

# **Executive Committee Minutes**

**August 28, 2003**

**Sue Jameson Room**

**3:00-5:00**

**Present:** Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Phil McGough, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Nancy Cunningham, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

**Absent:** Ruben Armiñana

**Approval of the Agenda** – time certains set for agenda items, item added: Senate Reassigned Time - **MSP**

**Approval of Minutes of 3/27; 4/17; 5/1; 5/15 - MSP**

**Correspondence Received** – None

**Appointment of ACIP rep issue (C. Renaudin appointed one year, ACIP only allows three year appointments) – attachment**

C. Nelson stated we received notice over the summer that ACIP only accepts appointments for three years rather than one year. We appointed Christine Renaudin for only one year to serve out Elizabeth Martinez's remaining time. **C. Nelson requested this be referred back to Structure and Functions to appoint Christine Renaudin for three years assuming she's available. MSP**

**Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – attachment**

C. Nelson presented the list of faculty eligible for Emeritus status to be sent forward to the Senate. She noted one of the names on the list is a lecturer and technically there is no category of Lecturer Emeritus in the Emeritus policy. She stated she plans to ask FSAC to consider that issue at a later date. The policy does say faculty and does not restrict it to tenured, etc. It was determined that this was not the first lecturer to receive Emeritus status. N. Byrne suggested using the term adjunct professor emeritus instead of lecturer emeritus. E. McDonald asked for a quick description of what emeritus status is and why it needs to be approved. C. Nelson answered that her understanding is that emeritus is an honor bestowed on retired faculty and librarians, SSPs, who have provided some heroic measure of service to the university. There are perks that go along with it. It is an academic issue and needs to be approved by the Academic Senate. **Motion to send the list of faculty eligible for emeritus status to the Senate – MSP**

M. Dreisbach suggested having members introduce themselves since there were new people. Introductions were made.

**Chair of the Faculty Report - (C. Nelson)**

C. Nelson reported she received an email from Bob Cherny, Chair of the Statewide Senate who is organizing visits with Kathy Kaiser, the new faculty trustee, to all the

campuses. She will be working on setting up a date for their visit. She asked if members had received the email regarding informal meetings with Provost Ochoa and the members had not. She explained that Provost Ochoa was continuing the tradition of every other week having informal meetings with the Executive committee just to talk about things off the record and give the members a chance to develop a relationship and communicate. The meetings are scheduled starting Sept 9 through Nov 11 from 3-4 in the Academic Affairs conference room. On September 9<sup>th</sup> Provost Ochoa cannot meet until 4:30, so the meeting will run from 4:30 –5:30. She asked who would be able to attend that meeting. Enough people were available to go ahead with the September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Associated Students is looking for a representative from the Senate to attend their meetings from 12 –2. She will announce this at the Senate.

### **Senate Reassignment time for Faculty Governance**

C. Nelson restated from her email that Provost Ochoa has asked the Executive Committee and the Senate to make a good faith effort to try to find 6 units in the total of 54 units to cut. The argument is that we all need to share in the budget cuts and the Senate should step up and take responsibility for their portion. A handout of the distribution for '02-'03 was passed around. She noted complications this year as there are committees without Chairs. Also last spring the Executive Committee did not formally approve this same distribution for this year. Provost Goldstein did approve the 54 unit total, but the body did not formally approve this list and send it on to Academic Affairs. She opened the floor up for discussion.

N. Byrne argued against cutting the units and stated that if the agreement is to make a good faith effort he would cooperate with it. He listed his two reason for not reducing the allocation of units to faculty governance. 1) Faculty governance itself is a pivotal value and increased workload should not be regarded as a concern with respect to a pivotal value. 2) The participation of new, junior faculty in faculty governance is dependent on having the reassigned time or they will not be able to fulfill their other responsibilities during the RTP process. He argued that new faculty provide new blood, enthusiasm, ideas and are very important to faculty governance.

R. Coleman-Senghor argued that it is a sad thing when faculty have to ask for support to carry through the business of the university. The support of the problem solving capacity of the faculty is so important to the operation of the university and there are many demands on faculty time. He gave the example of his own workload issues brought about by serving on the Senate. He asked Provost Ochoa where he saw the cuts would be possible, because he couldn't see any.

E. Ochoa stated a broader rationale for his request. As he looked at the cuts the Schools have had to bear already, he saw that precisely how we would have to deal with the cuts is by doing more with less or as much with less. He stated he thought that the Senate assigned time was not a priori untouchable and not subject to realities in the budget. More as a due diligence and perhaps as solidarity with faculty that are not part of shared governance, but are bearing brunt of resource reductions, it would warrant taking a close and good faith look at this assigned time and how it is being utilized. He stated he started out with the same average cut everything else is subjected to which works out to 6 units. Could 6 units be cut with an increased workload, but one that is manageable, not one that would make it impossible for people to participate?

Considerations such as new faculty status, particularly heavy workload in a committee would be part of the discussion. If after assessing those elements, we could see whether or not there were 6 units that could be spared in these extraordinary times. He stated that 6 units represents a comparable tightening of resources to the other things that we're doing. He asked the body to seriously see if it could spare it.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated that the faculty as a whole is taking the burden. Faculty governance is actually more burdensome than teaching, especially in the standing committees. An across the board cut strategy does an injustice to the realities of the workload. This is not an independent body like a department. All the faculty here belong to departments and have cuts there. This would be a cut on top of a cut.

E. Ochoa responded that he looked at it differently. He stated he saw that we are all the same people and that a cost/benefit analysis must have been done to allocate a certain amount of resources to instruction, research and governance. We have to cut back on support for teaching and support for research, shouldn't we cut back on support for governance to maintain the relative prioritization among those tasks that we had done before the cuts? If this does not get cut at all, it implicitly says this is more important than these other areas.

N. Cunningham said she was here representing SAC and that they were having trouble finding a chair, regardless of six units, no one is stepping forward. She stated she was basically told don't do it, it's crazy if you do that, it's too much work and we're not getting the payback, it's going to be hard for you in the tenure process. As librarians we don't get this set at all. For the other faculty on the committee the units were not even an enticement. So we have a problem here with junior faculty taking on leadership roles in faculty governance. We have a bit of a crisis. It is there a way that we can do it differently so, this it's not so burdensome. So these junior faculty can think about it in a different way. Right now they are afraid they can't handle it. She stated her concern for SAC and other Chair-less committees as well.

S. Hayes asked to deliver a rousing defense and then put forward a workload reduction proposal. In regards to Scholarship and RTP, she pointed out that the student body has been increasing in size and their costs have been increasing, so we are likely to see more scholarship applications and more work for the committees, not less. Secondly, the festival of hiring we've engaged in in recent years, we're looking at 25-30 people applying for 9 possible sabbatical slots, we are looking at an approximately 80 person tenure-track group last year and Spring is hell for both committees. The Chair gets it at least three times as hard as the rest of the committee in the Spring. She noted that it had come to her attention since she was Chair of EPC and after the constitutional reforms, a tremendous increase in workload of standing committee chairs has resulted in the attendance of chairs at Senate and Executive Committee meetings. When she was Chair of EPC, she only attended the Executive Committee when there was an issue that needed to be hashed out with EPC and only at the Senate when there was an action item. And that worked ok. Maybe it's time for the Senate to revisit the whole idea about how the standing committees chairs spend their time.

B. Moonwoman asked the Provost where would the money go if 6 units were taken from faculty governance and where has it gone already? Would it open up more

sections for the Fall or Spring? Most of the Lecturer Senators units have never been collected. So in theory they are banked somewhere.

E. Ochoa answered that most of the budget for his office has been devoted to backfilling the budgets of the Schools. And if we got a little more money from this, that's where it would go. The Schools would get a little more money. The Deans will have to make an assessment in their school how much would go to instruction and how much might go to other needs. He said he couldn't guarantee it would go dollar to dollar to sections, but it would avoid that much more of a cut to the Schools budgets.

M. Dreisbach stated she was intrigued by B. Moonwomon's comments. Since those lecturer units have not been used, there's the 6 units already. That is a place to start rather than making a permanent or semi-permanent adjustment. Faculty already has increased workload on the instructional side, so to increase it on this side, it's the same faculty members.

E. Ochoa replied that if it is the same individual they're going to work harder no matter what. It's just a matter of how they allocate their time or how resources go to support it. It would be a wash.

M. Dreisbach said that in the ideal world, yes, but if the Dean decides to spend the money on OE, it's not going to change. Our classes are already larger. She appreciated that E. Ochoa asked the body to make a good faith effort and that this is not a mandate. She stated she does know that the workload she has now as Chair-Elect and when she was Chair of SAC are not the same. There is a lot more work for the Chair-Elect. She argued against cutting the Chairs time. She noted the problem with reducing below 3 units per semester since most faculty teach 3 unit courses or there will be problems as R. Coleman-Senghor noted. RTP and Scholarship both have a tremendous amount of work in the Spring. The Lecturer's are not utilizing those units, so it seems like a place we could redirect those funds toward academic use.

P. McGough stated he was sympathetic to argument about sharing the pain, but in law they talk about reliance factor. This should have been done in the Spring. He argued it was unfair to have people commit to jobs and then say we're taking it back. The lecturer solution might be a solution, but they are essentially donating units they've already earned.

Provost Ochoa stated he would find out where those units are.

P. McGough stated for all but the SAC chair there is a reliance interest this year and the Spring would have been the time to do it.

J. Koshar as Chair of Scholarship stated as a faculty member she has taken more students in two classes. She also noted the extremely important community service work faculty do that they do not get release time for. Cutting units would be short-sighted because it becomes one more volunteer activity for the Chair. Having those units allows some wiggle room for time so she can think about ways the Scholarship committee can be more effective, run better, create opportunity for people on the committee who don't get release time to make their jobs easier. There are legal issues related to the Scholarship committee, as with RTP and Sponsored Programs that take

time to research and think about and plan. To cut units looks like a quick fix, but in the long term it may not serve the university to the best end.

R. Coleman-Senghor noted his long service in faculty governance at the university as the source of his knowledge of the work Chairs do and offered to provide Provost Ochoa a list of items that EPC worked on this year which would show how often EPC had to be at the Senate to answer questions. He noted the review process and how involved it could become. He noted the increase of his teaching and advising workload and the difficulty for new faculty. He stated our argument is that this is the best use these units can be put to.

N. Cunningham asked to explore what it means to be Chair and could things be done a different way.

C. Nelson offered as information, that the Executive Committee could not by fiat approve S. Hayes' proposal, but anyone could bring it forward formally.

E. McDonald expressed the value of the EPC Chair being on the Senate. As a junior faculty member, she thought she would greatly benefit from being in this environment of learning what the issues are that are coming up in the Senate and Executive Committee that EPC will have to deal with later.

C. Nelson stated that Elizabeth Burch who is Chair of Sponsored Programs sent an email in for the record to register her objection to cuts in the Senate's reassignment time. She talks about "university service being an integral part of university life and reductions in reassignment time in principle may be a slippery slope in which faculty may be expected to do more for less. That is of great concern especially with class enrollment on the rise." C. Nelson detected a general sense from the body that the units not be cut and asked did the Executive Committee wish to explore specifics suggestions for cuts or how did they wish to proceed?

N. Byrne stated his position remains as it was advocating not to cut any units. He did remark that the matter of the lecturer units use was important.

B. Moonwoman argued that the 54 units is a separate issue from the "banked" units because lecturers have earned them, but been unable to collect them. That may solve the problem for this year, but it does not address the main question. She stated she would very much like to see units that have been earned but not collected go directly to instruction. She urged the Executive Committee to urge that on the Senate as a recommendation.

R. Coleman-Senghor suggested that the 3 units of lecturer assigned time could be taken this year and used directly for instruction.

C. Nelson asked for clarification from R. Coleman-Senghor – Are you suggesting we recommend to the Senate that the 3 units currently allocated to the lecturers be cut?

R. Coleman-Senghor responded no. We have not distributed those 3 units to people yet. If we wanted we could distribute them to the Secretary of the Senate. We want to return it to the Provost for this year with the proviso that it be involved in direct instruction.

C. Nelson asked the Provost if we do that would the total amount of units we would be assigned be 51 and that would be the basis from which we would operate for the '04-'05 year? Assuming there are not other cuts, would that reduce the pot to 51 on a permanent basis?

R. Coleman-Senghor reiterated that his proposal is for one year only due to budget constraints and could be revisited.

E. Ochoa asked that before he answered C. Nelson's question directly he wanted to share some numbers. He stated that Academic Affairs is in the process of identifying approximately 2 million dollars in cuts in Academic Affairs. \$460,000 are coming out of the Provost office. Over \$200,000 at least in reduced operating expenditures for ESAS. The Library is taking a cut, too, of about \$78,000. The Schools have already identified cuts of about \$190,000. There's going to be a reduction in instruction costs as a direct result of the reduced growth target. That will be over \$400,000 and we still have to identify over \$500,000 to make that 2 million dollar number. That 2 million dollar this year is not bigger because of the 1.3 million that we got in one time money from the President. The 2 million would have been 3.3 million if not for the President's one time money. But we still have to identify 1.3 million for next year. So we are starting the first cuts this year and we know we'll have a big chunk of cuts next year. This is the context that I come to you and ask for a little bit of give. He said "I'll take whatever you can give me and I'll try to hold onto it as long as I can."

C. Nelson stated she thought that was a yes to her question. And Provost Ochoa agreed. She wanted to make sure the Executive Committee understood that if they go with R. Coleman-Senghor's proposal the total units will be permanently reduced to 51 in the Provost's mind.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated that he wanted to be clear that there are units floating there and we're trying to make sure they are available to the Provost because they have not been formally assigned. What we're doing as a body is saying just for this year. To agree to a permanent cut is to undercut the arguments we made last year and this year.

C. Nelson stated she understood and wanted the Executive Committee to be aware of the consequences of even recommending giving back units for one year.

B. Moonwoman stated that it is not clear that the Lecturer Senators will not want to collect those units this year. We do not volunteer to make a sacrifice that nobody else is making. She stated she was talking about the banked units. Furthermore, there is the Spring to consider. How employed will we be in the Spring?

M. Dreisbach noted that those units are complicated and Structure & Functions will be talking about the Lecturer units. There are some difficulties - how to pay the units, what to do if lecturer's fall below eligibility, it's a confused issue. The units right now are in limbo. What started the discussion was B. Moonwoman's remark about the "banked" units that were not collected in the past. We have a situation where SAC does not have a chair unexpectedly and everyone on the committee is fully scheduled and cannot step forward and there would be 3 units to use in an emergency situation only plus the banked units of the lecturer.

P. McGough stated that his understanding was that lecturers ran with the understanding that they would get a unit if they served a year. He was uncomfortable with the Executive Committee recommending to the Senate that we take these three units of the lecturers as a solution to this budgetary crisis.

R. Karlsrud agreed with P. McGough and with B. Moonwomon. He stated it is hard to believe that there will be many fully employed lecturers this year. To take the most exploited class of employees on this campus and propose to take those units to deal with the budget problem is a terrible solution. He said he'd be willing to bet, based on his experience as Dean, there are no "banked" units.

M. Dreisbach said R. Coleman-Senghor never suggested that we take the lecturer units only that we use any unused units from the lecturers who are at full time and cannot collect the units.

P. McGough asked the Provost when was the beginning of the 2 million dollar cuts, what is it being cut from?

E. Ochoa answered it is affecting the current year budget. We had to start cutting before we had a budget.

**P. McGough offered would it be a reasonable motion that since SAC doesn't have a chair that we give these back to the Provost?**

**C. Nelson asked if this was a formal motion. P. McGough answered yes** and asked if it appears that SAC will not have a Chair eligible for release time in the Fall.

N. Cunningham responded that the way things are looking the units will not be used in the Fall.

**R. Coleman-Senghor seconded the motion.**

R. Coleman-Senghor suggested the body was squabbling over pennies, but what it was really squabbling over were principles. It is a fact that changes with faculty assignments is not going to happen now. But we still have not gotten to the heart of the matter – how are we going to do more work with less. He supported giving the three units back and bringing to the Senate the possibility that units that are not used this semester by anyone be sent back to the Provost office. He volunteered next semester to give back 3 units of APC, but not in a permanent way.

**C. Nelson clarified that what R. Coleman-Senghor said appeared to be an amendment to the motion. She clarified that the his volunteering to give back 3 units of APC in the Spring would be part of the motion.**

**N. Byrne seconded the amendment to the motion.**

M. Dreisbach cautioned about doing this in terms of the lecturers because how the units will be allocated has not been discussed yet. If a lecturer is full time in the Fall and can't

collect the unit, but drops to 14 units in the Spring can they collect the unit? We haven't figured that out yet. How can we be giving away something that we don't understand? E. Stanny observed that if we use the SAC units for Fall and the R. Coleman-Senghor's volunteered units from APC in the Spring that's the 6 units. So we don't even have to deal with the lecturer units.

**R. Coleman-Senghor amended his original amendment to state that 3 units from SAC and 3 units from APC (Spring) be returned to the Provost for '03-'04.**

**E. McDonald seconded**

E. McDonald asked how are these 6 units we're giving back were any different from the lecturer units in terms of permanence of this reduction.

E. Ochoa replied that if what the body was telling him is that in your good faith effort you can only do this for one year and we have to take it on a year by year basis, that's fine. He would accept that.

N. Cunningham stated that if she reports back to SAC that we just voted out the three units they will shoot her. She stated she felt on uneven ground since the committee has only met once.

C. Nelson stated that her sense of the discussion is that the return of 3 units from SAC is because SAC does not have a Chair for this semester and that means that all of you are already fully committed with regard to your 15 units, so no matter who is chosen Chair, you can't use those units anyway, because you can't walk out on a class, etc. So when this is introduced to the Senate that point should be made in that context.

P. McGough remarked that in the past if the person wanted they could use those three units in the Spring.

C. Nelson clarified that then if someone becomes Chair in the Spring they only have access to 3 units.

R. Coleman-Senghor noted the workload is still heavy in the fall. He said he was making this concession because he sees no way out of this quandary except to do it this way, just take the load. Since the issue came up from Dr. Ochoa that we have to work harder then we have to locate it here. He stated he will, in fact, work harder for less. That's not any question of heroics. He wanted to see the body get on.

N. Byrne said he would vote against the amendment.

R. Coleman-Senghor noted that this is a recommendation to the Senate and SAC's concerns can be met there.

**Vote on amendment to amendment – none opposed**

**Vote on original motion – Recommending to the Senate to return 3 units of SAC and 3 units of APC (Spring) to the Provost for one year only – none opposed, passed.**

C. Nelson asked if R. Coleman-Senghor would pass on his agenda item concerning the role of the Senate Secretary. He agreed and passed out a handout to be discussed at the next meeting.

C. Nelson thanked the guests for being present. And turned to reports.

**President Armiñana was not present.**

**Provost Ochoa report**

E. Ochoa reported that he is a member of a Provost's Academic Technology Steering committee of the CSU which has been working on developing an implementation plan for the recommendations of the Technology Steering Committee of the Executive Council of the CSU. We've come up with a report that is being presented to the Presidents, to the full Executive Council and he anticipates that it will be approved. If it is approved there will be some initiatives launched in the area of academic technology. Out of the 8 that were initially recommended, 4 were recommended by the Provost's committee to be on the front burner. They are really broad. Two of them would be campus-centered with systemwide support and two of them would be system-based with campus support. The campus based initiatives are called Supporting Student Excellence and Success in the CSU and Technology Enhanced Teaching and Learning and Foundation Skills Support. They are still not recognizable as projects in terms of specific deliverables or timelines, etc. The recommendation of this implementation plan is for each one of these initiatives we develop an implementation team. Two that will be system based will be Academic Technology Shared Services Environment and the CSU Digital Marketplace. CSU Digital Marketplace would allow us to do systemwide purchases at bulk rates with an online environment. Academic Technology Shared Services Environment is one he is going to be watching carefully because, depending on how it is defined it could be as innocuous as just having a few standardized formats through which to exchange files across campuses or could go all the way to a single portal product to be used for students and faculty. So that will be an interesting one to watch. For most of these there are not new monies, so for most of these it's partly a matter of re-packaging or re-focusing what we do. But it does provide a good lens to view what we are doing in terms of academic technology. It also has some recommendations about process and structure that I think are going to be useful in our own assessment of ourselves on how we are going to move forward in the area of academic technology as a campus.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked if we could return to having access to our computer files when off campus.

E. Ochoa replied that we have a firewall on campus and given what's been happening recently with viruses, we need it. Sonoma is working on the Virtual Portal Access which will allow people to tunnel through the firewall with a password.

P. McGough asked if there was a timeline. L. Schlereth answered this academic year and he will get a more formal answer.

## **Emeritus Dinner input**

L. Holmstrom requested suggestions for speakers for the emeritus dinner. She noted Dan Markywn sent an email saying he could not speak, but was honored to be asked.

People suggested: Dennis Harris, LeVell Holmes, Ahmad Hosseini, J.J. Wilson, Tim Huston

C. Nelson asked for consensus on asking these people to speak at the Emeritus dinner.

The body agreed.

## **Return to Reports**

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth passed on his report, but offered to answer questions.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked if it is in the works or in consideration to go for a bond on the second half of the music project with a subsequent or attempted move of the faculty from Arts and Humanities into that new building. Is that part of the strategy that is evolving?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth replied that was more refined than what the campus is doing. We know that the State of California and CSU are likely to put a bond measure on the ballot in March for the November ballot in 2004. At the moment SSU has nothing to put on that ballot to be part of that CSU wide bond measure. Generally, when there is a bond measure you want to get a piece of the action, so the thinking is that something should be on that bond measure. That's about as far as I'd go. Our next project on the state capital outlay priorities is an instructional and faculty office building, so if there were other ways to leverage that with other campus evolution that would be good. That's as far as I'd go with it.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked L. Furukawa-Schlereth and Provost Ochoa to bring this to the Senate when it is ripe, but not when it's ripened.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth agreed.

P. McGough asked if there has been as progress in the faculty/staff housing project.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded yes, that the land in question is in litigation and the court date has been moved to October 7<sup>th</sup>. He asked at a future date to brief the Executive Committee in more detail about the faculty/staff housing issue.

## Senate Agenda

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes 4/24; 5/8; 5/22

**INFORMATION ITEMS** – End-of-Year Committee Reports from Senate, Senate Budget, Scholarship, Structure & Functions, Sponsored Programs, General Education

## BUSINESS

1. Election of two Senate members to Executive Committee for '03-'04. T. C. 3:15
2. Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – attachment T. C. 3:30
3. Constitutional Amendment: Lecturer Eligibility for Voting and Service – attachments – First Reading – M. Dreisbach T. C. 3:35
4. From S&F: By-laws change to SSP rep for APC - attachment - First Reading – M. Dreisbach T. C. 3:50
5. From S&F: Procedures for emergency Senate action - attachments – First Reading – M. Dreisbach T. C. 4:05
6. From Executive Committee: Senate reassignment time recommendation – attachment – C. Nelson T. C. 4:20
7. Joint CSU/CFA 2003-04 Supplemental Report Language document – attachment – B. Moonwomon T. C. 4:50

## MSP

### Statewide Senator- P. McGough

P. McGough reported he will not be at the Senate as he will be at the first Statewide meeting. He sent out the agenda on email for people's comments. He expressed his delight that C. Nelson is working on getting Kathy Kaiser and Bob Cherny here. He stated that it's unbelievable in a sense how influential the Chair of the Statewide Senate and the Faculty Trustee are because the people who make the decisions who influence this campus speak to them on a regular basis and they in some ways represent the faculty.

### Chair-Elect (M. Dreisbach)

M. Dreisbach reported that at the first meeting of Structure and Functions they will be discussing lecturer eligibility on the Senate, just trying to operationalize it. This was at the request of Bill Houghton and Judith Hunt who will be attending and she's also invited the current lecturer Senators to the meeting for their input and participate. She has contacted the Acting Dean of the School of Business that they need to elect three faculty members and a department chair to serve on new Dean search committee.

## APC

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that APC had its first meeting and identified our three primary tasks for the year. We are going to restructure ourselves into smaller groups to bring forward

more written material to this body and the Senate. Our plan is to find a way to meet with Provost Ochoa on a more regular basis and try to flesh out values associated with planning. We want to bring about coordination with Vice President Schlereth as well.

**EPC**

E. McDonald will bring a report to this committee in two weeks. EPC has not meet yet.

**FSAC**

E. Stanny had no report.

**SAC** representative had to leave the meeting early.

**R. Coleman-Senghor asked if his proposal regarding the Senate Secretary could be referred to Structure and Functions.** We might have reached the point that we can structure it so we don't need a Senate Secretary.

**C. Nelson asked for any objections for referring this item. None noted.**

**Meeting adjourned.**

*Submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*