

Executive Committee minutes

5/15/03

Present: Noel Byrne, Rick Luttmann, Steve Wilson, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Robert McNamara, Elizabeth Stanny, Robert Karlsrud, Karen Thompson, Art Warmoth, Bernie Goldstein, Catherine Nelson, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Susan McKillop

Absent: Ruben Armiñana

Guest: Susan Toczyski

Approval of the agenda – Additions to agenda proposed - French program 4 unit proposal with 3:30 time certain; Candidates for Graduation added to Senate agenda; Consent items for the Senate for unit changes in Psychology and English; Information item for Senate memo from the GE subcommittee; Naming of the Lifelong Learning Institute - *Approved*

Approval of the minutes of 3/27/03 – *Approved*

Reports

Provost/Vice President (B. Goldstein)

N. Byrne – Bernie, do you have a report?

B. Goldstein - I thought I had sent out an email addressing the issue of AB 81.

N. Byrne – Yes, you did.

B. Goldstein – We opposed AB 81. This is the Teacher's Education Council, we're opposed to AB 81 and we're very much in favor of extending the deadline for these multiple subject programs to go forward. It's pretty much detailed in the e-mail I sent you. I think you probably wanted to converse with the Statewide Senate on that.

N. Byrne – Susan McKillop is unavailable. Catherine, you have report?

Chair-Elect of the Senate (C. Nelson)

C. Nelson - The Structure and Functions committee is dealing, as is the Academic Senate, with a list of issues we're trying to get to before the end of the year and with any luck a couple of them will show up on the next Senate agenda. That's about it.

Vice President, Administration and Finance (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)

N. Byrne - Larry, I believe you have a report?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – Three items. The first one is actually really quite brief. It occurred to me that it may not be in everyone's knowledge, or perhaps I reported it

in a budget meeting, you all know that the Cotati-Rohnert Park School district will be leaving our campus at the end of this academic year. Did I talk about this here?

Several people answered no.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - The formal termination of their lease agreement is now been affected and we've released them from all obligations that they have. The reason they are leaving is their budget is so bad that they've actually closed a school due to loss of enrollment and their local School Board has chosen to move their administrative offices away from campus to the local school that is closed. So effective on or around the first of July those people who have been with us for almost seven years over in the Sonoma complex, the school district administrative offices will no longer be here at SSU.

S. Wilson – What about the technology high school?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – The technology high school will stay. And it will probably be here 24 more years depending on their enrollment but yes they are still here.

R. Karlsrud – Can I just ask if there are any budget ramifications?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – There is.

R. Karlsrud – What do they pay here?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – They paid to the Housing program approximately \$85,000 per year and that's going to be offset, we've chosen therefore not to build a new Police Services building and instead move the Police Department to that location. And then my division will have to pay that same \$85,000 to Housing, so Housing will stay whole. Some people are not overwhelmingly happy about putting the Police building right in the midst of the Residential Community, many other people think very positively about it. It's actually been received very well by the student body. We will have a strong presence of public safety perspective right in the heart of the residential community. It will probably take the fall semester to have that building slightly modified to accommodate the police.

N. Byrne – I presume the parents of students. .

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – The parents really like it for. And some of the students who are living right next to that complex are not as pleased. But it's the, what do they call it; the quiet area or substance free zone is the area that surrounds the police department.

R. Luttmann – Larry, I get the impression from housing that they could have used the extra office space themselves.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – I think we have them under control. If you're not knowledgeable about the complexes over there, there are two parts. There is the large part which was most of the School District's and then there was an apartment,

a Residence Life coordinator apartment behind the district offices space which represented the offices of the (unintelligible). Those spaces are going to be returned to the Residence Life coordinator which allow us to bring the Residence Life Coordinator right back into the residential community where they work and supervise, so that's good. So that will take care of that housing need. And it has the effect of opening four additional student accommodations where that Residence Life Coordinator was. Then on the other side, on a far north of the residential community where the technology high school used to be, we're retrofitting some of that space to create appropriate offices for the office of Residential Life. So Chuck Rhodes and his crowd will move there. I am pretty sure they're under control from everything that I've heard.

R. Luttmann – I just remember that there was a study by an off-campus group and I remember that they said in there that they were kind of surprised that the whole office structure that Residence Life had to function in was very limited.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – This will take care of that. Where the old Technology High School used to be is being retrofitting to provide appropriate office space for Residence Life. Chuck and his group are quite pleased. I think this will solve all those space issues. The other two items I want to talk about is where we stand on the third quarter financial assessment, we do this every year around this time to get a sense of where the campus stands as we come down in the final home stretch of the campus budget. Pretty much every thing that will happen has happened. There could be some things in the month of June that we all (unintelligible) generally not terribly likely. We have completed our work. We do the Academic Affairs division first because it's always the more complicated and more urgent. We just finished our last school, the School of Arts and Humanities about an hour ago and I am happy to say that Academic Affairs will clearly finished in the black. They will have resources on the table. We will fully address the access needs as identified by the school which turn out to be higher than what was reported in the VPBAC. If the \$917,000 number rings a bell to any of you, erase that number. Now think, one million three. The third quarter assessment has really helped me and Katie and, I think Bernie, understand much better from the Deans' perspective, and the various Deans, where they stand in light of the Governor's January budget and making sure we have the appropriate sections in place to meet to the target enrollment and that's going to require about \$1,300,000. \$650,000 will come from the campus Reserve. The remaining \$600,000 will come from year-end resources (unintelligible) Academic Affairs.

R. Luttmann – Larry, I missed that, why did that number go up?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - Why did it go up – benefits is clearly one reason. The initial projection that we were seeing at \$917,000 did not include employee benefits associated with the part time lecturers who are generally going to be teaching those sections, so on reflection we have to include the benefits at 27%. So that's the lion's share of it and the difference is, beyond that, is basically fine-tuning more what sections are actually needed. For example in the School of Social Sciences just last week Dean Leeder found that she add had to add one or to sections in order to accommodate demand. That will continue. That will change ever so slightly now as

we go through final registration. The Deans did not included benefits, or some how all benefits did not get included.

R. Luttmann – I thought they were on that paper you gave us at the VPBAC. There was a 26% added to salaries to accommodate benefits, wasn't there?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – I have to go back to that initial sheet, it is not accurate, the more accurate number is \$1,300,000.

R. Luttmann – I am puzzled over this. That number was derived on the basis of, there had been a projection earlier in this semester that we have the cuts and it would be around 227 sections and this money was to restore that. Now there may be additional sections needed but they wouldn't be under the heading of restored and there are also some backing out from that of the cost of the new permanent hires.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – I think there was a little confusion within the planning process about backing out. I am offering a little blindly here. I can tell you from my work with Katie and the five Deans and the five AMs the number that you should take to the bank is \$1,300,000. The \$917,000 is not a correct number.

R. Luttmann – Will we get something in writing?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - I think we will do that in the VPBAC. But most of these figures are coming out of the Schools and the division of Academic Affairs the \$917,000 is not correct based on my judgment, based on my work with the Deans and the five AMs, I think it is closer to \$1,000,000. I think it's actually \$1,270,000. But I'm going to say 1,300,000 because naturally there will be some fine-tuning issues.

S. Wilson – Will this latest revision be involved with some more lecturers getting hired back?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – Steve, I am going to defer that question to the VPBAC. I'm not as intimate or as close to the day-to-day operations. . . Bernie might know.

S. Wilson – What I know is that there are quite a few lecturers who are concerned they don't have any classes in the fall yet.

B. Goldstein – The 227 sections that we want to fill still need to be filled.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – They are not in the schedule. . .

B. Goldstein – Yes, part of the difficulty is we had to adjust a little bit upward on these dollars because what Katie and I did was remove the tenure-track group of faculty members and the adjustments in part timers from the whole analysis because they were not supposed to be part of the budget cut. So we removed those, but it turned out that the some of the Schools had already done it. So we had to put that back in and that adjustment plus the benefits adjustment is that it would be \$1,300,000 instead of \$916,000.

N. Byrne – Let me clarify that point, some of the schools already removed. . .

B. Goldstein – They had already added, modified their numbers on the basis of that they could not count the tenure-track faculty group that we had hired and the adjustments in part timers from that group. They were not to be included in the budget cut. So they were removed by us, but they had already been removed by others so we had to put them back. And that drove things up, benefits added up to \$1,300,000.

R. Karlsrud – It does not come as a surprise to me at all that they would need \$1,300,000 when the original cut in the Governor's budget was \$1,400,000 million for the various Schools and then they lost 160-170 sections, by my estimation, from the tenure-track hires, so you can see what, Larry and Bernie have been dealing with, what the Deans have been dealing with trying to figure out a way to get all these sections (unintelligible). I'm not surprised by the \$1,300,000. What surprised me is this morning's paper said we had a \$4,000,000 reserve, is that just wrong?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – Fantastically wrong. I think they got confused about the \$4,000,000 budget reduction from the Governor. We don't have a \$4,000,000 reserve, we have a zero reserve.

R. McNamara – A point of clarification. Can I ask you about your calculation, what number did you give?

R. Karlsrud – Sections?

R. McNamara – Yes.

R. Karlsrud – 160-170

R. McNamara – Out of the 240?

R. Karlsrud – The Governor's budget drove the loss of sections, that is in the nature of some 200 plus, but if you count tenure-track hires, you have to count the sections lost because you now have some on 12/13ths instead of 15/15ths and you have approximately \$10,000 more you have to pay every tenure-track new hire than the lecturer that you are theoretically replacing. And then you have to worry about the \$180,000 in search costs and that converts to sections. You add all those sections up, that's why I kept hounding Larry, are we going to lose those sections forever and the answer is yeah. But the \$1,300,000 is going to help a lot and some of these lecturers will be brought back. But I understand, and this is with talking to the Dean of Social Sciences, they hope to keep some of the money they had in place, some of the reserve money for example. but just mounted a fuller schedule other than they would have otherwise been able to, given the real money that existed on the table.

R. Luttmann – Today I think is when the Governor's budget revision comes out. Not addressing that, but still based on the January budget. . .

Several people noted that the Governor's revised budget was now available.

R. Luttmann – The administration is not backing off of its claim to replace all of the cut sections?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – There is a great deal of confusion. It has nothing to do with cut sections, it has everything to do with access. The administration is committed to making target.

R. Luttmann – No, no. I don't agree with that. We had a plan in February that would meet access, it was very simple, we just teach 200 people at a time. That however resulted in a lot of unrest on the campus. Students didn't like it, lecturers who were going to be let go didn't like it, permanent faculty for various reasons didn't like it either.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – But it did meet access.

R. Luttmann – Yes, it met access. So that wasn't the issue. The issue was how do we preserve the small class character of the institution and not lay off all these lecturers and so on. And that was what this plan for \$917,000 was going to solve.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – And it's my sense and I can commit to you that it's now \$1,300,000 not \$917,000,000. But the \$1,300,000 will do exactly that. It will meet access without the super size classes. And without the some of the more controversial things that had been modeled in the Schools. For example there were implications for the Ukiah program, there were implications for the Human Development major. There were a number of other things the Deans were thinking could be possible. Those things have been taken away. That's what the \$1,300,000 does provide. For one year. But it has gone higher for the reasons Bernie mentioned and I think I can say with reasonable certainty that it's covered for '03-'04. So that's all very positive. '04-'05 and the May revision are very different. When we have more time. . .

French Program Four Unit Proposal – A. Warmoth

N. Byrne – We will turn to this directly after our time certain. Art, do you want to speak to this first, the Bachelor of Arts in French?

A. Warmoth – Yes, I will. I would call your attention to the cover letter that goes along with the proposal that Laurel just distributed. In some ways it is probably the most interesting part of the whole proposal, but the cover letter is an information item, not an action item. Basically, what happened is the School unanimously recommended the 4 unit French proposal and EPC took a look at it and felt that the rationale was reasonable. There are only two, I believe, the GE classes and the GE subcommittee didn't see any problem with going to four units in those classes so the proposal on its merit seemed pretty non-controversial, but we also noted that there has been a pattern and this actually comes up in relation to the English department graduate program and other things we've seen or heard about that suggests there is a move in the School of Arts and Humanities to move in the direction of 4 units classes more broadly. And it was our feeling that this kind of change at the level of a

whole school, where it may well not be a very bad idea, raises all kinds of possible implications around scheduling, staffing, numbers of units students are likely to sign up for, etc. So what the committee did, I believe it was unanimous, we referred the matter to the Academic Planning committee to take a look at these larger issues in some kind of coherent way in a conversation with the School of Arts and Humanities, so I would anticipate therefore that EPC would not deal with any more 4 unit proposals on a piecemeal basis from that School until we get an assessment of the big picture from the Academic Planning committee. So our recommendation is basically that the Executive Committee go ahead and put it on the agenda for next week as a consent item with the cover letter for information purposes.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I would say that I agree with the general assessment of that conversation that went forward that this is a proposal that is being put forward by the French Department. They had in effect followed the guidelines specific to the proposal and at no fault of the department's their proposal was stymied in administration, stymied is not the word, but there were some details that were not followed through on it. Elaine Sundberg generously acknowledged in our discussions that this document should have come forward and so we want you to know, this is no fault for this coming at this time and making this request for a first reading as it lay on the (unintelligible). The difference lays in the approach EPC is taking it. I think the general consensus is that we do need to look at these issues, but I think also I would say that my colleague is, went a step too far forward in saying that EPC will not act on it and that is not the position that EPC has taken. What they have taken, is that they want this issue referred because it has implications not only for the School and implications for General Education. Since there is this move to start re-thinking General Education and units attached to certain courses we certainly want this body and APC, EPC and the Senate to address it.

A. Warmoth – I made that statement in the first person because it is my opinion as Chair and if we have another Chair the next Chair may have a different opinion, but personally I would not expect EPC to deal with these things on a piecemeal basis until the APC has sent us a recommendation.

N. Byrne – Is there any discussion?

R. Luttmann – I have two questions here. The conversion from three units to four units, you are going to telescope a 2 unit class into, a 2 semester class into one. And it says here you are going save 8 units this way.

S. Toczyski – In French what we do is we have a two year rotation, so we offer that class that remains, we offer it once every two years. Every other upper division class is only offered once every two years, so over two years, by getting rid of French 302 and combining French 301 and 302 into French 300, we save 8 units over two years and those are distributed over upper division classes over two years.

R. Luttmann - By saved you mean in terms of not what students are required to take, but the burden on your teaching.

S. Toczyski – In other words, we have two more units we could use to teach GE classes or next semester I'll be Chair, so that will be part of it.

R. Luttmann – What I'm wondering about is what affect it has on students? It says here something about increasing the major from 30 to 33 units. Is that all? That means that only two courses changed from 3 to 4 that were in the major or what?

S. Toczyski – No, we took the 8 units from French 302 and we added one unit to each of our 6 upper division classes.

R. Luttmann – Oh, so in other words you collapsed two 3 units courses into 6 units.

S. Toczyski – No, we collapsed two 4 units classes.

R. Luttmann – Two 4 units classes into one. That saves 4 units.

S. Toczyski – Over two years (unintelligible)

R. Luttmann – I mean for each student. I'm taking about from the student's point of view, they have to take, so they have 4 units less there, but 6 classes that were 3 are going to go to 4.

S. Toczyski – Right.

R. Luttmann – Ok, I understand that and that's ok with EPC? Generally speaking we've been rather hostile to increasing majors.

A. Warmoth – there was no sense that it would create a problem with scheduling.

R. Coleman-Senghor – What I want to speak to is the fact that this is not the place to debate it. I understand your point of view about where it is, but this is not the place to debate this. This should be a question of whether or not this document is in readiness. EPC has looked at it in terms of its readiness. If there is something substantial about it that you find, Rick, that is not in readiness. . . but we looked at those questions and we raised those issues and now it's seems we can get it onto the Senate and debate it. Do we want to send it as an information item or as a consent item that's the privilege . .

A. Warmoth – Would be a consent item or if there are concerns it could be put forward as a discussion item. But it requires two readings.

R. Luttmann – I understood that this was being proposed as a consent item and in that case the provision is that we have to unanimously approve it. So I'm trying to find out whether I can do that. Whether I can approve it. That's why I'd like to know, Art, whether this matter of increasing the size of major was discussed because I know it's been a concern in the past of the Senate and been for many years a concern of the Senate that there's a sort of an upward creep in the number of units required for each major which means a downward creep in the opportunity for students to take electives.

A. Warmoth – I have the answer. It was not specifically addressed as an issue.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I'd like to report just the opposite. There was an individual who raised this question and about what this would mean and that individual was myself. The other thing in that respect is that we issued a call from EPC, and I think it was reported out to the Senate, I can't remember in any detail on this, but EPC did an analysis of the number of units for all of the majors and discovered that the Humanities had the lowest average over all and this comes well under other majors for instance like the Business major or Sociology major, Political Science. So I do not think there is any danger here of that, but it talks to the other question you have, the creep upward, I thought that the rationale that was presented was a rationale of the integrity of the program and we did specifically ask that especially with regard to issues related to GE. There's a course here that had (unintelligible) we found out there had been previous practice and previous acceptance of this model and we also looked at the overall increases with respect to other courses. This falls really in the lower half of our course average.

R. McNamara – On that point it is noted that in fact it makes it on par with the Spanish major and which is also 32 units. It looks like it was addressed in fact.

A. Warmoth – I was going to point that out and I think Bob Coleman-Senghor is correct in stating that this in fact is still not a major that is among the ones that have a high number of units. The rationale in general seemed to make sense. I think as has been indicated was somewhat unfortunate that the routing of the thing coming to the committee was not managed the way it should have been and if it had come to us earlier we would have had time for a more extensive discussion, but the vote was unanimous.

R. Luttmann – I'm going to suggest, Art, that if we do indeed to agree to send this forward as a consent item in the time that is allotted to you at the Senate to explain it you probably ought to stress the fact that even at 32 units it is a small major, because I think that's certainly, that observation certainly assuages my concerns. I know there are many majors that are much bigger than that. There's one other matter I wanted to talk about and that is the last page in the packet regarding the letter from Paul Draper. I'm not quite sure what he's saying here. Presumably, there's some French course that satisfy the C4 requirements and they were 3 units and that was all that was required for GE. Now students can still take the course and count it toward the C4, but it's going to require a 4 unit commitment. And that has two effects – one would be to discourage students from taking that, if they can satisfy C4 with an actually 3 unit course, then they are more likely to do that. And the other concern and for those who don't do that, who actually continue to take the French course, its going to be a de facto one unit increase in their GE.

N. Byrne – I would just refer to the experience of the Sociology of Religion which is in area C3 and which is a 4 unit course. Susan Garfin typically has an enrollment of around 70 and it's on Friday afternoons. It's an unpopular time, it's a 4 unit course and it's jammed. I don't know, at least in respect to discouraging students, I don't believe the absence of any student that would otherwise have it for 3. In terms of the

unit load in a 51 unit size of GE does bear on that, I guess I would note too that we do have a number of courses in GE especially in area C and also in area D and E that vary between 3 and 4 units. So it's not inconsistent with establish practice.

A. Warmoth – I would just add that my expectation would be that students that want to take French for GE is because they want to take it and they are not going to be significantly affected by the fact that it is 4 units instead of 3 units, on the contrary I can imagine a case being made for the notion that students would appreciate having the extra unit given what's involved in learning a foreign language. So I would not see that as a particular problem.

C. Nelson – I just wanted to back up what you said. There is a similar situation in Political Science with course (unintelligible) which is GE and we retain (unintelligible) We have no problem filling the class.

S. Toczyski – If I could just add too, right now all of the lower division French classes are 4 units and in fact they are 4 units plus a unit of lab and those count for GE already and I think that's why the subcommittee decided that this was not going to be a problem because we have several 4 unit classes already. Also the students that will be taking these classes for upper division GE would probably be majors anyway because you have to have a strong mastery of the subject to take history or literature in French. They would be there either way. I don't think they would care if it's a unit or not. They're there because they're majors already.

N. Byrne – Is there any other discussion?

R. Coleman-Senghor – I do think, to pick up on the concern that Rick has, that there is a course, just to make sure we are all on the same page, the FLIE (unintelligible). And we addressed that by looking at how this represents, this comes then to those larger policy issue of the general shift in the School and the implications of when the shift occurs and Rick's point is that we have a 51 unit GE requirement and that we are going to have to look at that in all courses including the ones in Sociology, and other courses that are 4 units because if a student takes a combination of requirements many will be exceeding those numbers of units so the point is well taken. I think that the case being made here is a very strong one. I do not think the French department is going to design a curriculum they need to survive that is going to reduce the number of students in the classroom rather than upping (unintelligible) and I think this is what part of this revision is about, not only changing the workload of the faculty, but organizing it in such a way that they can do it with (unintelligible).

N. Byrne – Any other discussion? We are two minutes away from our next time certain, there is no more discussion, I should ask. . .

R. Coleman-Senghor – I would like to propose that we do send this forward as an information item and. . .

A. Warmoth – Consent item. . .

R. Coleman-Senghor – Consent item, excuse me, if anyone then has considerations they can take it off.

N. Byrne – I was going to ask if there was any objection. If there's one objection then it can't be a consent item.

R. Luttmann – I'm not going to object, but there might be objection at the Senate and we need to be prepared for that.

A. Warmoth – I will revise the cover memo to include the suggestion you mentioned.

N. Byrne – Taking account of Rick's observation, **I hear no objection to placing this as a consent item on the Senate agenda, so we will do so.**

It was recommended that S. Toczyski be present at the Senate meeting.

Graduate Program proposals in Psychology and English – A. Warmoth

N. Byrne – Item three – Graduate program proposals in Psychology and English. Art would you like to speak to those?

A. Warmoth – I actually realized I need to revise the cover memo because I had 4 unit courses on the brain and what is really going on here that they are increasing the number of units in the major by 2 units in each of the areas and it is related to the shift to 4 unit curriculum in English major, but in the Psychology major it actually represents an attempt to expand the programs because the M.A. in Psychology is increasing an applied professional program and the sense that in all these areas students need additional knowledge and skills. The proposal was unanimously supported by the Graduate Studies subcommittee so we're forwarding it with a recommendation that it be a consent item for the Senate. If you turn to the second page look at Professor Merrill's letter of support (unintelligible)

R. Luttmann – Could you summarize for us what is being proposed?

A. Warmoth – What is being proposed is 2 unit increases in each of the options within the Psychology major and within the M.A. in English.

R. Coleman-Senghor – No, with the M.A. in English they want to go . . . (people talking over each other) the original proposal they sent forward was 30 thinking they could combine two courses 500 and 501, but further discussion led to the conclusion that combining was (unintelligible) so they would like to go to 34 units instead of 30. So they are adding one 4 unit to their program packet.

R. Luttmann – So once again we're seeing degrees sneaking up. (people talking over each other)

R. Coleman-Senghor – Nothing like adding a little tone to the damn thing.

N. Byrne – Is there any discussion of this proposal?

R. McNamara – When reading over this I'm clearly ignorant in these areas, but when I was looking at the Art Therapy program, I was looking at the justification for the change – Diane Sawyer's ABC News Special and Hilary Clinton at the Rotunda, I just had questions about this and what you thought of this, especially as it's your department.

A. Warmoth – Well, I think the point is not that it is part of the justification for the increase, but simply that it's pointing out that Art Therapy has moved from being kind of hidden off in the corner in terms of professional Psychology to recognition in various national media as an important branch of the profession of counseling. Basically, it's part of the generic profession of Masters level counseling. So I don't think that this is presented as any kind of justification, but simply information about what's going on in terms. . .

R. McNamara – Ok, because it didn't convince me and I thought maybe it convinced you.

A. Warmoth – No, the main point is that I think the graduate faculty felt that additional units in research would be useful to people going into that field. That's basically all that needs to be justified.

N. Byrne – Is there any other discussion of the proposal being put forward as a consent item?

S. McKillop – Could I ask the pattern of Master's degrees generally, is this within range that we usually do give or take a little. Or does this make it quite a bit different?

K. Thompson – I'm on the Graduate Studies committee and according to Title V we have to have a minimum of 30 units in a Master's program and beyond that there's room to move.

S. McKillop – So it's within the range that's respectable?

K. Thompson – Yes.

N. Byrne – I believe the Counseling program is at 60, is that correct?

A. Warmoth – Yes, that's correct.

N. Byrne - The range quite huge.

C. Nelson – The M.P.A. program is at 40.

A. Warmoth – This is basically an attempt to make this a more solidly professional program which would be in relation to the M.P.A. and M.A. in Counseling. People

would actually go out and practice with this degree, so in some sense even with 36 units it's kind of a minimum number of units.

R. Coleman-Senghor – As we're looking at this and making observations I thought Charlie Merrill made a very important point in making the presentation that these programs are basically free market programs. They have to go out and get a clientele. So that they can't raise the units too high because that is going to cost people more money to get through the program, so what they've tried to do is to balance it between the curricular needs and the selling of the program. When you consider those two factors, then you get a sense of exactly (unintelligible) measured this business of curriculum and cost.

K. Thompson – I was hoping that if we are going to send this before the Senate that maybe some of these proposals could be more complete because I've seen the full ones that have come through Grad Studies and I think the English one, there's just, there should be another page here at least here, I think, that explains what's going on and also maybe on the depth program one, if it could be made a little more clear what's being added what semester. I think when we saw it at Grad Studies it was a little more clear, that's all. It might help the Senators.

A. Warmoth – I'd be happy to go back and get that addition.

R. Luttmann – Since there is a page missing here, I understand that the English department's concern is by going from 3 units to 4 units on virtually all their courses, the Master's had to cut out two courses, but they want to raise it. . .

R. Coleman-Senghor – That's the second page. The second page laid out, it had first the portrait of what they had on the 3 unit, then the portrait of what they had on the 4 unit with the combined courses and on the third page they were showing you what they had with the 4 units with the additional course. So what's missing is exactly the page that Karen is talking about.

R. Luttmann – So only one course.

R. Coleman-Senghor – They're basically adding one course. If you note on the 3 unit package they had that course 500 and 501. Then when they went to their proposal they brought before us last year, they cut out the 501 and they combined it pedagogically until folks argued and people finally figured out how impractical and difficult that would be. So now what they did is presented to us a package in which they returned the course, the 501, with the consequence of a 4 unit increase in the pattern.

R. Luttmann – That's on research methods. . .

R. Coleman-Senghor – They've always retained the research methods. Research methods was never out of the program.

C. Nelson – Your cover memo says EPC unanimously approved the attached proposals for units curricular in the M.A. in Psych and then when you get to the

Charlie's memo it says proposed to change the units for their respective programs, for the area in Psychology they're only talking about increasing areas 2 additional units. I get the impression from the cover letter we're going from all 3 unit courses to 4 unit courses from your memo and from Charlie's that they're only increasing each concentration by 2 units overall is that right?

A. Warmoth – That is correct. In the proposal for Psychology. As I explained I kind of spaced out when I did that cover and was in a big hurry. I screwed up. I will fix that before it goes to the Senate. Basically, my understanding it is clearly a 2 unit increase and needs to be made clear that it is a 2 unit increase in the Psychology options, mainly to make them somewhat more substantial as professional programs. That it is a 4 unit increase in English that is related to the conversion to 4 unit courses.

C. Nelson – Charlie's memo on the English department is not entirely clear either so if you could re-do the cover memo I think it would save a whole lot of confusion.

A. Warmoth – Also as has been pointed out there are apparently a couple of pages missing from this version of the English proposal.

R. Luttmann – I'm still confused here. Bob, you said 500 and 501 which were 3 units each before are going to be cut back to a single 4 unit course.

R. Coleman-Senghor – No, if you look at the program look at the number line. This 500 and 501 are two distinct courses if you look down below that they put it into a 4 unit course, then combine the two.

R. Luttmann – I don't see that because although the 501 is missing, there's still 4 units Critical Theory.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Yes, I see what you are saying. There is a change here. The proposal which they had . . . this is incorrect. And I think that we should get it correct before it goes on. So you know what the proposal is, I think what happened is that before we got a document was revised and the change was not appropriately made. But what they've done is they had 3 unit courses and they had the 500 and the 501. Then what happened in the discussion in the department as to what they would do as they moved to 4 unit, they did not want to increase the number of units in the program, so that their plan was then to combine 500 and 501 into a 4 unit course. They thought about that and found out how unworkable that was and so they then brought this proposal, which is not correctly laid out here, where they have now a 500 course for 4 units and a 501 course and they've kept everything else, so now we've gone from 30 units to 34.

R. Luttmann – Reducing by one the number of electives, I guess.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Yes.

R. Luttmann – But there were four electives before and this one is now two, so the extra course would be an elective.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I think the thing that we need to do here, and I apologize for not catching this as a representative of the School, and that is we need to make sure this document does have exactly that description and I'll make sure it's in your hand by Monday.

A. Warmoth – I just wanted to observe this discussion as well as the earlier discussion really underscores what we felt in EPC was really the basic issue that needs to be addressed which is that there are larger implications of moving from 3 to 4 units and apparently, what happened is that the English department discovered that, they couldn't go ahead based on just changing the course values, which would not normally come through the committee process so they had to increase the number of units then it had to go to the Graduate Studies committee and come to EPC. So I think that in terms of some of the kinds of concerns that have been raised I think the fact that we've taken the action of flagging this as a larger issue and recommending that it be looked at in a more comprehensive way by APC as well as having some guidelines as it comes back EPC and its subcommittees really gets at what I see as being the main underlying issue we need to be addressing and on the basis of the fact that we are attempting to address that issue I think it's ok to permit these specific proposal to go ahead with the kinds of elaborations and amendments that have been suggested.

R. Luttmann – Art, may I ask and, Bob possibly this is addressed to you too, is this honestly an unintended consequence of the change in English from 3 to 4?

R. Coleman-Senghor – Depends on what you mean by that.

R. Luttmann – Well I mean did the department decide to change it and then sort of as an afterthought realize that there was going to be a problem here or . . .

R. Coleman-Senghor – I think that what happened is that the department, well, I'll tell you what happened. I started barking about this from the git and I said you cannot combine 500 and 501. And there were a lot of people in the department saying they saw no problem with it. And I said you haven't talked to both of them, I've talked to both of them. So now when they had to sit down and actually go through the business of looking at the curriculum and they discovered that the methodology kept squeezing out the theory and the theory kept squeezing out the methodology and they were not achieving the goals they wanted to achieve just on paper. So then they said oops, let's go back and look at it and the only way we can solve that problem is to go to 34 units. The point that was made by Helen Dunn was that this is something that should not present any problem and her reasoning for that is 1) that is was significantly under the Graduate course requirements as reflected at other CSU's for English and 2) that it did not represent a significant increase in graduate program generally. It was a minimum of 30 units and so that these four units did not represent any significant take on it. So yes, the answer is yes, they did think about it, they went forward with other proposal and then they found out that that was not going to work. They took this issue, by the way, to Graduate committee and the Graduate committee looked at it and accepted that argument and they found no problems with it.

R. Luttmann – Can I just follow that? I just wanted to say that I’m trying to get the English department here, but there might be a lesson to be learned here in case other departments are thinking of doing this. Especially, if you have a graduate program, and not every department does, but we’ve got to think the whole thing through and I would suggest that, no I think I won’t. I’ve made my point.

S. Wilson – So I gather then the other 4 unit course that would bring this 30 units up to 34 is on the other page.

R. Coleman-Senghor- Yes, it is. It was on the backside, I believe.

B. Goldstein – I just want to emphasize the point Art is making about the broader implications of this. It requires some extensive discussion. As I listen to this conversation we’re talking a lot about units, but what is the academic justification for changing from one to the other? And what about the student/faculty ratio. And what about scheduling and all the kinds of things you would imagine would have something to do with the implications. It seems almost like the cart before the horse. A wider discussion should be had, but I understand what you’re trying to do.

A. Warmoth – Well, I hear you agreeing with Rick and I agree with Rick and I think the basic point that you’re making that there is real reason to think this sort of thing through in a more comprehensive framework. I’m less concerned about it because it is a graduate program and as a general rule these days 30 units is a pretty minimal for a graduate program. And also because we have this subcommittee structure, to some degree we rely on the Graduate Studies committee doing the depth work in the same way we rely on the GE subcommittee doing the depth work in their areas of expertise because otherwise we wouldn’t be able to get to the agenda. But I think the basic point that you’re making which is that this was an example of unanticipated consequences and therefore we need to start anticipating the consequences was clearly the intention of EPC when we referred the whole question of what’s going on in the School of Arts & Humanities to the Academic Planning committee for guidance from that academic planning perspective. So basically, I’m entirely in agreement with the basic point that you make.

R. Coleman-Senghor – This is not to belabor the point, but to say that I’ve listened to this debate in a number of different quarters. Social Sciences went this way years ago, 4 units. And what our new faculty are looking at is the disparity between their workload and the workload of their colleagues. Also we’re looking from an institutional point of view of this mix of 3 and 4 unit courses that have really, in one sense, no pedagogical grounding, but has in effect an institutional staffing issue. That’s really what this is about and how we articulate that need with the curricular need and the pedagogical need is something that we are going to have to, as a governance body, address very quickly. Because one of the things that concerns every faculty member coming to this campus is what is the workload. Part of that workload is the number of preparations. So this is a good place for this body to look at that issue and speak about its implications around everything from hiring to what we expect people to do in terms of their teaching.

A. Warmoth – I wanted to respond directly because I think the implications that this is primarily a staffing and workload issue is not necessarily accurate. I think the fact that the School of Social Sciences went through the process of getting there first, as I said it may well be a great idea, but I think there needs to be a process we go through to get there for any School that wants to go that route and that process needs to look at all the academic and resource issues that surround that change. That's all we're suggesting.

K. Thompson – This is a little off topic. I was just wondering if I could get a time certain for the business item on the grade appeal procedures?

N. Byrne – We'll put you down for 4:35.

K. Thompson – Thank you.

N. Byrne – In the course of the discussion it has been said some adjustments will be made, that is the missing page for the English proposal will be provided, a correction of the current page of the English proposal will be made and provided, that Art there are some adjustments you would make prior to its appearance before the Senate. With those understandings are there any objections to sending this forward to the Senate as a consent item?

R. Coleman-Senghor – Yes, and I'm actually responding to Rick. I would like to make sure this pass under the eyes of Rick and the Graduate, that's Karen right?, Karen's eyes after Art has written it up because I do think he's pointed to the confusion associated with statements on this page. It clearly needs to be cleaned up before it moves forward. With the proviso that it be done and that it be corrected by Tuesday morning at 12, so folks can get a handle on it and it can go out in a ready fashion.

A. Warmoth – You can have it by Monday.

K. Thompson – I recommend you put it by Charlie Merrill. I'd be happy to look at it. He's the Chair.

N. Byrne – So your suggestion is that this pass be approved by Rick and Karen and if it is proceed to the Senate as a consent item?

R. Coleman-Senghor – Yes, and approved by Charlie Merrill because it actually has to go back to the maker to make sure those errors are correct. And if we make a change here, even though I have an understanding of it and I've presented my understanding of it, if the maker looks at this document and says this is not what we intended, then I would be in error and I would like to make sure that I'm not subject to that by taking it back immediately back to Helen Dunn, having it pass under the eye of Merrill, come to Art and then to Rick and it will be in readiness.

A. Warmoth – I think what happened in Psychology is that it was front to back and only one side of thing got covered, because there are pages missing in the other one too. I think in terms of corrections we're talking about in English is clearly needs to

be re-thought through by makers and I'll run the Psych stuff by Charlie to make sure it is complete.

R. Coleman-Senghor – And I'll be more than happy to work with English.

N. Byrne – With that understanding is there any objection to adding this as a consent item on condition that these changes be reviewed by Charlie Merrill, Karen Thompson and Art Warmoth.

R. Luttmann – I would say the whole committee. . .

R. Coleman-Senghor – Yes, of course, I will send it out to everyone.

R. Luttmann - Well, the assumption is that if you look it over and you still have concerns, then you let Noel know and it has to go on as a business item.

N. Byrne – Is there any objection to that? That will occur.

No objections to the Graduate Program Proposals in Psychology and English being a consent item on the Senate agenda.

N. Byrne – Regarding the proposed constitutional amendment I'm going to put that on as a 4:25 time certain, the Lecturer eligibility, and I'd like to invite Larry Furukawa-Schlereth to proceed with his report.

C. Nelson – I'd like to remind the committee that items 1 and 2, if at all possible, need to be heard by the Senate so we can have a constitutional amendment in the Fall. So we need to get to these today.

N. Byrne – What we will do then is we will proceed with business item number 1.

Proposed constitutional amendment from FSAC: Voting and Service Restrictions – C. Nelson - attachment

C. Nelson – This committee referred the proposed constitutional amendment from FSAC regarding Voting and Service Restrictions and the idea was to include a certain class of Student Service Professionals called "Academic Related" to be able to vote for and participate on hiring, retention and promotion committees. The reason this is before you now is that Structure and Functions when they first looked at this a week ago today, turned it down because they did not think that there were certain classes of Student Service Professional, but fully believed Student Services Professionals were not included in the regular faculty tenure, tenure-track faculty RTP process. After the meeting I had a conversation with two members of FSAC, found out that indeed we were wrong, the committee was wrong and agreed to put the constitutional amendment back on Structure and Functions agenda for next Tuesday. And the reason I'm requesting that this be put on the Senate agenda is that in case Structure and Functions approves it as is, with no change, it could go on the Senate's agenda and we could include it in an election about constitutional

amendments at the faculty convocation in the Fall. If there's any objection to doing that whatsoever, I'm comfortable with it. This is just an expediency, if nothing else.

N. Byrne – I put myself on the speaker's list. I would comment that in the discussion at Structures and Functions an important element of the objection is one that I cited, and I could be wrong, but the Student Professionals often don't have doctorates, they don't have a disciplinary association and I know that in many instances when faculty come up for promotion the issue of their promotion is a very close issue and also how they are ranked on a promotion list. Someone can be approved for promotion but it is clear only so many of those promotions can go forward. Someone can be ranked low and therefore I felt that this was definitely a delicate issue.

E. Stanny – So the intent here was to include everyone that was evaluated by the University RTP in the group of people that could vote for the University RTP. So this group of Student Services Professionals - Academic Related is a very small group. In fact there is only one member in it right now, Scott Miller, and that two other people in there who are retired are Phil Brownell and Debra White. These people are considered probationary and the other people who are considered Student Services Professionals now are temporary and so this set is very small and not the set you were thinking of.

N. Byrne – That is true.

E. Stanny – So it seems to make sense to include everyone that's evaluated for tenure by the University RTP committee, they should be able to vote and this would include this small group of Student Services Professionals who are covered by U RTP.

R. McNamara – I think here we just need to ask if this is going forward or not because I'm really hearing us arguing that.

C. Nelson – And I understand that this might be unusual and like I said if there is any problem, fine. I just thought we might give it a shot and see what happened.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Mine was a question of procedure. This will require in effect a waiving of a first reading. I guess my question to you is how controversial do you think this is?

C. Nelson – If it is clarified that this particular category of Student Service Professionals A) are indeed to subject review of the campus U RTP process. Secondly, that they have the academic qualifications in terms of a PhD. as a terminal degree then I don't think it's going to be controversial at all. If that is not the case, then I think it will be controversial and I think it should be held over for more debate.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Can I observe that there are people who can serve on the RTP committee who do not have PhD's as long as they have the status of full professors.

S. McKillop – The studio people only have Master's and in music.

C. Nelson – Then that's something else for us to consider. All this should be in Structure and Functions. This is what we need to get at.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Just in terms of clarifying that that doesn't seem to be an objectionable issue so that should not be a major question.

C. Nelson – If the committee's concerns can be cleared up by Elizabeth coming to see us on Tuesday, this will not be controversial because we will have answers to all the questions. If they can't, it will be controversial, we will not change our minds, we will pull it from the agenda, it's that simple.

R. Luttmann – I'm a little confused now as you said Scott Miller is the only person in this category. So I'm assuming your saying he's not a member of the faculty.

E. Stanny – He is a member of the faculty.

R. Luttmann – Then what's the problem. It says here, it already says members of faculty who are tenured and so on and he must be faculty, he's on the Senate. I don't see the problem.

E. Stanny – This issue is that it's confusing, he's faculty but in the collective bargaining agreement he comes under Student Service Professionals not under the faculty category, even though he's covered under the bargaining units. It's a quirk in the classification that he's not covered under faculty.

R. Luttmann – This reference page that you gave us Article II spells out who is in the faculty. Now does Scott Miller fit one of these categories?

E. Stanny – That's the thing is that he's in 1.3, but 1.3 isn't in 3.24.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I think that Catherine's point is taken. What I would like to do is to see this put forward as an information item and I'd like to have it on the agenda. Business, item, excuse me.

C. Nelson – And I promise if there is any controversy we'll just pull it out.

R. McNamara – I just want to say we haven't gotten to what the agenda is going to be. We're going to have a very full agenda and I think what we really need to do is to prioritize and it's not to say that this is not going to come forward and I know it is about the constitutional issue in the Fall Convocation, but I really would like to see if it really is ready to go forward in terms of priority. Because we're going to have to waive the first reading and just because of the way business happens there, people ask questions, like we are here.

C. Nelson – Noel and I have actually talked about exactly the same thing.

N. Byrne – Our concern is as strong as yours, believe me.

K. Thompson – I was going to say we're past a time certain.

N. Byrne – If there is no objection, we'll put this on the agenda. Later we will prioritize the agenda.

C. Nelson – I will notify the Chair after Tuesday's meeting as to the status.

N. Byrne – And now we turn to our 4:25 time certain, the naming of the Life Long Learning Institute and there is a document that each of you have.

Naming of Lifelong Learning Institute – B. Goldstein

B. Goldstein – This should be straightforward. I have attached the policy to the document so that at the end you can see what it is that we are doing. We have a committee to evaluate the naming of Lifelong Learning. The question of naming went to the Dean's Council, they approved it unanimously and the name that they have suggested is Osher Lifelong Learning Institute at Sonoma State University. If you thumb through the pages you can see that there is a committee that did the work and the committee was essentially derived from the identification of the members from the policy. There is the suggestion that we have that naming and this is a matter of consultation with the Executive Committee, it doesn't have to go to the Senate. It's just a consultation with all of you. I'm hoping that you will see fit to go ahead with it because there's a million dollars involved, it's a tremendous program.

N. Byrne – You're not proposing that this be on the Senate agenda, but that this be. .

B. Goldstein – The policy calls for it to be consulted with the Executive Committee. It doesn't say anything about going to the Senate.

R. Luttmann – The only question I have is why you have not included Mr. Osher's first name.

B. Goldstein – I'll ask the committee why they didn't. Originally I had Bernard Osher there. I'll add that if they want to include that to, and that's okay with everybody, we can do that. But this was the name and it may be the name that was requested through the Osher Foundation.

N. Byrne – Apparently there is a discussion about why the first name was left out. I'll see if I can locate it here.

S. McKillop – I just have an idle curiosity, they never tell you, who the other institutions are, wouldn't that be in your document? Six CSU, four UC, we have no idea which ones they are.

B. Goldstein – You want to know which ones they are?

S. McKillop – Sure do. Curiosity killed the cat.

B. Goldstein – I certainly want to feed that curiosity. I will get those names.

S. McKillop – Thank you.

N. Byrne – In looking at the first two pages that were addressed in the Dean's Council dated April 24th, in the middle of the bottom paragraph there is that statement in our view naming the Lifelong Learning Institute in honor of Bernard Osher Foundation, but then later on in the second page middle paragraph, in his proposal Dr. Adler mentioned the Osher Lifelong and then again in that paragraph, there is a statement in our unanimous recommendation that our program be named the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute at Sonoma State University and it says Dr. Adler has incorporated this modification to his original proposal.

R. Luttmann – But the modification has nothing to do with (unintelligible)

B. Goldstein – The key thing was to make sure we said Sonoma State University.

R. McNamara – There is the Osher Center for Integrative Medicine at UC. It is used.

S. McKillop – That was my question. Is it for these that we don't know the names of are using the same pattern as far as Osher is concerned, then at least consider joining the pattern. From Osher's point of view they may want to have the name common to all of those.

B. Goldstein – That's correct.

R. McNamara – I would like to make a motion that we suggest that the Provost clarify whether they want the Bernard there or not and support it.

N. Byrne – Is there a second to the motion that the Provost clarify this matter with the relevant parties and support it?

C. Nelson – Second.

N. Byrne – Any discussion?

Vote approved with none opposed.

R. Coleman-Senghor – As a point of information. This issue of naming has come up on a couple of other occasions, exactly what in your mind is the role of the Senate with respect to the naming of buildings. I realize we have a policy and a state policy, what is the role of the Senate?

N. Byrne – I would like to turn to this, but we do have a 4:35 time certain.

Proposed Grade Appeal Policy update from SAC – K. Thompson – attachment

K. Thompson – There is the updated Grade Appeal policy in the packet you got with your Executive Committee agenda and I also have a handout to further clarify the

proposal modifications that we're recommending to the Grade Appeal Procedures policy. This policy has actually been through both FSAC and SAC a number of times, so initially the background on this was that there was a new executive order that came down from the Chancellor which required that our Grade Appeal Policies needed to make sure we had some kind of procedure for students to follow, or anybody to follow, in the event that there were some kind of improper procedures followed by the Grade Appeal Hearing Jury. This new executive order superseded the one on which our original Grade Appeal Procedure was based. So the first set of changes simply follow in terms of these allegations of improper procedure, so on the first page there are some changes underlined and crossed-out which are simply to bring it into conformity with that Executive Order 792. And also wherever the old executive order was listed, it's been changed to 792. But the real changes are in section 2, E, 8 about five pages from the back. It says that the decision of the Grade Appeal Jury shall not be subject to further review excepting cases where there have been allegations of improper procedure. And then in section 2, H, we actually have listed out which procedures should be followed in the event that there are allegations of improper procedure. This was something we were not in compliance with because this was a new executive order. So that was the first change. The second change is that now the contact person for student's filing grade appeals is going to be the Grade Appeal Coordinator and not the Student Grievance Coordinator anymore. And this was decided because Academic Affairs was the contact for Grade Appeals while Student Affairs is the contact for Student Grievances and currently we have a student Grievance Coordinator who is handling all grievances and grade appeals. It's a conflict of interest and some people say that it's just too big a workload for one person to be doing. Richard Rodriguez is currently the person who is doing that. And so our recommendation is that this new Grade Appeal Coordinator be the contact person for the Grade Appeal Procedure policy and Dr. Link and Provost Goldstein that this is the proper way to go.

S. McKillop – My only small question is I realize this procedure probably fits in a manual and has other numbers, but I would suggest because we do have a full agenda that when it's published for the Senate that there be page numbers down here to shorten the conversation.

K. Thompson – Yes.

S. McKillop – And put it in your cover packet here.

N. Byrne – Is there any objection to this proceeding to the Senate as a business item?

R. Coleman-Senghor – A point of clarification. I'm sorry I didn't get time to fully read the document and my concerns as I look through it what does this mean for the faculty in respect to workload.

C. Nelson – Oh man! I'm right smack in the middle of all this. That's why I'm oh man-ing, not because of what you said.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I'm just trying to say where in the document, did I miss it? I was looking for a place in the document.

K. Thompson – Currently, what I can tell you is that currently the person who is doing this, . . . is Richard Rodriguez faculty?

Several people said no.

K. Thompson – Currently, it's not being handled by a faculty person. I don't know what Bernie will decide as to who this Grade Appeals Coordinator will be.

C. Nelson – The current Student Grievance Coordinator is Sharon Dzik.

B. Goldstein – It's a good question about the workload issue. We are currently the possibility of selecting somebody among the Academic Affairs administration to do the coordination. It seems to be half an hour, but some grade appeals take 20 hours, weeks to go through.

C. Nelson – No, the half an hour doesn't even come close to it. I'm telling you.

K. Thompson – So it sounds like the answer is that it's not going to be a faculty workload issue.

R. Coleman-Senghor – This is a proposal going forward but that question was not answered in the proposal. I think in that sense it's not in readiness.

B. Goldstein – What's not answered?

R. Coleman-Senghor – The question of who's going to . . . I'm just asking, is there a designation in this document as to how this will be handled.

C. Nelson – I'm not sure I can help clarify, but I'll try. The way the process works is that the Grade Appeal Coordinator is the contact person for the student, generally someone in the administration who takes the initial appeal, the form. What happens is that is turned over to the Chair of the Grade Appeal Panel who is a faculty member, from that point on the faculty member goes on. What this does, the only specific faculty whose workload will increase, if I understand what's going on here is the Structure and Functions committee because they will act as the jury if someone appeals the decision of the Grade Appeal Jury based on procedural factors. So in terms of specific workload, it's the Structure and Functions committee who may have to call a separate meeting, meeting outside the regular schedule to accommodate this, which I might add might be very difficult to accommodate.

R. McNamara – Just as a suggestion, if this goes forward that maybe some explanation of that process, as it is a bit involved, and that it might help smooth it again. Some brief, just what you explained, would be helpful to a lot of the Senators because otherwise we don't know how we fit in this as faculty.

R. Coleman-Senghor – That's all I was trying to say with my cursory reading of it. I just didn't get that and I thought (unintelligible)

R. Luttmann – Well, there's a reference throughout the document now to the Student Grievance Board replaces by Grade Appeal Coordinator. It occurs to me that there is no explanation in the document anywhere about who either of these people are or how they are selected, is there?

K. Thompson – I think there is, one is selected by the office of Student Affairs and one by office of Academic Affairs. It may not be in there specifically. . .

B. Goldstein – Yes, the office of Student Affairs will select the Student Grievance Coordinator. They have already selected. . .

K. Thompson – Is that on a different policy or somewhere. . .?

R. Luttmann – Is that in here?

B. Goldstein – I don't know. . .

K. Thompson – I don't think it's in there.

C. Nelson – To my knowledge there's nothing in the Grade Appeal Policy about who chooses the Student Grievance Coordinator.

R. Luttmann – It seems to me that this document is huge and obviously goes into all the details. It seems to me that one is conspicuously missing. I think that something ought to be said about who this Grade Appeal Coordinator is and how they are selected.

B. Goldstein – We will have that person, but by the time you discuss this next week, I think we will have a person.

R. Luttmann – I don't mean the name of the person, I mean the procedure for selecting them.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – There was a tradition, it used to be Joaquin Sanchez. That's because Joaquin Sanchez at one time was the Dean of Students, this goes back many years and it just evolved. Then it became Richard Rodriguez, I believe, and both Richard and Joaquin believed there was a conflict between their role as a counselor and their role as a mediator, so I think now the Vice –President for Student Affairs appoints.

C. Nelson – Then you have the Student Judicial Officer acting as the Student Grievance Coordinator which puts one person in the position having to advocate and potentially pursue charges against this person.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – I think it is the VP of Student Affairs that makes the appointment.

R. Luttmann – Of the Grade Appeal Coordinator?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – No, the Grievance one. The Provost appoints the other one.

R. Luttmann – (unintelligible) say that.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – That's the practice.

B. Goldstein – That's the practice. I have been assured by Richard Rodriguez that whatever, whoever this person is that is the Grade Appeals Coordinator will be able to work with Richard as a counselor and also work with the legal aspects of the campus, so there will be plenty of help for that purpose.

R. Luttmann – And would work with the Chair of Structure and Functions

B. Goldstein – Of course.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – The legal aspects, you mean legal counsel.

B. Goldstein – Legal counsel, to make sure that all the letters that are written by the Grade Appeal person would have to be looked at.

N. Byrne – So if this goes forward, Bernie, then you would arrange for this information to be added.

B. Goldstein – I would.

K. Thompson – Should we also put the change in there that the Grade Appeal Coordinator is appointed by the VP?

C. Nelson – No, because we can't make recommendations, can we?

S. McKillop – But it could be on the floor.

N. Byrne – As a point of information.

B. Goldstein – It's an administrative post and I would say we would be more than happy to take any kind of recommendation, but it will be an administrator in Academic Affairs. It won't be a faculty member.

C. Nelson – You're right, but the point is whether or not that information should be in the policy.

B. Goldstein – Oh, as how we do it?

C. Nelson – Yes,

B. Goldstein – Sure, why not. . .

R. Luttmann – I would suggest then that, yes, you're right we can't amend it here, but you could decide on the basis of consulting with your committee what you'd

like, how you'd like to handle it and if possible have it in the packet for Senate next week.

K. Thompson – Or I could pass it out.

R. Luttmann – Well, you could, but it's better to have it in the packet.

S. Wilson – There's a good chance the first reading would be waived if we're going to get it in place by the end of the year anyway.

N. Byrne – Are we ready to proceed with this, with the suggested changes, including Rick Luttmann's? Karen does that seem feasible to you, that it would be in the packet?

K. Thompson – Yes.

N. Byrne – With these understandings is there any objection that this be added as a business item to the Academic Senate agenda? . . .Hearing no objections it will be and now we will turn to the 4:45 time certain and that is the proposed constitutional amendment: lecturer eligibility for voting and service.

Proposed Constitutional Amendment: Lecturer Eligibility for Voting and Service – C. Nelson

C. Nelson – This constitutional amendment was sent from FSAC to Structure and Functions and Structure and Functions reviewed the amendment, excuse me, reviewed the proposed constitutional amendment and found and unanimously recommends that it go forward to the Senate. The discussion was, questions that rose in the discussion had to do with how half time or 50% time was defined in various contexts for lecturers regarding benefits, both in terms of health benefits and in terms of retirement. We talked about some of the language in the whereas' but the committee did not feel it was their place to recommend any changes in the whereas' just to decide, as is, whether it should go forward to the Senate. And the committee unanimously recommended that it does. The clear trend from what we can gather, both in the legislature and what the union is trying to do is move to a 6 unit standard for half time when it comes to benefits and there are apparently other moves afoot as well, so there it is.

E. Stanny – Did you say that it came from FSAC?

C. Nelson – I'm sorry, Lecturer's Council. My apologies.

S. Wilson – I'd like to suggest that rather than establishing 6 units as the basis of half time that we just delete half time and replace it with 6 units. The question is what is half time? Are you basing half time on a 12 unit teaching load or are you basing it on a 15 unit teaching load, it's ambiguous. And so coming up with 6 units would resolve that ambiguity which could wind up saving some problems and there's a long story about how eligibility for benefits and retirement are being moved down

to 6 units. I'd just like to say rather than thinking about half time, just replace half time with 6 units. It clears up all the ambiguities.

S. McKillop – Well, we've been on a big round in the last two years about how part time people should not be working without pay. This is how we have three people on the Senate who have pay. Now if you put something open like this, what is that going to cost if then the union comes up and says they're working without pay because they are sitting on these committees, what is their protection from your replacement for having to pay all those part time people extra money because they are going to serve on the Student Affairs committee? I mean, I think that a very dangerous piece we're doing unless we have protection for the. . . I know they are going to tell me that, that's ok, but I think it should be out on the table. Very dangerous.

R. Coleman-Senghor – We are debating this item. I'd like to have this item approved for the agenda and move forward. I move that we approve for the agenda as a business item.

S. Wilson second.

C. Nelson – Just very quickly. This is a proposed constitutional amendment so if it is, again we're trying to set up a ballot for the Fall Convocation, so a first reading would have to be waived.

R. Luttmann – As we've been reminded several times today our function is to make sure things are in order for the Senate and I would suggest that we really need something a little more specific here since we are going to be amending the constitution. I think we need to see, as we did in the case of that other, the language quoted from the specific section we are going to amend. . . Oh, there's a back side to the document. There should be some strike out and/or some bold face in it?

C. Nelson – Yes, in 3.23 only members of the faculty as defined in Article II, Section I whose appointment is a least 6 WTU's are eligible to vote on any faculty or Academic Senate business or eligible for election to any faculty or Academic Senate office or committee.

R. Luttmann – This language here is the way it is now. And so this at least fifty percent of the normal full time load will simply be replaced by 6 WTU's.

C. Nelson – My apologies for not making that clear. We can fix it.

R. Luttmann – I think it has to show that before it goes to the Senate.

C. Nelson – You're right.

N. Byrne – If this goes to the Senate, it will contain those corrections.

S. McKillop – Well, I think there should be an item in here that says how the recompense is going to be taken care of. That should be part of this. It is really

crucial that this not be the first step to having the general fund suddenly going out to so many people. It is what should be on here to go forward. That's my point.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Point of Order. This document is as it is stated. I think Rick's point about having the document with respect to indicating what the changes are, are substantive issues with regard to the document. What you're debating is an issue that can be debated fully in the Senate and it can also be debated in terms of whether or not we should waive the first reading and I think that that is the point where you can really bring to bear your argument.

S. McKillop – You're right. Thank you.

N. Byrne – I would like to ask that any further discussion of this refer to reasons for this not to go forward. If there are no speakers in opposition, I would like to ask then that this go forward. **No speakers in opposition, then it will go forward and will be debated as a business item.** We're getting very short on time. There are two things. On the one hand what we have to do most certainly is take a look at the agenda that will go forward to the Academic Senate. The other things is, Laurel, I don't know, do you want us to address the Emeritus Dinner prior to the end of the semester?

Input for Emeritus Dinner

L. Holmstrom – Proposals were made and I was just bringing up whether you all agree to them or who should speak, so if you have any ideas. . .

N. Byrne – The dinner is when?

L. Holmstrom – It will be in October, I haven't set the date.

N. Byrne – This will probably require more discussion than we can give it at this time.

R. McNamara – How many do you need actually. There were several that came forward.

L. Holmstrom – It's up to you. How many do you want?

N. Byrne – It seems then that we don't want to rush this.

Senate Agenda for 5/22/03 approved

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Noel Byrne

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

- Approval of the Agenda; Approval of Minutes 4/3/03

- French Program proposal - attachment

- M. A. in English proposal - attachment

- M. A. in Psych proposal - attachment

- Candidates for Graduation – attachment

Information Item: Memo re: GE Mission, Goals and Objectives implementation

BUSINESS

1. Resolution on University Community Solidarity Fund –*Second reading* - B. Moonwomon-attachment – T. C. 3:30
2. B. S. in Engineering Science –*Second Reading* – A. Warmoth - attachment — T. C. 3:45
3. Proposed Grade Appeal update from SAC – *First reading*- K. Thompson – attachment – T. C. 4:15
4. Constitutional Amendment: Voting and Service Restrictions - *First Reading* – C. Nelson – attachment T.C. 4:25
5. Constitutional Amendment: Lecturer Eligibility for Voting and Service – *First Reading* – C. Nelson – attachment – T. C. 4:35
6. By-laws change to SSP rep for APC from S&F – *First reading* - C. Nelson – attachment
7. Procedures for emergency Senate action from S&F – *First reading* - C. Nelson – attachment
8. Installation of New Officers

B. Goldstein – I have consulted myself and I think I have determined why the Bernard Osher, why the Bernard is not there, because there is a Mrs. Osher. If you are going to put both of them on it becomes a long name, so I think that the decision by the family is to go with Osher.

R. Luttmann – Bernie, the foundation giving the money is called the Bernard Osher Foundation.

B. Goldstein – Yes, that's true. I will consult with whoever and we'll figure out what happened.

It was suggested that that the Senate meeting of 5/22 be extended to 5:30. A polling of the Executive committee showed 7 in favor.

Adjourned 5:00pm