - That could be presented to the Trustees and they can make the decision independently.

P. McGough - With the current labor situation they may not want to.

S. Moulton - Wasn't it last year the student's requested a meeting? Could we focus on what we are going to talk to them about rather than who will do the talking?

R. Luttmann - But back to Peter and his comment. Should we have a forum for faculty, in addition to the same meeting?

P. Phillips – It seems pretty well decided. The Executive should not have a meeting where we ask the administrators will not be there. Trustees should have access to faculty outside the power structure of the University. It may not be possible this time.

R. Luttmann - What would we like to say to these visitors? It is clearly a volatile time in the CSU because of the broad gulf between faculty and administrators at the bargaining table. I'm hopeful that talking with these high ranking visitors might build some bridges. It's good to chat a little about what we want to discuss.

C. Nelson – YRO.

P. McGough - Ask the alumni Trustee why there was such a unequivocally positive Chancellor's evaluation in one area, but in relating with faculty he has not done a very good job.

L. Schlereth - Because this particular Trustee is in real estate, if appropriate, it would be good to articulate support for faculty and staff housing in our area.

P. McGough - Where are we on that?

L. Schlereth – We are actively engaged in negotiations for land. We have support from the Chancellor's office. It is important for Trustees to understand how very important this is for our campus. If he hears it from professors that would be helpful. Particularly younger professors.

P. McGough – I saw in the paper that low end housing has gotten more expensive.

L. Schlereth - That would resonate with this particular Trustee.

S. Moulton – This issues is making it hard to hire faculty.

P. Phillips - Have we come to the conclusion that the only way to deal with housing is a supplement for housing?

L. Schlereth - Faculty salaries, in a region like this, even if we were to close the so called gap it would still be hard for faculty to buy housing and would still require a supplement. There is a third approach, mortgage assistance program, but it's not a terrific program.

R. Armiñana – There are legal issues about salary supplements under our current contract. Salaries are from tax revenues. It will be seen as gift of public property. There are significant IRS issues at the end of the day. To be very honest in a high cost area like this these, the only thing that will make a difference is a subsidy of the cost of land.

R. Luttmann – I'd like to remind you we are accumulating a list.

P. Phillips - The principle that faculty aren't responsible for curriculum has been moved a bit with the Trustees 120 unit imposition. That did not come from faculty, it was top down. Another big area was Cal Teach. That was the Governor's decision to supplement teaching programs, neither of which came from faculty. Our community has the strong belief that faculty responsible for curriculum development. We should make a statement about that.

B. Goldstein – I hope that we can make a pitch for instructional equipment for campus. It was in the budget for last year but was taken off. We are in dire need in all schools for instructional equipment. It is useful to define what we mean. We desperately need to revamp laboratories and other instructional equipment.

T. Wandling – Representation. I've noticed that morale has really gone down since I came to the CSU. Generally with this Board of Trustees, nothing is coming from leadership about what the Chancellor said about the Academic Senates being controlled by a bunch of radicals, and that is unfair representation. I'm interested to know what the Trustees think about that.

R. Luttmann - If you think of anything in the interim, let me know.

## 120 unit memo from EPC – attachment

R. Luttmann - This actually came from EPC at the end of the last academic year. We need to get this to the Senate. It is not at this body for discussion about the issues itself, but if it ready to go to the Senate.

A. Warmoth - This was not taken lightly by EPC. We had a fair amount of time looking at it. Our conclusion is that a small number of majors that don't have a fair number of electives. Using any other units is better done in an overall discussion of GE.

P. McGough - What procedure does the department go through? Do they have to go through EPC or the Senate?

A. Warmoth – There is no campus policy. If you have 120 units you can graduate, but department may have higher requirements.

R. Luttmann - Listed on back side of memo of is the number of elective units available.

S. Moulton – I have a procedural question. How have you gotten the word out to the departments that need to address majors over 120 units? Have you send out a request? It needs a timetable.

A. Warmoth – I'm assuming this would go through Academic Programs.

R. Luttmann – It hasn't been passed by the Senate yet.

C. Nelson - What is the procedure if someone wants to provide a statement of justification, who has the final say? Can department say that's what we're doing and that's the end of the process?

B. Goldstein – That is exactly what we will do.

R. Armiñana – There is an approval mechanism which ends in the Academic Affairs of the Chancellor's office for anything over 120 units. They will make a ruling.

C. Nelson - A step by step process would be good.

P. McGough - We need to determine how this is effecting our FTES. In Business we hear rumors we've lost FTEF because they didn't have to take 4 units.

A. Warmoth - No one has looked at that. Most people take more than 120 units. Is there really any reason for people to take 4 units they really don't want to take. The feeling was to support what the departments are doing. It's simpler to send it through Academic Affairs since it goes to the Chancellor anyway.

R. Luttmann - Are you proposing EPC would have no further involvement?

A. Warmoth - Yes that is my understanding. Unless something comes us that we should have more involvement in. Departments should come up with reasonable justification.

P. McGough - If it's going to the Chancellor's office it has more credibility if it has gone through a faculty governance committee?

A. Warmoth – The Senate can do whatever it wants to do.

B. Goldstein - What would EPC do?

W. Poe - When majors change EPC certainly reviews all changes that involves numbers of units. The Senate also reviews changes that require review of the Chancellor. It is a tradition on campus that EPC is involved.

A. Warmoth – I'm not clear we are changing the majors. It was the general sentiment at the GE committee that reducing the number of total units is basically about 4 units at the bottom of the pile. If the Senate wants EPC to look at it could they do that.

S. Moulton – There might be implications of academic curriculum and quality. Curriculum is our one and only authority. I ask that it be reviewed by EPC.

A. Warmoth – Should we amend this item?

R. Luttmann – Should we put it on the agenda with the expectation that EPC will want to amend it on the senate floor? Or if we come to a consensus here and you agree to send it back to EPC for amendment before it gets to the senate floor.

A. Warmoth - I could go either way.

W. Poe - What exactly is the Senate going to be asked to pass. This isn't even in the form of a resolution or policy statement.

R. Luttmann - That's true. My assumption was that we were proposing that the policy would be approved. It's true it isn't stated that way.

S. Moulton - It doesn't effect majors and does affect the degree. It should be the same.

T. Wandling – Is this going to be retroactive - starting this year? Then we need to push it through as fast as possible. We need to get information to the students and make provisions for them to drop. We need to put an effective date on this document and get publicity to students.

P. McGough – I agree with Tim. Would it be inconsistent with what EPC is presenting if Academic Affairs brought a description of the mechanism that departments above 120 units would use, and includes EPC , the Senate, the Provost and Chancellor's offices?

R. Luttmann - One problem is with timing. If the Senate approves all degrees effective that day at 120 units, but departments that want to maintain a higher number in the term there would have to be an window.

A. Warmoth - Either at the end of this semester or next semester.

P. Phillips – The Trustees approved this policy a year ago. Any student can petition to graduate with 120 units today.

R. Luttmann – That's not how I read the document. The Trustees set a floor on the number of units that we have to require. It's a floor. We sometime will go above the floor.

P. Phillips - We had long talks at Statewide about this. It was clear that students could petition at 120 units. Everyone has the right to demand a degree at the 120 units.

P. McGough – The only problem we have with over 124 units were the BS programs. The Trustee policy allows that set number of units that are there. Once they set that policy that's it.

A. Warmoth - Given the constraints I'm inclined to go with Phil to have a supplement with mechanisms that comes through Academic Affairs.

P. McGough - We urgently need to get our act together and at least have it retroactive to the beginning of semester. If one department is telling students 120 units and another isn't we will have a lot of unhappy students.

S. Moulton – There is also the catalog deadline. We will need this to be in the new catalog.

A Warmoth – Let's go ahead with this policy then request Academic Affairs provide a supplement document with implementation procedures

P. McGough - And an effective date.

R. Luttmann – It's very critical to have some date by which departments that need exceptions, unless there will be a window. The wording needs to be tinkered with to go to the Senate.

A. Warmoth - If someone like you would be willing to help fine tune it, as long as it doesn't change the content.

P. McGough – It is already a policy. What happens if the Senate turns it down? What they should have are procedures for exception to 120 units.

R. Luttmann - This is a curriculum issue. Faculty have the right to set degree requirements.

T. Wandling – If a major is not in compliance, this language speaks to being able to graduate with 120 units. It won't create that window that your are talking about. Some student have to take 132 because they couldn't double count courses.

A. Warmoth – I agree with your point about wording. I can check it out with EPC. I will be awaiting your consultation on what the wording should be.

W. Poe – Is it a resolution or a report from EPC?

P. McGough - We could change it to a report from EPC. If Bill's objection is valid, why is EPC doing approving this at all?

W. Poe - The report could be on the procedures being developed on the waiver of 120 units.

C. Nelson - I thought when this was originally brought to us we were being asked by EPC - does the faculty agree to this. Why does it say EPC approves rather than support?

R. Luttmann - Doesn't faculty go along with 120?

B. Goldstein - I gave the wrong impression. It was early in the game that it was not an adopted policy. I originally thought it was going to be more faculty driven. It's something we do have to do. We need to put a process together and I think we'll be fine.

A. Warmoth - It seems clear that the general sentiment at EPC was to look at each situation for the number of elective courses in most majors. It does not present a problem for vast majority of majors.

R. Luttmann - What do you want to do? Put it on the agenda with a supplement from Bernie? Or as a report.

P. McGough - Would it be appropriate for the Senate to approve the process?

B. Goldstein - Yes.

P. McGough - That would be an action item and the report an information item.

T. Wandling - EPC has already approved this as it is without further meddling. It has nothing to do with GE.

R. Luttmann - We'll leave it to Bernie or Art to get the appropriate documents to Laurel for the Senate.

A. Warmoth - The document here will go to the Senate.

### **Appointments to announce/propose:**

Les Brooks for Structures and Functions

Dan Markwyn for Lifelong Learning Institute

Elaine McHugh and Barbara Lesch-McCaffrey for Advisory Committee for DRC

Catherine Nelson for PBAC

N. Byrne - This is fairly clear cut. The most relevant information is provided on the agenda. I contacted Les Brooks and he agreed to serve on Structures & Functions. Dan Markwyn's nomination had been submitted and Structures & Functions authorized that. Elaine McHugh and Barbara Lesch-McCaffrey had expressed interest on the Advisory Committee for the DRC which we endorsed and finally Structures &

Functions recommended that Catherine Nelson be a member of the PBAC taking the place of Bill Barnier.

R. Luttmann - **The appointment of Les Brooks is to be done by this body. Are there any objections? He's taking the place of Duncan Poland. No objections noted. Done.** Any questions about any other proposals? We also have the replacement position for the Vice President of Development committee. We discussed last time a short timeline, I emailed you and from that there was a three way tie. I got little and mixed responses to my proposal, so I just did it and appointed Buzz Kellogg. Unless someone wants to over rule the Chair, Buzz is appointed. All seemed well qualified. Buzz will do good job on that committee.

### **Senate meeting room**

R. Luttmann - In good faith we booked Schulz 1121 thinking it was an ideal room. After our first experience, its a bit tight and we had lots of absences and soon we will have three more members. Despite this it looked like it was a room where you could hear better, but it was at least as difficult as others. So I asked Laurel to get information about alternatives. We have this handout with the results. The Multi-Purpose Room has costs, The Cooperage is not an option or we go back to the Commons. What do you want to do?

P. McGough – I've tried to get room on the third floor of Schulz. Never argue with a librarian.

R. Luttmann – We can't have food in other library rooms and the Cooperage is far way from campus.

**There was consensus to move back to Commons.**

### **Draft Senate Agenda – attachment**

Lifelong Learning Institute – T.C. 4:00 - Les Adler

Revision of Senate ByLaws – 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading - attachment

120 unit BA report and procedures – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading for procedures – Art Warmoth, Chair EPC - attachment

Compensation for Lecturers on the Senate – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading – Wm. Poe, Chair FSAC - attachment

Resolution endorsing CFA Teach-In – 1<sup>st</sup> Reading – Andy Merrifield - attachment

### **ADJOURNMENT 5:00**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*