

**Executive Committee**  
**5/13/04**  
**3:00 – 5:00 Sue Jameson Room**

**Present:** Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, John Wingard, Brigitte Lahme, Elaine McDonald, Robert McNamara, Elizabeth Stanny, Eduardo Ochoa, Noel Byrne, Ruben Armiñana, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Rick Luttmann

**Absent:** Phil McGough, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

**Guests:** Jason Spencer, Brad Mumaw, Steve Wilson

**Approval of Agenda –*Approved***

**Minutes of 4/15/04 – *Approved***

**Correspondence:** Resolution passed by Cal State Hayward Academic Senate regarding equitable scholarly publishing practices. They have asked other Senate if they would be interested in considering a similar resolution. *Referred to Structure and Functions.*

## **REPORTS**

### **President of the University - (R. Armiñana)**

The President reported that the subject has been the compact with the Governor and the May revise is probably out, but he had not seen it. It is supposed not to have any more cuts than we had in January and perhaps some augmentation or change in the money taken out for “outreach.” The compact between the Governor and the CSU and UC would begin in '05 -'06 with 2.5% enrollment growth, 3% general support, 1% for long term needs, and a fee policy tied to the California personal growth index. For '04 -'05 it would be 14% for undergraduates, 25% for graduate students, 20% for teaching credential students. The UC is 20% for graduate students. Then for '05 - '06 and '06 -'07 at 8%, so it balances the three years at 10%. Then a series of accountability measures we have to do including coming up with the formula and a process to stop subsidizing the students past 120 units plus about 20%. Anything over that will not be subsidized. He thinks there will be some accountability in reference primarily to retention and graduation results. Not everyone is happy with this. Students are not happy because they were not at the table. Very few people were at the table. A lot of people think they should have been at the table. We'll see what happens. At the Board of Trustees meeting for next week there is a revised item regarding the fee policy. It is similar to the compact. Everybody has to show up to make quorum.

The President was asked about his political compass on the compact, which way he thought it would go and what his own position was on it.

The President answered that he was in favor of the compact because it creates stability. It doesn't do much to restore the half billion lost in two years. And a billion if you add a few more years back. It is clearly stated and everyone accepts that in

good times with one time money, there may be ways to address some of the lost revenues that the university have suffered. There will be pressure for greater enrollment than 2.5 because, in his estimation, our natural growth is more like 4%. But it does give a floor, stability and protection. Where it will go is a done deal. What can the Legislature do? Scream a little, but basically all they can do is add, not subtract. There might be some attempts to punish in one form or another the administrations of the UC and the CSU because they met with the Governor and they got a deal.

The President was asked what the budget for '04 -'05 would be according to the compact.

The President said he did not have the figures, but suggested a formula for computing it for '05-'06. He said '04-'05 is what we've had, plus adding 4% revenue from fees and discount that by 20%.

The President was asked about how he thought YRO (year-round-operations) would play out.

The President said that the plan has always been that every campus would be YRO as funding was available. It happens that in the last two years that funding was truncated. The compact talks about YRO and eventually all campuses being YRO. It's not clear how soon that will happen for the non-YRO campuses. He suspects that within the next three to four years every campus will be YRO.

The President was asked if as a campus we should take advantage of what has happened to us negatively to be engage in planning for YRO.

The President said that summer school as we have had it in the past is dead. Some of us are sorry and sorrowful about its death, but it is dead and we have to learn to live without it.

The President was asked about the Multi-Disciplinary building connected with the Green Music Center and the direction the university is going on that project.

The President said we are working diligently on repackaging this. There are no details yet. We do have quite a bit of money and plans. It's going to take a while to "maximize" the plans we have and the money we have. We may have to do some reconfiguring to be able to build a facility that will include both a 300 seat recital hall and 50 faculty offices and classrooms to accommodate 500 more FTES, etc. He thinks they will approach it as one facility instead of two. The increase in the cost of building is not singular to the this project, but is generalized. He cited other instances of similar bids coming in at similar amounts. He is convinced that the Green Music Center will happen.

#### **Provost/Vice President (E. Ochoa)**

The Provost noted that in the compact the increases in fees are going to be in addition to the base budget growth and FTE growth. This helps relieve pressure on

us for next year. The financial model for the summer session has been blown up as a result of the arbitrator's decision and the compact reaffirms the move to full YRO. The question will remain on our campus, how quickly to move to YRO. The factors that have to be assessed in making that decision are how quickly can continuing education wean itself from summer session as a source of revenue and as a program. Another factor is the switch of that enrollment to FTES enrollment. We will probably transition to YRO more quickly than before the arbitrator's decision. We had a celebration this week to accept the donation of 3500 acres of prime land in Mendocino county which will provide a great laboratory for our students and faculty to do research in and to steward. He thought in retrospect it would be a real landmark day for the campus in years to come.

It was noted that it would be good to start planning YRO soon as the calendar would be altered. Campuses that have moved to YRO have lost their intersession which is a dramatic impact on the calendar. We also try to arrange our calendar to coincide somewhat with the local school districts, so there are a lot of factors in play and we make these calendar years in advance.

The Provost responded that we will have to figure out the time table first due to the financial constraints. Once we have a fix on that, then we can move to the calendar.

It was suggested that we may be able to provide a rationale for our unique situation on our campus in terms of YRO.

It was noted that junior faculty really count on teaching summer school to make some extra money and we have trouble recruiting because of the high cost of living, so if summer school goes away. . .

The Provost responded that for frame of reference he could offer his experience at four quarter campuses. They have the ability to offer additional employment for faculty in the summer. The way they did it was that every third year the faculty were eligible to teach for pay during the summer and the pay was more substantial. It made a difference. He didn't think that would be much of a problem. More of a problem is how continuing ed would be migrating away from this and the impact that will have on the School budgets.

It was noted that some programs have summer session build into them and that there is a pressing need to plan for curricular changes. We need to think about how we are going to provide for those programs we have committed ourselves to institutionally. We are only seven months away from that situation.

#### **Chair-Elect of the Senate - (M. Dreisbach)**

M. Dreisbach reported that the Executive Committee had referred the Naming of University Facilities policy to Structure and Functions. We carried out that work and have some proposals. She wrote up a memo for the Executive committee for the beginning of the Fall semester. The Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters policy has been revised and the committee still wants to add a couple of things to it and should be ready to go forward in the Fall.

## APC report

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that APC meet with the Provost today to talk about the Multi-Disciplinary building and to encourage a wider participation of the faculty in planning for how we can get the best out of the building from a curricular point of view. The GE Task Group has made a small revision in the language of the last wording of the APC Statement on GE. They are trying to organize a meeting with ESAS personnel to discuss the freshman year experience. They will also be working next year on the faculty workload issue as an integral part of their concerns. How large and small classes can be handled in terms of the Long Range Planning document is being looked at as well.

It was noted that we agreed to look at our faculty governance structure next year. Where will that occur? Would APC start looking at that since they are looking at workload?

It was determined that Structure and Functions would head up that project. Structure and Functions would determine the process of evaluating faculty governance and it was suggested that APC could look at the wider implications of changes to faculty governance.

**It was formally moved that Structure and Functions review the faculty governance committee structure as requested by the Provost to see if it is functioning in its most effective and optimum way. Second. *Approved.***

## EPC report

E. McDonald reported that they have met with Katharyn Crabbe about the withdrawal policy. When A&R looked at the current withdrawal policy they found it completely out of compliance with Executive Order 792. That order specifies that if a campus wishes to have a voluntary withdrawal period during which a student may withdraw from a course for any reason, that period cannot extend past the census date. The interim proposal for the coming fall will be that students may add and drop classes during the first two weeks of the semester. At the end of the add/drop period student schedules are fixed. Students who wish to withdraw from a course must petition to do so with the recommendation of the instructor. For students seeking to withdraw after the fourth week, the standard of the evaluation of the petition is serious and compelling reasons. Serious and compelling reason include, but are not limited to extended illness or accident, changes in work schedule imposed by your employer as a condition for promotion or continued employment, errors made by Sonoma State. In the Fall semester will be asking the University Standards committee to look at the policy and decide if it is good or needs to be changed, look at the definition of serious and compelling reasons, make a list of things that do not meet the definition of serious and compelling and report back to EPC. EPC has also been looking at the Academic Affairs Strategic Initiatives and have identified some areas of concerns. We also have made an endorsement of the APC Statement on GE reform. A small committee has been looking at the Provost's freshman book proposal. We've made a short list that they will decide on

next week. The short list is *Reading Lolita in Tehran*, *Occidentalism: the West in the Eyes of its Enemies*, *Nickel and Dimed: On Not Getting by in America*. For next year EPC, besides looking at programs that come through, will look at the definition of excess units and how that is going to change our policies. We are working with SAC on that.

The Chair of APC shared the new language for the APC statement on GE reform.

### **FSAC report**

E. Stanny introduced John Wingard who will be the new chair of FSAC in the Fall. FSAC passed the Misconduct in Research policy today. We are still working on the Course Outline policy, but she thought it was close to being ready. FSAC started talking about the Endowed Chairs policy.

**It was agreed to put the interim policy on withdrawal on the Senate agenda as a consent item.**

### **SAC report**

B. Lahme reported that they received a lot of feedback this semester on Advising. We have put together a list of recommendations about what to do at the beginning of next fall. What we've found out is that there's really not a problem with the advising policy, it's the culture of advising on campus. To improve that what we are planning is to make advising more visible on campus, to get more support from the faculty and we are going to ask the Deans to give us some time in each School meeting to talk about advising, updates on advising and preview workshops. These plans are tentative, but a big workshop at the beginning of the Fall for junior faculty and anyone else interested in advising with follow ups in November. Also there is really a need for some kind of booklet for GE with all the GE information together. We don't know who is going to do it, but we think that the people working on summer orientation will be working on that. During Fall '03 there was a Lucy Advising booth in the library that was very successful and students liked it and the advisors liked it. It was not repeated in the Spring because ESAS lost staff and faculty were overwhelmed. It really needs to be supported by a broader base. We will ask faculty to have their office hour at the booth. Some departments have a very successful model of advising and do a good job of advertising. There should be more sharing of what's working and what's not working, getting the right people together and knowing who to ask. This is what we are planning to do and hoping to get the support of the Deans and Schools and the Provost. She passed out a copy of the plan. The Academic Advising subcommittee has been doing a lot of work on this over the past few years. They have been frustrated with the support they have been receiving. Their charge has been to report on advising to SAC. They feel that their advice on the advising policy has not really made a difference in the past few semesters. She passed out a memo she received from the chair of the Academic Advising subcommittee. They ask that something changes. Either the committee is disbanded or they get re-charged with a different job or get relocated. We have some ideas in SAC about what to do and this can be part of the discussion about the organization of faculty governance. Also Gustavo Flores came to SAC and gave

information about the incoming freshman class. B. Lahme gave the specific stats. *(these were put in the Senate packet for 5/20/04)*

It was noted that the use of the words “we encourage faculty” is not strong enough to get more faculty participation in advising.

B. Lahme said she forgot to mention that SAC would like to see advising as part of the RTP process, so if junior faculty are involved in advising that should count as service to the Department or School.

It was noted that advising from a screen rather than from a booklet was frustrating and time consuming. It was argued that support for faculty education about advising should not just go to the Center for Teaching and Professional Development, but to the departments and Schools as well.

The President of the Associated Students remarked that workshops offered to the faculty were not well attended either and that the word mandatory needs to be used.

B. Lahme said that is why it is going to the Deans so they will tell the faculty to go.

The President of the Associated Students also suggested that faculty get enough release time to do advising as a way to change the culture.

The Provost said it was critical to create outcome measures for advising as he has been on campuses where advising has been part of the RTP process, but no outcome measure were identified and then it didn’t really work very well. It wasn’t clear how to capture faculty performance or involvement in advising. He disagreed that online advising information was frustrating and gave examples of success. He said we will be resuming the vigorous search for tenure-track faculty next year and we are following up on developing a strong and full compliment of tenured and tenure track faculty consistent with our mission as a liberal arts and sciences university.

It was recommended that senior faculty also be included in advising workshops due to the new PeopleSoft format. The speaker argued that advising is moving away from being one week during the semester, but it is more comprehensive and on-going. He gave the example of being able to access a student’s records who was in his office due to having problems, not for specifically advising. He said he thought some faculty were not aware of being able to do that and he hoped that perspective would be part of our understanding of what advising is now.

The student guest suggested that the advising policy say that advising workshops are mandatory for the faculty.

A guest said he supported the hiring of tenure-track faculty, but that did not mean that currently employed lecturers need be displaced according to ACR 70.

It was suggested that a study be done to determine what kinds of tools faculty need to be effective advisors and the speaker advocated a flexible, hybrid approach.

## BUSINESS

### Statement from the Campus Climate Committee – E. Ochoa

E. Ochoa introduced the item. The Campus Climate Committee took up a discussion of whether to take a position on the issue of same-sex marriages and ended up endorsing this statement. He was asked by the committee to bring it to the Executive Committee and propose moving it to the Senate for consideration. He noted the committee is not advocating that anyone break the law.

There was discussion whether the item should go forward to the Senate. **It was moved and second to go forward. *Approved with one vote in opposition.***

### Senate Agenda

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson  
Correspondences:

#### **Consent Items:**

- Approval of the Agenda
- Approval of Minutes – 4/22/04 emailed
- Interim Withdrawal policy – attachment
- Candidates for Graduation – (handed out on 5/6)

**Information item:** Statistics regarding incoming freshman class

## BUSINESS

1. Academic Affairs Strategic Planning document – attachment – C. Nelson – Second Reading T.C. 3:15
2. APC Statement regarding “A New Path for General Education at Sonoma State” – attachment – R. Coleman-Senghor –Second Reading T. C. 3:40
3. Statement from Campus Climate Committee – attachment – E. Ochoa - First reading T. C. 4:20
4. Dean Saeid Rahimi – B.S. in Engineering Science T. C. 4:30
5. Installation of New Officers T. C. 4:40

Adjourned 5:00

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*