

Executive Committee Minutes

December 12, 2002

Present: Noel Byrne, Art Warmoth, Bernie Goldstein, Robert Karlsrud, Elizabeth Stanny, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Karen Thompson, Rick Luttmann, Robert McNamara, Steve Wilson

N. Byrne: The agenda for the next AS meeting will be forthcoming and will have all of the unfinished business from the last meeting.

A. Warmoth wants to be on the agenda for the EPC-APC Resolution on Academic Planning.

R. Luttmann asked to withdraw Item 2 from the agenda.

E. Stanny wants a time certain for the two FSAC items that she has been waiting to have come before the Senate for the last several meetings as well as a resolution from the lecturers.

S. Wilson reported that he was going to propose an amendment to the resolution.

The agenda was approved.

Approval of the minutes of November 21, 2002:

R. Luttmann noted that under “Approval of the Agenda”, the second line should read “resolution to lengthen the senate seat term of lecturers to three years. Under “Summary of actions 2.”, it should say Senate Budget Committee. He would like to see the discussion either broken up by speaker or at least have the speakers in bold. His remarks on page 3 should say “BS in Engineering Science” instead of “BA of Science and Engineering Program”. In his further remarks, he said “I think it is a major departure from the view we hold of APC ourselves” instead of “the view we hold of ourselves” and “bringing a proposal to APC only when we’re done with it”.

R. McNamara: On page 2, his remarks should have been more along the lines of “Let’s not draw broad stripes here”. His remarks should have been attributed to A. Warmoth. Senior faculty in R. McNamara’s department do teach large sections, and some teach small sections in the graduate program. It should be the department’s prerogative to maintain small sections in graduate courses.

B. Karlsrud said that senior faculty had small classes while an instructor would have an SFR of 30 students, and the data that we send to the Chancellor’s Office is full of those kinds of discrepancies. When he says “It would be easier to ask administration for funds in order to adjust SFRs if we were also prepared to make adjustments,” he meant in departments.

R. McNamara said that there are senior faculty who are out there making an effort to teach large sections.

B. Goldstein said that the RSCAP fund was not augmented. The travel budget was.

The minutes were approved with these adjustments.

Correspondence: None

Reports

N. Byrne: No report.

B. Goldstein: We're working on the retreat. The goal is to define what is meant by a quality liberal arts and science curriculum and how to fund it.

B. Karlsrud has concerns about budgets. With the budget concerns, he is wondering about the money spent on tenure track searches and the Provost's search.

Bernie responded that the Trustees are looking at student fee increases in January. Our cuts in the Spring shouldn't affect classes.

B. Karlsrud: A \$5 million cut would be significant. Why are we spending money to hire people when these cuts are coming?

Bernie: We don't know what the cuts are going to be. We may have to cut back on searches.

R. McNamara: We need to know about the cuts for planning purposes. We were told that the searches are on.

Bernie: at present, they are on, but there may be changes. We will let you know as soon as we can.

R. McNamara: The hiring freezes are said not to affect permanent faculty so the searches should be going on.

Bernie: The searches are going on.

R. McNamara: But if the searches are going on, it will cost a lot of money, and if the people won't be hired it will be a waste when we need the money. Where are the decisions about the searches made?

Bernie: At the campus level.

B. Karlsrud: What about the provost search? That's going to cost \$100,000.

N. Byrne: The president has the prerogative to use an outside head hunter, but I hadn't heard that an outside source would be used.

Bernie: It hasn't.

B. Coleman: We have the option of using an interim Provost. We should have a strategy for dealing with levels of loss. Perhaps we should look at the 40 searches. Is it possible or not? If it is not we shouldn't be spending money on them. We have curricular needs. We need to be able to plan. We have had people leave while we were trying to decide. Where can we announce places where we can find savings so that we can put these savings into the classroom now?

President Armiñana came in. B. Karlsrud asked if he had any plans.

R. Armiñana: There are to be 1200 searches in the system from the CBA. Not hires – searches. We need to know what constitutes a search. The system wide average is 70% for successful searches. When have we satisfied the CBA? 45 States are in the same position as California. Texas is the only big state that's not in trouble. There are a number of searches that you probably need to do to fill holes that we have. Our average has been twenty a year. That is probably normal for us. We are going to have enrollment increases. You take your target enrollment off the table. If there is any new money, it would be in response to access, increase in enrollment. There will be new money for enrollment and then there will probably be twice that amount taken out. A week ago it was technically correct to say that the budget cut would be \$5 billion plus. \$10 billion is more than \$5 billion. The governor called a special meeting of the Legislature Monday to deal with the \$10 billion mid year cut. The Senate met for thirty minutes and the Assembly for forty minutes. The Assembly also agreed to have some of their subcommittees meet at various places in the State to deal with the cuts. They said that they weren't going to do anything until mid January when they get the Governor's budget, and both houses adjourned. The Governor has said that he was going to look at revenue enhancements. These include fees, and taxes like the vehicle tax. The Trustees are going to meet to look at the situation. The Governor is going to look at the amount that education is overfunded by Prop 98. He will take \$1 billion this year and another \$1 billion next year. The cuts to Community Colleges are \$250 million. K- 12 is overfunded by 3.7% for K – 12 and the Community Colleges. \$59.6 million for the CSU and \$74.3 million for the UC. The budgetary concerns include for 2002-03 a one time reduction of \$43 million. There are unfunded health costs of \$18.5 million, and that is a low estimate, an unfunded compensation of \$4.3 million for faculty and trades people, Units 3 and 6, and \$59.6 million in mid year reductions for a total of \$125.4 million. This was supposed to be one time money, but in the 03-04 budget it will become permanent. There will be a lot of theater at the Trustees meetings by students and CFA. There is a 10% fee increase proposed for undergraduates. 1/3 of the fee increases will go to financial aid. This should bring us \$20 million so this brings us to \$39.6 million in mid year reduction. This amounts to a \$72 million fee increase for undergraduates which will be retroactive, and retroactive fee increases are not always easy to collect. This annualizes to \$144/year,

which is about 40¢/day. This is an increase from \$1428/year to \$1572/year, for undergraduates and from \$1506/year to \$1734/year for graduate students. This puts us at the level of North Dakota or Arizona. North Dakota doesn't have that many people. Arizona is a special case because of the large number of out of state students there. The Trustees will deal with the fee increases next Monday. Who knows when the Legislature will deal with it. The Democrats want more revenue, the Republicans want less spending. With the makeup of the legislature, it will be difficult.

B. Coleman: The new fees are still less than the cost of one instructor for one course.

R. Armiñana: The legislature will not accept a decrease in the number of students. We have done too good of a job selling access.

R. McNamara: How do the 1200 searches in the CBA work? Do they all have to go forward?

R. Armiñana: It is all new territory. We will see how it plays out. Will the CFA want to put the searches on hold? A contract has two parties.

R. McNamara: For planning purposes, there are going to have to be discussions about these decisions. Are these discussions taking place?

R. Armiñana: Not so far with labor people. There is a discussion scheduled for tomorrow. We don't know what they are going to talk about - the \$59 million or the \$39 million?

B. Karlsrud: How do we know which money we are talking about?

R. Armiñana: The Trustees are meeting on Monday in an emergency meeting. The Regents are meeting on Monday and proposing increasing undergraduate fees 11.2% and 19% in nursing to 26% in medicine. \$215 million for Community Colleges. For them a fee increase requires an act of the Legislature.

B. Karlsrud: Where will the cuts come from? Academic Affairs?

L. Schlereth \$1 million

N. Byrne: \$216 thousand from enrollment enhancement

R. Armiñana: Remember the health costs could go up.

B. Goldstein The faculty are worried about the 40 searches.

R. Armiñana. So am I. These searches are 03-04 expenditures. In January the Governor will release his figures. We will get a better idea then. Nothing of the searches will

happen until after the holidays. At that time we will reassess which of the 40 searches are real and which should be put forward and which ones are not going to go forward.

S. Wilson: If a department is having several searches do they count as different searches?

R. Armiñana: It doesn't matter.

B. Coleman: The president is the ultimate authority on the hires. But will you postpone signing on the searches until we as a faculty have an opportunity to review the searches? We need to have time to determine where the needs are. When will the faculty come into play? If the Academic Senate recommends a hiring policy of Senate guidelines of how units can take advantage of whatever money is available. You won't know how much money will be available for a while.

R. Armiñana: That is true. It may be until July or September. I am very reluctant to go outside of the current structures for handling these matters. We will have to decide on deadlines etc. soon. There will be a systematic procedure.

B. Coleman: Deciding that we need to hire a position in a certain area should be a faculty decision.

R. Armiñana: To the Vice President's Budget Advisory Committee, the faculty and the Academic Senate

B. Coleman: There's no one there to decide on curriculum.

B. Goldstein: The decisions were made in the departments.

B. Karlsrud: In the event of collapse the president has the flexibility to decide if a search is hired or not. The deans are also involved.

B. Coleman: In the departments it is decided where to make the hire. Who decides who gets hired? We have a certain number of dollars. Who decides who gets what?

B. Karlsrud: The dean is involved. The dean makes the recommendation to hire anyway.

R. McNamara: It seems that nothing has changed. The President says that we have a certain augmentation and we with the deans come back to the table and say what our priorities are. We are going to be involved in those decisions.

R. Armiñana: By the time it comes to me, it has been so well cooked. I look at the resume and they generally look good. I have never rejected one. I have found some cases where they didn't have the appropriate degree, but if they don't have a degree, the hire is usually contingent on them getting their degree. I keep a close eye on that and congratulate them when they finish it.

N. Byrne: Anyone who has an urgent desire to make a report can now do so.

No one does.

N. Byrne Retreat: We were going to have a retreat off campus, but budgetary considerations persuaded us to hold the retreat on campus. In the morning sessions, there is an examination of the interrelations among various disciplines with small group discussions in the latter part of the morning, lunch, and in the afternoons, discussions of various issues which are specific to this campus, with the relation to our liberal arts mission and how to best achieve it in light of the budgetary considerations and how to mount such a curriculum.

B. Goldstein: There will be a panel discussion or small groups about G. E., a residential campus, or lower division curriculum. These are all things which have been suggested by the Executive Committee.

N. Byrne: We are still fine tuning the details.

R. McNamara: So that last session is a one hour discussion for the four areas.

N. Byrne: There will be one session where everyone will be an audience to all four areas followed by group discussion

R. McNamara: This would be a good time to have the discussion that we have been talking about for quite a while about resource allocations, and get more junior faculty involved. I would have liked to have more flexibility to have that.

A. Warmoth: There is a good deal of flexibility. It is thought that all of these discussions would contain discussion about resources, but we could have a session on that by itself. What do faculty see as their priorities?

R. McNamara: That's it. And we need to see what new faculty see.

A. Warmoth: It would be useful if we had a discussion with Bernie and could look at some of these issues and some of the options we are looking at and thinking of. If we are looking at a 5% budget cut, then what do faculty think our priorities are.

R. McNamara: And to hear from faculty that we don't usually hear from.

B. Goldstein: We had one, and it was good.

A. Warmoth: One of the messages we should get out would be that we are particularly interested in getting junior faculty to come, because they want to see us respond to this massive crisis.

R. McNamara: If you need to look at options, you need to decide what your priorities are.

B. Coleman: All the panelists have been here for less than two years.

N. Byrne: That was by design.

B. Coleman: We should have some input from senior faculty. The resource topic should be addressed, so that we can come out with outcomes. There are always options. We should get the faculty to think that they are going to have to think in terms of priorities. This would put us in good position for our WASC report.

A. Warmoth: I'd like to note that 1:15 and 2:15 description has a dangling preposition in relation to the resources.

B. Goldstein: We have a discussion in the morning of the philosophical foundations of the crisis, and then there is a bridge discussion on how to bridge to connect the potential with the actual, and the resource discussion. Since this is a university and faculty, we need to have some kind of an intellectual discussion.

A. Warmoth: We are in a technological revolution, which is precipitating an epistemological crisis that goes along with a budgetary crisis and an economic crisis, and so, the thing that is interesting about this format is that it's designed to focus on the epistemological crisis as well as the economic crisis to see if we can come up with some interesting connections.

B. Coleman: Can we deliver our GE package in the face of these crises?

N. Byrne: Item 2 is gone - on to item 3: Statement of the Mission Goals & Objectives of CE at SSU, from EPC.

A. Warmoth: EPC and the GE Subcommittee would be quite happy if it could go on to the Senate as it is. I hope that there will be discussion there. It will be very helpful for those of us who are thinking about it over the break in preparation for the retreat.

N. Byrne: Item 4.

Distributed a draft resolution on the Provost's Search Committee.

N. Byrne: The issue is in response to the discussion in the Senate about the process by which the chair of the Provost's Search Committee was chosen. I would encourage everyone to read the final and last statement and then proceed to the first, because it is there by design.

R. McNamara: Who did this?

N. Byrne: Bob Crowley and I worked on it.

A. Warmoth: Do we need to do anything more than put it on the agenda for the Senate?

N. Byrne: I believe that is the case.

B. Coleman: The fourth Whereas is inflammatory, and the word “unilaterally” should be dropped. The President has provided the Senate with reasons. I just don’t agree with them. The President has given the reason of a silent sanction. That is a reason that I don’t agree with.

R. McNamara: Should this be a conversation that we have in the Senate? There are those that take exception with the reasons.

A. Warmoth asks that this resolution be put on the agenda after the time certains previously agreed to.

B. Karlsrud I would argue that the “Whereas the Academic Senate . . .” clause should be struck. One reason is that it will generate conversation. We should tone down the language. I have seen administrators serve on search committees even as chairs. I would think that Larry would be beleaguered already by all of this budget stuff.

B. Coleman: The question is not about Larry serving as chair. It is the President’s appointment of Larry as chair. There is an order where there is a distinction about which committees can have the President appoint the chair of the search committee. The VP is not one of them.

A. Warmoth: I request that the text of the policy should be included with the text of the resolution in the Senate package.

R. McNamara: Why don’t we just delete the whole clause. If you look at the last clause, it’s the practice that’s the issue, and I don’t see how this fits, and it will bring up a lot of diversion.

N. Byrne: Let’s excise it.

B. Karlsrud: If the committee had chosen Larry as chair, would that have alleviated the problem. (To R. Luttmann) Has the committee acquiesced to the naming of Larry

R. Luttmann: Not that I have heard.

R. Armiñana: The search committee is advisory in nature. What I have done is no different from the way that the CSU hires executives. The chair of the board directs the chair of the search advisory panel. Bernie was on my search committee when he was a Trustee. Basically, what I have done is I have followed that model. I know that some people may disagree, and I expect that. Some people will say, “This is different,” and “We do it differently.” That is sort of the model that I follow. I am on the search committee for the president of Sacramento State. The chair determines who the chair

was. We had Hauk. Funny enough, in that search, they make the recommendation but they don't have a vote. Other than the Trustees, nobody has a vote. In a sense, that is what I am following here. The panel is advisory. I have named the chair, and at the end of the day there is only one vote. That is logic. You can deny it. That is perfectly fine. At the end of the day, you can probably guess where I am going to end. But I do listen, and I will make the final decision.

B. Coleman: That is where the difference lies. At the end of the day, the final selection is yours. It is your prerogative. But your prerogative is part of a protocol, and part of that protocol is a committee and a process, and that process is a policy which is designed to make sure that, when a recommendation comes to you as part of that policy, that you have the prerogative to say that you don't like any of the candidates, or that you are going to suspend the search. That's clearly in your power. But if you are going to name the chair and control the whole process, why have a committee at all? That's what's at issue. Also at issue is local practice. That's why you have University system wide policy that allows for a policy at a local level to be articulated. It is important that the concerns of the committee can come forward for your consideration. My reading of the policy is different than your reading of the policy and your reading of the policy is that mine is invalid.

R. McNamara: I second Bob's ideas. The issue is shared governance. We have a responsibility to bring our concerns forward even though no one disputes that the final decision is the President's, but, as Bob says, the process is important which is why I would disagree with what you said, Bob. I don't think that this is a matter for the committee itself to deal with. This question is so much beyond this particular decision, that it really is a matter for the Senate in its entirety, so I do think it is appropriate for the whole Senate to have a say in it, not just the committee.

B. Karlsrud: It's not inappropriate for the Senate to deal with it. I'm saying that it is appropriate for the faculty as a whole to deal with it. It's such a heated subject and whether the person we're actually talking about, Larry, is going to do a good job.

N. Byrne: Proposed agenda should include all unfinished business from the last meeting, the Statement of Mission Goals & Objectives of GE, the Resolution on the Provost's Search Committee, and the Lecturers' Resolution from FSAC. The faculty retreat will be dealt with in my report. We didn't get to the parking issues, but Larry reported on it at the last meeting. I will put the times certain in the Senate package.

Adjourn.