

## **Executive Committee Minutes**

**February 13, 2003**

Sue Jameson Room

3:00-5:00

**Present:** Catherine Nelson, Robert Karlsrud, Elizabeth Stanny, Rick Luttmann, Steve Wilson, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Ruben Armiñana, Bernie Goldstein, Susan McKillop, Karen Thompson, Robert McNamara.

Meeting began 3:10

**Approval of the Agenda** - SBC report and R. Coleman-Senghor's information item were added to the Agenda - *Approved*

**Approval of Minutes** - *Approved*

**Correspondence Received** - None

## **REPORTS**

### **Chair of the Faculty - (N. Byrne)**

N. Byrne is in Long Beach at the Statewide Senate Chairs meeting.

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

R. Armiñana - The budget is confusing. A special session of the legislature ended with no action taken, thus we are back at ground zero. There is the beginning of a petition to recall the Governor. This needs 900,000 signature to be put on the ballot. It would cost \$2 million to get the signatures and it is not clear who would put up the money. With a recall, a list of names of people who want to become governor is created and whoever gets one more vote is immediately governor. The lieutenant governor does not become the governor. This is all adding to the issue. I'd like to make two points: the governor's budget is the best budget for the CSU. There is no alternative. No taxes or fee increase revenues will do it. The Governor has specific cuts, money for more enrollment and a 25% fee increase for students. CFA is opposed to the fee increase, others are opposed to the enrollment dollars especially the community colleges. The Governor's budget is the best by a long shot. My number for this campus is, after all this information, plus 445 FTEs, there will be a reduction of 5 million dollars, which is 10% of our budget. This represents a significant reduction at all levels of the university. It's not a pretty picture for any division.

S. McKillop – I heard Susan Jones talk at a Higher Education Assembly committee hearing. The community colleges chancellor gave a marvelous talk, the UC rep said they would lose classes, and the CSU said we are doing fine. Is this part of Chancellor Reed's thinking. If we're quiet, we'll get the best we can?

R. Armiñana – We are not going to get any better. Right now it's best to hold to what we have. We have to manage these cuts. Crying any more doesn't do it. Yes, that's the strategy. Community colleges are hurting a lot. They don't have a leverage point. The UC is concerned primarily with losing their contract from the Federal Government, that will really hurt. State funding is not major arena of concern for the UC.

S. McKillop – Lui said my take is the CSU is pretty satisfied. She read it as not complaining.

R. Armiñana - The Assembly is in complete disarray. They are totally out of touch with reality. The Democrats are meeting to figure out who they are and might come out with a different speaker. Nothing cohesive is coming from the Assembly, possibly from Senate.

R. Luttmann - Any new information from your visit to Long Beach?

R. Armiñana - The budget hasn't changed.

R. Luttmann – We've got to plan for fall, create schedules, complete hires, what are we supposed to do?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – All four divisions will have aggressive plans for their reductions.

B. Goldstein - At the VPBAC this week, it was the first time we saw the numbers. We will be meeting with the Deans on Tuesday. We are holding off on positions to have time to process this information. The Deans will provide their plans they have been creating.

B. Karlsrud – Does the campus have any discretion over searches?

R. Armiñana – Let me give you some context. The contract with CFA and the CSU calls for 1200 searches, not hires. We took a survey about how many searches were needed and it came out around 1248. In a recent survey, it showed where we are in those searches. Our latest number, which is not solid, is there are 40 searches going on. At that moment the total CSU was at 1157. No matter what happens we expect some Unfair Labor Practice. There is strong interest to do approximately 1200 searches. We have been asked to follow our searches. Will there be at the end 1200, adjusted for 3% standard deviation? We don't know. I think we will comply with the searches. We have more leeway in hiring than conducting searches. Most campus intend to complete our allotment of searches, hoping to hire 70%. Chico is in real trouble. They cannot grow. They have reached their physical and planning capacity. No enrollment growth for them. They will probably cancel all searches. If this continues, they will have to fire, layoff, permanent employees. Searches and the ability to grow correlate with each other. We have a little discretion in hiring.

B. Goldstein – We need a balance between lecturers and permanent faculty. We don't want to layoff probationary faculty. The input from the VPBAC was very helpful.

R. Armiñana - I brought this to the Extended Cabinet. Regarding decisions coming from Schools two sentences are not allowed - The Provost made me do and the President made me do it. Deans in consultation with Chairs have to come up with - we would like to do X. Not all CSU's are going in the same direction. Deans need to know what resources they have and what will be cut, how that effects target, integrity of programs, and make recommendations about searches with that in mind. I expect what the Provost recommends to me is what the Deans recommend.

R. McNamara – From a planning point of view this has been really tough. Should I go make phone calls to people flying in or not? I don't know where the decision is going to be made. Is the Chancellor saying go with 1200 searches, understanding that they may not be hired?

R. Armiñana - Our understanding is that we agreed to searches.

R. McNamara - Are we using good faith putting forward these searches?

B. Goldstein - Go forward and don't make offers. That's the advice we've given to people. Its all contingent on the budget. There may have been a couple of offers on early searches.

R. McNamara - We're more at the beginning stages of searches. Do we put energy into a search or not?

B. Goldstein - To be equivalent, go ahead with searches.

R. Armiñana - By next Tuesday, we'll know.

S. Wilson – There is a lot of concern among lecturers on the 40 tenure-track hires, I've been counseled that to continue with this would be divisive. I'd like to talk about growth money. With an increased student population we get growth money – I'd like this to be keep in mind in the budget planning process.

R. Coleman-Senghor – There is a lot of discussion about reduction in classes and systems agreements, I'm unclear about this. Is it true that the money coming to the CSU was not to be for anything other than instruction?

R. Armiñana – The legislature has not given us any money. It's the Governor's budget. In that proposal there is enrollment money. To get this money, you teach that many students. You make the cuts in these categories. That is all at this moment.

R. Coleman-Senghor – 10% at all levels of university, is the decision made as to the allocation to Academic Affairs? Is the way it is broken up, up to the Deans?

R. Armiñana - The Governor gave us reductions in very specific categories. It's the first time I've seen this since the orange book. The Governor also recommended fee increases. And an enrollment increase of 7%. Taken cuts in categorical areas, add to that positive number enrollment growth and fees, and we can come out with a net number. That net number is approximately 10% of our general fund appropriation, not equally divided across campus because cuts came categorically. I came to the \$5 million as I do believe not all money in growth can be applied to budget reductions, also we have 445 FTES to teach. My guess 45 – 50% of money is needed to deliver instruction to people. \$4 million of cuts, then add 1 million, which is half of growth money, happens to be roughly 10% of general fund appropriation. It's not across the board cuts. They are highly specific.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – It turns out that the new figure in Academic Affairs is slightly less than 10%, and more in Student Affairs. It does net out to be 10% for the entire campus and does come in very specific way.

R. Coleman – You have to start with what you have. We have demand coming from the state and the union. The union and the Chancellor may end up in an argument, but we have to go ahead. We are going to be involved in these searches, and need to prepare ourselves to function without hires. Then everything else becomes gravy. If we take a position that we should not go forward on the hires, it's a volatile situation. Whether or not we can utilize hires, we are going to have to meet target. We have to limit capacity unless we have structural, physical changes.

R. Karlsrud – We may not make target if we let lecturers go. We would at least be looking at 1/2 million dollars in cuts in Social Sciences, before searches. Lecturer money will be pushed over to searches.

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

Information presented above

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

I brought searches information from the various campuses. Sacramento worked all through Christmas vacation to get searches done. I attended the hearings of the Assembly Higher Education Committee, chaired by Carol Liu. I understand that by Friday, February 17, the day that bills with fiscal impact must be filed, the entire committee is expected to sponsor a bill that will seek to stop the boom and bust cycle of funding for higher education. It will probably recommend a reliable and stable increase of student fees to allow students and their families to anticipate the costs of education. John Vasconcellos has information on his website so we can know where his mind is. Remember twice before in very difficult times somehow this campus rose above the bottom, somehow, some took part-time leaves, people learned how to do computers, etc. We should try to figure out, from the campus upward, about developing leadership and working

towards community. Community saved us twice. That's something we should seek to figure out. We don't want to be at each other throats. We can take the positive view to see how we could survive as well as twice before.

R. Luttmann (to B. Goldstein) – You have decided the Deans can make the decision on searches and hires?

B. Goldstein – The Deans will work with the schools. It's essentially a joint decision between the Deans and Chairs. Tuesday is the Dean's Council.

### **Chair-Elect of the Senate - (C. Nelson)**

I have two items from Structures & Functions. We ratified Lea Ann Schell on the DSS. The original deadline for nominations has been extended by a week to February 20th. There are a couple of offices that still need nominees. I encourage you to help fill those slots. We passed a resolution on lecturer senate terms.

S. Wilson – There is talk among lecturers to reduce the eligibility to 6 units. That would require another constitutional amendment.

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - I have four items – tomorrow is Valentine's Day and the official date that Provost search candidates need to have all materials in. The committee meets next week to screen the pool. We may seek guidance from the President if we need a second search, if we do not identify semi-finalists. We've had a very aggressive response to the recruitment. Budget issues are a concern among non-faculty employees. We will start the process in the Campus Reengineering Committee and begin to scrutinize, with a great deal of precision, support functions. The cuts are equally problematic on the staff side. I've invited the labor unions to the meeting. Senators, you may feel the anxiety of the academic support staff. I will report back on this. Next week my report to the Senate could be longer. I have information about the SFR issue as it relates to other campuses. The report should take 15 minutes and then questions.

C. Nelson - Is there any objection to using 1/2 hour for L. Schlereth's report?

No objection.

R. Coleman – Can you get the accompanying materials out early? The Senate needs time to read the SFR report. We would like to see it come only when people have sufficient time to read it and absorb it.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – It's not that complicated.

R. Luttmann – I have great interest in Larry's report, but I'm concerned there are items on our agenda that we've been postponing for months. We really need to get them off the agenda - the lecturer's resolution, the emeritus policy, the

teaching award, the GE statement. We need to make sure we have time to move on those things.

B. Karlsrud – Hiring freezes? Any possibility of hiring freezes?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – The hiring freeze from the Governor that came nine months ago is in effect. Vice Presidents have to sign off on hires now saying they understand the budget issues.

R. Coleman-Senghor – What is purpose of the SFR report from your point of view?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – When Steve Orlick presented the data on SFRs, I couldn't grasp why ours was different and wanted to get at why that was going on here. I know 10 years of data intimately. Why was it our campus would look differently than other campuses? Where is the money going if it didn't go to instruction? Also the email that went out this week stating that money is being redirected from instruction - As CFO I want to be able to answer questions from the media with accuracy.

#### **Chairs, Standing Committees - (Coleman-Senghor, Warmoth, Stanny, Thompson)**

R. Coleman-Senghor - pass

E. Stanny – no report

K. Thompson – no report

#### **Senate Budget Committee**

C. Nelson – At our meeting on February 11<sup>th</sup> after the VPBAC we have observations and recommendations. The SBC applauded the work done by the administration, especially Vice President Schlereth, in making the proposed mid-year adjustments for this academic year, without direct costs to students and instruction. Nothing that has been presented in the VPBAC or elsewhere has convinced us that the university should cancel any of the tenure track searches for Fall 2003. The SBC does not believe that the faculty has excessive reassignment time, and therefore do not believe that this is a fruitful area for reducing budget problems. The SBC believes that the university should consider having administrators with proper credentials teach a course each semester in their departments, or areas of expertise. The SBC wants to reiterate that the CSU fails to fully fund growth by both under funding new faculty at less than it actually costs to hire them, and because they improperly count permanent faculty workloads by assuming they are in the classroom at 15/15ths.

**The body asked that this report be made available to the Executive Committee at its next meeting and also made available to the Senate.**

## BUSINESS

### **Appointment of Professor LeaAnn "Beez" Schell to the DSS Advisory Committee**

C. Nelson reported that Structures and Functions has completed this task.

### **Resolution regarding Lecturer Senate term from S&F - C. Nelson – attachment**

C. Nelson - Structures and Functions passed this resolution unanimously. We approved the 3 year terms instead of 1 year terms, with a constitutional election at Fall '03 convocation. We recommend to wait until after Spring 2004 to implement the outcome. If passed the lecturers would receive staggered terms as stated in the resolution.

R. Luttmann noted that the constitutional vote can go ahead in the Fall and the rest of the changes could be made in the by-laws.

R. McNamara pointed out that the body was amending something the faculty already voted on and urged the body to think it through clearly.

**C. Nelson offered to provide the specific recommendations to the Senate and the body approved.**

S. Wilson suggested that perhaps a reference to the by-laws in the constitution would be useful.

There was a short discussion of the reasons for creating a 3 year term for lecturers.

S. McKillop offered a proposal to have L. Schlereth-Furukawa's SFR report and discussion deferred to the next Senate.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth noted that the SFR report could be deferred to another time and offered instead to provide a fairly detailed explanation of the budget at the next Senate which might be more valuable. **He agreed to put the SFR information out on Senate-Talk.** He noted that the more resources in tenure track positions, the worse SFR becomes. Mathematically that's the way it works. We have to make trade offs pedagogically within the budget problem.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated that was exactly the point A. Warmoth and he had been pursuing. It does cost more for a liberal arts education. High contact between faculty and students, advising and mentoring cannot happen when people may be here or not be here.

**C. Nelson suggested the Senate meet from 3-5:30, and to put L. Furukawa-Schlereth at a time certain of 4:30.**

**There was no objection.**

### **R. Coleman-Senghor's information item**

R. Coleman-Senghor stated that he had been involved with the wording of the Provost Search Resolution and that the press release sent out by the Secretary of the Senate recently did not express the mood or spirit of the discussion and was not appropriate for editorializing. He stated his opposition to sending the press release out to Statewide people. The resolution could be sent out with only the words that this is an action taken by our Senate. **He asked the body to consider retracting the press release.** He argued that the press release as it stands does not represent the Senate, it only represents S. Wilson's interpretation. He stated that the Senate Secretary has an obligation prior to sending out press releases to pass them by leadership as it is a communication of our governance to the public and the administration.

C. Nelson asked whether this issue was appropriate for the Executive Committee or the Senate. R. Luttmann stated that he believed the Executive Committee was appropriate.

**R. Karlsrud seconded R. Coleman's request to retract the press release because it does not represent the Senate.**

R. Armiñana stated that given what has happened, he is not able to react positively or negatively. He never received it and thus had no time to respond.

S. Wilson answered R. Coleman by stating that he passed the press release by Senate-Talk and asked for comments on it. One reaction said he needed to send background information on the resolution. Another comment was to not be specific and only write what he could document. Thus he took out the numbers and just stated the concern faculty have about money being diverted from instruction. For that information, he was referring to the SBC minutes of November 14th. He stated that the assertion that there is concern is documentable and that said concern was related to the resolution. He said "I stand by my actions."

R. McNamara responded to President Armiñana stating that we did discuss the issue of Provost Search committee in the Executive Committee and found you had made up your mind and hadn't put that forward to the Senate. The resolution expresses the sentiment of the Senate in this matter.

R. Armiñana replied that the resolution asks him to reconsider his decision. He stated if you believe that I've made up my mind, then write a resolution condemning me. He would accept that. He stated that if the body want him to reconsider a decision, give him a minute, or day or week to consider. The wording for official action requires appropriate wording. He is a stickler on that.

R. McNamara responded that the point was taken on reconsideration. The body passed it and he doesn't want to speak for the body. This was the first time he had heard about it and did not think Senate-Talk gives something the right to go forward. He expressed his displeasure with the process and since he had not seen it it does not speak for him.

R. Coleman stated that the Senate spent a lot of time fighting over the language of the resolution and the press release does not address the fundamental concern. He stated that it is a violation of the spirit of our practices to bring in extraneous issues to the



matter about relationships and the budget. On this resolution we want the President to be able to respond. He argued that Steve's action pre-empted the President's response. It's not good to put us in the position that the President can say, I didn't receive it and so I couldn't respond to it.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth stated that as CFO it was concerning to him to read about SBC's concern regarding redirection of funds. If SBC had this concern, he does not believe they have contacted him or B. Goldstein to discuss it. He stated that Bernie and I have bent over backwards to publish budget information. It was hurtful.

R. Coleman-Senghor argued that we are scientists and should put out the data and stand on the data. This kind of press release is more confusing. We as governance are put in the negative.

B. Goldstein noted that he has been involved in three different Senates and there's always been a process whereby resolutions go to the President.

R. Karlsrud stated that he argued strenuously against waiving the first reading of the resolution at the Senate. He finds it appalling that the press release went out. He noted everything the Senate did to craft a persuasive document and now the President does not get to respond. If the language of the press release has been included with the resolution, the resolution would have failed.

R. Coleman-Senghor suggested that a statement from the Chair be sent to the places that got the press release. He noted there is nothing wrong with an apology, that is strengthens you.

**R. Coleman-Senghor's motion: to strike all accompanying language from the press release sent out with the Resolution on the Provost Search and that a statement formulated by the Chair retracting said language be presented to the Secretary for the Senate to send to recipients of the press release.**

It was agreed to extend the meeting to 5:10.

**Vote on R. Coleman-Senghor's motion - *Approved, one abstention by S. Wilson***

**The Executive Committee requested that this action be reported to the Senate.**

S. McKillop noted that at the Statewide Senate the Chair forwards a packet of resolutions to the Chancellor with dates passed at the end of each semester.

**C. Nelson – Should the chair come up with procedures for press releases?**

**The body agreed.**

R. Coleman-Senghor stated that some faculty have noted that it is impossible to place a hold on registration for students who have failed courses. They can still sign up for courses in sequence. Can we find some way to make sure they can't sign up until they pass?

**B. Goldstein said he would look into this.**

**Senate Agenda for February 20<sup>th</sup>:**

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)  
Provost/Vice President, Academic Affairs - (B. Goldstein)  
Vice President/Admin. and Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth) **T. C-4:30**  
President of the Associated Students - (J. Minnich)  
Chair-Elect of the Senate - (C. Nelson)  
Statewide Senators - (S. McKillop, P. McGough)  
Chairs, Standing Committee - (R. Coleman-Senghor, A. Warmoth, E. Stanny, K. Thompson)  
Report of Senate Budget Committee - (B. Crowley)

**BUSINESS**

1. Revision proposal for the Excellent in Teaching Awards -- *2nd reading* -- E. Stanny -- attachment - **T. C. 3:15**
2. Revision proposal for the Emeritus Policy -- *2nd reading* -- E Stanny -- attachment
3. Lecturers' Resolution on Tenure Track Hiring -- *2nd reading* -- E. Stanny -- attachment
4. Statement on Mission, Goals, and Objectives of General Education at SSU -- *1st reading* -- A Warmoth -- attachment -**T.C. 4:00**
5. Resolution: Constitutional Amendment regarding Lecturer Senator Term - *1<sup>st</sup> reading* - C. Nelson - attachment

**ADJOURNMENT 5:10**

*respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*