

APARC Minutes – 12/4/18

Minutes: Beth Warner
Present: Mark Perri, Alexis McNab, Mike Visser, Elita Amini Virmani, Laura Krier, Matty Mookerjee, Daniel Soto, Beth Warner, John Dunstan, Elias Lopez, Laura Lupei, Karen Moranski
Absent: Merith Weisman
Guests: Lisa Vollendorf

Chair's Report (Mark Perri)

1. Chico has proposed some air quality criteria for the CSU to adopt regarding campus closure.
2. SSU has purchased the apartment building in Petaluma for employee housing.
3. The CSU is considering action against CourseHero.com for infringement. This site encourages students to upload their tests and class documents in exchange for other students' postings.
4. The deadline to comment to Mark Perri regarding the Strategic Plan is this Friday, December 7.
5. The Statewide Academic Senate will be meeting with the Chancellor's Office re: a new proposal for shared governance. Campus Academic Senates are discussing and voting on it, and so far one CSU has accepted and two have rejected on grounds it does not go far enough. This action was catalyzed by the CO's Executive Order 1100 regarding General Education, which was put through using an emergency procedure, bypassing the 75 days for faculty review. One main issue is that faculty are accorded responsibility for curriculum, but whether this is defined narrowly or broadly has a big impact on faculty oversight.

Agenda: Approved.

Minutes of 11/6/18: Approved.

Stevenson Working Group Update (Alexis McNab)

1. Working Group is identifying all possible study spaces. LK asked about criteria for these study spaces; AM = door to close; Group also considering who can reserve them, what to do if all booked.
2. Four firms are bidding and will be ready with their final pitches in February 2019.
3. EL clarified that there are two processes, one for the surge and the other for the architect's work

Business Item #1: Progress on Priority Recommendations (Mark Perri)

1. Description of program review process was outlined for newer faculty. MV made a request for an earlier workshop for departments being reviewed to get a head start.

2. Discussion re: MOUs and whether we want to say more about them. There are five MOU meetings coming up, and KM will send MP a list of how many have been drafted. A one-year-out survey is going out to programs with MOUs regarding their action items; Human Development is first up.
3. EV asked about decision-making regarding faculty hiring. EL described two different methods, one based on the Academic Dashboard and the other based on growth needs.
4. Brief discussion of how budget cuts are implemented and use of increased SFR to absorb.
5. MP will forward the document to ExCom on Thursday.

Business Item #2: Strategic Budgeting (Laura Lupei)

1. LL described the new budgeting process and its timeline. In the old process the budget was the plan but we are moving to link planning to the budget using assessment to create a strategic budget, which is the strategic plan in action. Metrics are being developed.
2. Operationally, this means creating an earlier annual budget cycle to create next year's plan before the end of the previous year. Do not want to wait for final budget from CO.
3. Old process was top-down. Now will be implementing a budget call to campus units. This year will be to Deans but will be implemented to subunits/departments in subsequent years.
4. Will now be planning for whole year, with some allowance for spontaneity.
5. Key will be tying budget requests to Strategic Plan, e.g. how does this expenditure support the University's priorities and goals, especially GI 2025? It is easier for some units to tie to goals than others, so KM will have a forum to help units understand how this works and how to do it. KM passed around a handout with 108 barriers to student success that could be used to support expenditure.
6. LK raised the point of Deans using MOUs as guidance for budget priorities, so is important for the MOUs to work with the budget cycle.
7. LL: The language is bumpy between units; some use "goals", some say "themes", so finding common understanding is important.
8. LL is awaiting budget priorities from the Cabinet. There will always be adjustments when we get the final allocation amount from the CO. The trick is to learn how to think farther out and to calculate ahead of time what to do if there is a budget reduction so it is not a scramble if it happens.
9. Budgetary matters will continue to go to PBAC so faculty input is considered. LL will work with MP to revise the budget cycle document to reflect the new plan.

Business Item #3: Faculty Consultation Policy (Provost Vollendorf)

1. MP gave a history of the 2006-5 Faculty Consultation policy, and LV described perambulations of revision APARC submitted last year.
2. LV and President Sakaki looked afresh at it, and determined that it seems to have been written in reaction to specific SSU historical and cultural moments. The existing document already captures how we are working together and how we will continue to work: consultation; respect; building effective shared governance.

3. Administration's conclusion: we want a loosely-framed document that serves us well, so it is better to keep the existing document and revisit it as necessary.
4. Discussion about how priorities are set and by whom, and when faculty gets review. PBAC is faculty voice for budgetary matters.
5. Discussion of faculty nervousness around rescinding budget consultation policy. LV: When fully implemented, new budget process will provide greater consultation. Key is to not encode processes in policy but to build strong processes on a basic policy framework.
6. LV: SSU's budget has been available but hard to understand, so it wasn't completely transparent. The process of consultation needs to include the right people, but also help people to have enough context and information to engage.
7. Discussion of faculty role in committees and suggestion to route through S&F, as expressed in rejected policy revision point #E: LV: OK for topics where Senate has purview, but can get cumbersome for ad hoc working groups involving whole institution, or time-sensitive, or legally-mandated groups. MP: we could develop a process document for working groups. MV: need a framework to decide when consultation is needed. DS: Need to move policies from safeguards to shared values.
8. LV: Shared experiences at SJ State and some best practices about constituting committees.
9. LV: Question is, is anything not expressed in existing policy? If not, need to address then. Bumps are inevitable but can be negotiated. So, can we live with the current framework, build a shared-values culture, then come back and evaluate whether this is fitting our purposes?

Meeting adjourned at 5pm.