

Executive Committee Minutes

March 28, 2002

Present: Rick Luttmann, Noel Byrne, Phil McGough, Susan McKillop, Tim Wandling, Catherine Nelson, Art Warmoth, William Poe, Sam Brannen, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

Absent: Peter Phillips, Ruben Armiñana, Bernie Goldstein

Meeting began 3:04

Approval of the Agenda

The Chair asked that Brookfield homes invitation to the Senate and Elizabeth Martinez asking for release time for international programs be added to the agenda. T. Wandling asked that mentoring for new faculty be added as well - *Approved*

Approval of Minutes – *Approved*

A. Warmoth announced that the EMT report will have its second reading the Thursday after the break. He offered to send a draft to the committee. R. Luttmann asked that he send it to Senate-Talk. EPC meets from 11-1 in the Sue Jameson room.

Correspondence Received: None

REPORTS

Chair of the Faculty - (R. Luttmann)

April 25th Armando Flores, the current mayor of Rohnert Park will come to the Senate. R. Luttmann expressed issues he wished to bring up to the mayor - concerns about affordable housing, the development north of campus, and conflicts between students of color and the Rohnert Park safety department. He also announced candidate meetings for the Dean of Extended Education. He is going to a meeting of all Senate chairs on the 4th in Sacramento. He has been notified that the chairs want to discuss the resolution our Senate passed last about Preservation of Access, Affordability, and Quality.

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

No report

Provost/Vice President (B. Goldstein)

No report

Statewide Senator - (S. McKillop)

S. McKillop is going to the State Legislature on the 9th. She will also attend a planning session for a 3-day conference on the master plan. P. McGough noted that a resolution honoring Vasconcellos was passed at the Senate. S. McKillop stated that the Modern Languages issue is still being worked on.

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

No report

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth asked if the following items that the CPC took action on would be of interest to the Senators. If so he could report on them next week. They are: naming rooms in Salazar Hall after donors, and a recommendation to the President to approve the new small vehicle and bicycle policy. The committee affirmed that these would be of interest to the Senate. He also told the committee that there is no money for workstations for new faculty and that he is working on identifying resources for new faculty workstations. He will let the Senate know about the bond issue for Darwin, if the President does not. S. Brannen asked for a hint of about the policy. L. Furukawa-Schlereth gave an overview. T. Wandling asked about bike lanes on campus. L. Furukawa-Schlereth stated that the alternative transportation committee will be taking this up next week. There was also discussion of where faculty and staff offices will be housed when the Darwin remodeling begins. L. Furukawa-Schlereth noted that SSU, in its terms for the renovation, is obligated to get rid of its temporary buildings. Thus, the Village will not be available for use by Darwin people during the remodel of Darwin.

Chairs, Standing Committees - (Coleman-Senghor, Warmoth, Brannen, Poe)

SAC

S. Brannen reported that SAC voted unanimous support for EPC's recommendation that EMT become a permanent program with the advising component remaining under SAC's purview. SAC was asked to present names for the College Who's Who, but only had two weeks to submit names. They will think about it for next year. Women Student Leaders of the Year were mentioned as possible candidates. ESAS will have an open house on April 6th for new admits. SAC also discussed the new \$1000 housing deposit. There was concern that it might drive away middle income students. A question was raised about CMS and registration. L. Furukawa-Schlereth noted that CMS plans to go live on May 6th for registration. However, they will have two systems ready to go in case CMS has problems. They will make a decision on April 17th about which system they will use. T. Wandling asked if CMS is holding up graduate admissions. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that the backlogs are gone now. Other members of the committee said there are still problems in some departments.

FSAC

W. Poe reported that FSAC thinks it has resolved the issues concerning the Evaluation of Temporary Faculty. He asked the body about how this new document should be presented to the Senate. R. Luttmann suggest that B. Moonwomon could withdraw her substitute motion and the one FSAC has crafted could be offered in its place.

S. Brannen asked for clarification on the full time appointment issue. W. Poe described issues associated with full time temporary appointment. It was noted that departments do the appointments. They could appoint jointly, but they don't. Thus, temporary faculty who are appointed in different departments will get evaluated in each department. T. Wandling asked if a department appoints for full time , does that impact the campus in terms of benefits. L. Furukawa-Schlereth answered yes. T. Wandling stated he thought this was a disincentive for joint appointments. He argued for the campus to be able to do that in future.

APC

R. Coleman-Senghor noted that APC had a very successful symposium. Information gathered will be put out to the attendees for restatement and evaluation. We will put that on the APC website (<http://www.sonoma.edu/Senate/apc/>). Groups will work through specific recommendations that come through the process and have proposals for the Senate and Administration. We also want to know how departments see themselves in the future, and understand how departments fit with their schools and how schools fit with each other. The next symposium will be on the convergence of technology and the liberal arts. We are working toward everyone on campus being involved at some level in planning. We suggest that the Senate standing committees work on vision statements too.

BUSINESS

Motion from S& F re: Academic Calendar and Spring Break – attachment

N. Byrne introduced the motion stating that faculty would like spring break to be consistent with K-12 schools. But some of the reasons against this position is that it could lead to only two weeks of school until the end of semester. Structures & Functions' proposal deals with both these concerns.

S & F' proposal regarding Academic Calendar guidelines:

Spring break shall match the practice of area public schools and the community colleges ~~except that in no case shall SSU spring break end later than April 15.~~ **but in no case will there be less than four weeks of instruction remaining in the spring term following spring break.**

Highlights of the discussion - Area schools are not in sync with each other, though some voiced uncertainty about whether this was really the case. Concern was voiced that this was

not just for faculty parents but also student parents. It was suggested that Sonoma County Office of Education (SCOOE) conform to us. It was noted that spring break could be separated from Easter. That such a dialogue be initiated with SCOOE was affirmed. It was suggested that we discuss this with the junior college to see if it matters to them or not. If so, it could strengthen our argument with SCOOE. As the Executive Committee we could encourage the President to delegate someone to talk to SCOOE. A dissenting opinion was raised arguing that it was arrogant for us to ask county schools to conform to us, as there are many more schools and we are one university. It was noted that perhaps it is not wise to bring up the challenging discussion of removing spring break from Easter. We are mandated to connect with our community and have lots of partnerships going on now, especially in the department of Education. It was approved that the Executive Committee ask the President to pursue this discussion with SCOOE. Structures & Functions' motion was approved for the Senate agenda.

Brookfield Developers invitation to the Senate

R. Luttmann explained his reasons for wanting to invite the Brookfield Developers to the Senate. The offer from the campus expired and Brookfield did not respond. Luttmann asked the body - Would you like a meeting? The body expressed a variety of opinions and suggestions. A smaller meeting with a specifically interested group might be good, but the advantage of having them address the entire Senate sends a message that we are concerned. Concern was expressed that it will be a hostile unproductive meeting. R. Luttmann's impression was that they are anxious to please us. R. Coleman-Senghor favored the meeting at the Senate to give them a wider range of response, then a have a de-briefing. Scott Miller could put out information ahead of time to the Senate. W. Poe stressed effectiveness. He argued that there was an assumption that the developers have made up their minds, and that the decision sits with the city council. We shouldn't spend all our energy with developers and not have energy to talk to political decision-makers. The specific concerns faculty have are the issues of affordable housing for faculty and students, and the nature of the commercial development. L. Furukawa-Schlereth stated he has seen their presentation which he described as pretty glitzy, but said it's what they don't tell you that is important. He recommended that the faculty ask them if the university district is consistent with Rohnert Park's plan of the university district. Steve Norwick claims the plan is out of sync with Rohnert Park's general plan. It was noted that the commercial development is going in last. It was recommended to use expertise we have on the campus. It was recommended that the Senate set the agenda if they come and to discuss further what we want to happen when they come. R. Luttmann will contact them and let them know we are not interested in a presentation, but we have specific questions to put to them.

Elizabeth Martinez's request for release time

R. Luttmann introduce the topic noting that Elizabeth Martinez, who is the coordinator of International Programs, wrote to him requesting release time. R. Luttmann suggested the response should be that the international program is not part of faculty governance and give her moral support to find units. S. McKillop offered that she didn't think that is standard practice across the system and she would be willing to find that out. R. Luttmann agreed that would be useful information.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked for time to ask questions of L. Furukawa-Schlereth related to APC's symposium on becoming a residential campus. The body agreed.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked who determines how space is used for the residence halls? L. Furukawa-Schlereth stated that the majority of the space is for student housing, and there are some common areas. Do students pay for those spaces? Yes, through dorm fees. Students and student organizations do not pay for use of space. Other campus entities would pay. A challenge we would face is if we delivered living and learning spaces together.

APC would like to find a context to ask the President to speak to his relationship to the long range planning document and where he is in agreement with this document. APC is looking at public acknowledgment of that support and is seeking that kind of commitment from the President. APC would like to request this body to ask the President to address this issue. **It was agreed to put this on the next agenda.**

Senate Agenda

FSAC's Evaluation of Temporary Faculty – second reading – attachment

Motion from Structures & Functions re: Academic Calendar Guidelines – attachment

ADJOURNMENT 5:00

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom