

APARC MINUTES 11/29/16

Present: Chair Michael Visser (MV), Laura Krier (LK), Kathy Morris (KM), Mark Perri (MP), Beth Warner (BW), Suzanne Rivoire (SR), Richard Albanese (RA), Tim Wandling (TW).

Ex Officio Present: Laura Lupei (LL), Karen Moranski (KM)

Absent: Daniel Soto, Shawn Kilat (Ex Officio).

Guest: Katie Robinson, assisting with GMC Budget presentation.

Chair welcomed visiting new SSP representative Beth Warner to the committee, and introductions were made.

Chair Report:

Chair Visser handed out a new version of "SSU TT FTE 2008-2016" with graphs. KM discussed how the situation in her school has not worsened. The committee discussed various ways in which reaching back to the earlier years might change our understandings. BW asked if there was data on staff.

Laura Lupei will be making a scaled-down version of budget reports to Senate this week.

Academic Technology and Instructional Spaces sub-committee has been finalized by structure and functions. Until that sub-committee is formed, we are still in the role of providing input on pending matters. One such matter is the Stevenson remodel. Check with people in your school about what they like to see in instructional spaces.

MP added a note here to say that staff numbers have increased by 50 positions (in response to earlier question from BW). Data from prior work on SBC.

Approval of agenda. Added new agenda item at item #1: GMC Budget Presentation.

Agenda Item #1: 3:15. Laura Lupei presented GMC budget presentation (attached).

Questions & Comments:

Several questions about rise and fall of various expenses, explained by Katie Robinson (KR).

RA: Do fundraising staff work on state support? LL: No.

RA: Do they back more than they earn? LL & KR: Yes. See sources of support chart.

KM question about "Budgeted Expenses by Department." How many people are involved in the personnel costs listed towards that \$3M? LL: Over ten. 12-14 ish doing rough math.

LK: Performance budget are listed just for performance? How do you decide between artistic and performances? LL: At one time based on funding available.

MP: Is the \$2.3M general fund money? Why do we still need a reserve? KR: Because without the funding from cancelled grants, a reserve needs to be created. Why isn't this reserve money just listed as part of university reserve?

RA: Is this reactionary? A new way of presenting this info about the GMC? LL: No it has always been split.

Discussion from several members about the alignment of the \$3.1M with mission. How fixed are the costs?

Discussion about the way costs are assigned on page 8. RA said it is important to make the case to students about the value of the GMC to the education mission of the campus and/or the growth in music department. More discussion from committee about this topic.

Agenda Item #2: Sonoma State University Budget Cycle.

MV suggested we start with WHAT we want in terms of priorities more than starting with HOW we should achieve those things. EX: "Need increase of TT density in terms of advising rather than "we need more TT hires."

MV: When would be the best time for APARC to bring a list of recommended priorities to the Senate?

Discussion of timing of that report and the primacy of APARC or a request to the Senate to have some deference to the work of the APARC (TW).

Discussion about best way to present faculty collective voice on priorities.

MP suggested we could use CFA survey.

MV summarized his ideas:

SEPT: APARC makes an attempt to gather the collective voice of the whole (faculty). 3-5 key things the faculty wish the administration to make progress on in the next year. Finalize this by December.

JAN/FEB/Mar: Adjust plan with consultation from campus bodies.

April: Final Recommendation.

Further committee discussion about how best the committee might help the campus give voice to its collective priorities. KM brought up that we should include assessment data in our planning cycle.

Agenda Item 3: Faculty Consultation on Budgetary matters.

MV handed out current policy on "Faculty Consultation in University Decision Making" & also the current "Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters"

Discussion by the committee about the relative value of the two documents. Whether or not the two policies were both needed. Is one more of a procedural routing documents than an actual policy?

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Tim Wandling