

Executive Committee Minutes
March 15, 2007
3:00 – 5:00, Sue Jameson Room

Present: Carlos Ayala, Elaine McDonald-Newman, Eduardo Ochoa, John Wingard, Doug Jordan, Edith Mendez, Elizabeth Martínez, Catherine Nelson, Mary Halavais, Elizabeth Stanny, Art Warmoth, Tim Wandling, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

Guests: Steve Wilson, Meri Storino

Urgent Charge for FSSP and Discussion about current IDC conditions

The Chair began the meeting by handing out a document she, along with Rick Marks, used at a meeting with President Armiñana and Larry Furukawa-Schlereth to talk about the change in IDC rates for faculty grants. She said she thought that she and Professor Marks would have to argue that there needed to be exceptions to the 20% IDC rule. They found that the President had already reached that conclusion himself. They then discussed how were the grants to be considered, who decides the worthiness of the grant, especially if it comes in under 20%, what would be the criteria for that and what process would be fiscally prudent as well as efficient for faculty and something that does not seem capricious to faculty. She proposed that a policy be created as soon as possible. She thought the Faculty Subcommittee on Sponsored Programs would be the committee to develop a rubric and process right away. She asked the President if it was ok if the committee worked with the Provost and L. Furukawa-Schlereth to develop the process and he said it was ok with him. She brought it to the Executive Committee to charge FSSP with this task. She thought it was critical, especially for junior faculty, to solve this problem right away. The Provost said that he had developed an interim set of criteria for Deans to use for grants, particularly, if they were below 20%. These are just a set of questions to ask about the grant that get at the issue- is it key to the academic enterprise? He recommended to the Deans that if they found the answers to a particular grant affirmative, they supply the difference between 20% IDC rate and whatever the rate was on the grant as a stop-gap measure to get the grant through. He is also trying to do an analysis on the actual cost of administering grants. He explained the cost structure (from NIH) that L. Furukawa-Schlereth is using as a benchmark and how his (the Provost's) analysis will attempt to lower the IDC rate. The Chair said she appreciated that and said she felt that asking the Schools to come up with the difference at this point means no grants will be funded because the Schools have no money. The Provost said his understanding was that the Schools do have some money they can put toward grants. He also pointed out that grants are something we would want to do anyway, so every little bit helps. He gave an example to show that it was still worth doing. He noted that this was for core "stuff" that would be done even without the grant. Then there was another level of grants that are important and wouldn't get done because we don't have the money. The third level are grants that we'd like to do, but don't have the money.

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:45 AM

Deleted: ,

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:46 AM

Deleted: they

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:48 AM

Deleted: y

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:48 AM

Deleted: the

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:49 AM

Deleted:

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:49 AM

Deleted: and

A member asked what was in the first category. She thought it would be zero here. The Provost did not agree.

The Chair asked the committee what they wanted to do about it. She did not want to leave the decision up to the Provost and Deans, whoever they may be. She wants a way that faculty can know how their grant will be judged, who will make that determination and what process grant applications need to go through. The Provost said he thought it was a totally appropriate topic for faculty governance. He proposed that what he had created as a stop-gap measure could be a starting point for the discussion. The Provost thought out loud about what process might ultimately be created.

A member said there was a two-pronged problem. One was **that** information needed to go out immediately about what has changed and that the Deans have been given a list as a stop-gap measure. She also agreed that FSSP was **a** good committee to begin the policy process. The Provost agreed and said that he thought the word would have gotten out through the Deans. The Chair said the first anyone heard that exceptions would be made to the 20% IDC rate was at the Senate meeting last week. The word did not get out at all.

A member said that she didn't have a problem sending it to FSSP, but was concerned about their meeting schedule and if they knew it was coming. The Chair said technically, they would be referred it to FSAC to give to FSSP.

A member said that since faculty are *required* to keep up on scholarship and research, rather than penalizing faculty, the university should at least subsidize the overhead. She added that if we were running the university as a non-profit, it wouldn't be a problem. She could not believe the extent to which the faculty here, rather than being praised for teaching, research and scholarship, are penalized **d** at every turn.

The Chair explained the document she had passed out, and noted that taking out three of the faculty who get the grants with the largest IDC, the **percentage** of faculty grants under 20% goes **up** dramatically. She also looked at the last three years of grants and found that 83% of faculty grants were under 20%. Another page showed a sampling of what kind of grants faculty are getting that are under 20% IDC. She agreed with the previous speaker arguing that the whole university should be subsidizing grants.

A member asked why are we now holding the stakeholders accountable to the subsidies? He noted an important grant being administered through the School of Education (ENACT) that is bringing enormous value to the university, but no monetary value is being put on it. Perhaps we should assess A&F for that kind of value. There is no way we can get anything back. He then gave an example of a grant he was working on as he did not want to put in the 80 hours needed to get it done if it wasn't going to work.

The Provost said he said agreed with what people were saying and that they did not have the right audience right now. (The President and CFO had not yet joined the

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:51 AM

Deleted: that

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:52 AM

Deleted: ,

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:53 AM

Deleted: number

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:53 AM

Deleted: down

meeting) He has been trying to make this argument. He also noted that part of the problem is that the administrative structure of the university is overwhelmed in the area of grants and contracts. It's not secret what has happened and it has been major. The university has lost a big chunk of our capacity to manage grants and contracts. L. Furukawa-Schlereth's 20% is a hard and fast rule. He doesn't want to make things worse. He came up with a number and now we have to refine it. The other part of it is we are going to have a big financial hole in CIHS and the university is going to have to pay for it. The 20% rule is not only insuring everything going through now is covering its own expenses, but it is not contributing to this hole. If it creates any surplus, it will go towards the hole. Where it is affecting things a little bit is on the distribution. If it came to the university as a whole, we would pay 60% in terms of share of budget. So now we are absorbing some piece of it – the difference between 20% and what the grant can generate, on those dollars we may be hitting 100% on those dollars temporarily.

Time certain reached.

Revision to Counseling Program – M. Halavais

M. Storino was invited to the table. M. Halavais introduced the item and noted that it was the School Counseling program that was being revised. It had not been revised for about 10 years. Requirements for counselors in schools are changing rapidly, so all the changes reflect the new needs. EPC approved it unanimously. It was moved to put the item on the consent calendar. A member asked about the rationale for the changes. M. Storino noted all the influences that affected the change and that their accreditation process had helped them see where they were weak and strong. **No objections to this item on the consent calendar.**

Return to discussion about current IDC conditions and what the Senate can do about it.

The Chair returned to discussing what the Senate can do about the crisis regarding grant funding. She had proposed a committee or subcommittee work on a policy or procedures for faculty to consult when writing grants. Or, she suggested, there could be one big resolution at the Senate that condemns this decision and the burden it puts on Academic Affairs.

A member said there were two issues - the 20% rate and the procedures. He thought the procedures were in the academic realm and the finance realm and that faculty governance could not tell the Chief Financial Officer what to do. The Chair said she has already gotten his agreement to work with the group to develop the procedures.

A member argued that the university was acting like a profit center instead of a non-profit entity. She also argued that the Senate should look at the U.S. Constitution and its constitution in terms of the Executive branch.

A member noted that some grants had external pressures put on them by CSU statewide and were now at an unfair disadvantage because of these restrictions. She also thought it would be interesting to know what percentage of faculty are

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:54 AM

Deleted: ,

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:55 AM

Deleted: '

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 9:56 AM

Deleted: we are absorbing

involved in applying for grants, as she thought it was hitting some people harder than others. She said she would like to see both a motion condemning the 20% and condemning the way it hasn't been publicized. She suggested that the Provost send out information immediately. She supported working on procedures that would take effect immediately and then having a committee working with the Provost and the CFO for more permanent procedures.

The Statewide Senator noted that the statewide equivalent of FSAC is taking this same issue up with the Chancellor's office. **She moved that the interim procedures be referred to the Faculty Subcommittee on Sponsored Programs. Second. Approved.**

A member said that she found the statement by the Provost that the Schools have money incredible. She gave examples. She noted that faculty are doing work "out of their hides" and she couldn't see being asked to do more.

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:01 AM

Deleted: '

The Provost said that he may not sound sympathetic, but in that School the member uses as an example, they are making resource allocation decisions that the money being asked for could be used where they can generate more FTE. He said the Schools have ways of using money for the core type of grants that they have. In some cases, there may be a small pot of money, in others they may pay the 20% IDC and then have less money to do the actual work of the grant, but the grant can move forward.

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:02 AM

Deleted: ly

A member asked where the Schools could get more money to get more grants. If there is no IDC, where would that money come from?

The Provost responded that the \$200,000 they will get next year and the 4 subsequent installments of \$200,000 will eventually lead to a 1 million dollar faculty development fund that could be targeted, in part, to grant proposal development.

The Chair commented that there was money that used to be paid out of a different pot for grants and now that there's new money set aside for faculty development. we will have to pay for things we did not pay for in the past and perhaps even pay more. She questioned whether it actually cost 20% to pay for indirect costs.

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:03 AM

Deleted: that

The Provost said that the 20% is not set in stone and we're going to work on that. Also of the \$200,000 that comes in, Academic Affairs only gets 60%. So the net new money is \$74,000 a year. Some of this could be used to support grant activity.

A member asked where the money came from before three months ago to subsidize the grant process? Why is it not available?

The Provost said the 20% is not a realistic threshold. He said that no campus in the CSU approaches an average 20% IDC rate. Some of the better performing campuses get about 15 or 16%, but that's it. So 20% is an over estimate of the out of pocket expenses for supporting grants and is motivated in part by A&F's, looking at the whole contracts and grants area as one pot that has a big problem and they are trying to solve it first with IDC money, to minimize the bill that comes to campus.

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:08 AM

Deleted: is

The Provost is arguing that A&F should come to the campus with the bigger bill and separate out the academic grants. Treat them as they were before, 15%, 12%, whatever.

A member reminded the body that the President has said at the Senate that grants and contracts should be separated and he heard the Provost doing that, but wondered if A&F is doing that.

The Provost said he has worked out an agreement with the President before this “all hit the fan,” to treat faculty research grants differently than contract work. That’s been overrun by recent events, but he’s trying to get back to that.

A member asked if the Provost could assign a number to the giant hole he kept talking about.

The Provost said he didn’t dare to hazard a guess, as his number would not be accurate.

The Chair thanked everyone for having the conversation. She reiterated that FSSP will look at interim procedures. A resolution condemning this new 20% IDC rate will return to the Executive Committee soon.

A member said that there needs to be a communication about what is happening so that everyone knows about the changes, so no one misses deadlines, etc. The Provost said he would send out an email to all faculty about the emergency procedures he has shared with the Deans and making them aware of the need for longer lead times. The Provost said the campus has lost the institutional capacity to process grants. He said we have people, like L. Coate, learning on the job. He said the university needed to build into the general fund positions to support grants and contracts.

The APC Chair reiterated the need to get the word out and said APC was talking this morning about budget projections and thought things might be looking better. Now they hear about the Business School Accreditation and IDC and he’s waiting for what’s going to happen next week or next semester. It was very disconcerting to him.

Formal Dispute Resolution Procedures – D. Jordan

D. Jordan noted that this represents a major change from a jury-based system to a fairness board system for grade appeals, student grievances and cheating and plagiarism cases. SAC approved it and Structure and Functions approved the Fairness Board. A member asked if the timelines in the policies would be changed. D. Jordan noted that all the policies would need to be changed if these procedures are approved and they can be discussed individually at that time. **Approved to go forward to the Senate.**

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:09 AM

Deleted: e

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:10 AM

Deleted: e

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:11 AM

Deleted: ,

| Request to survey School representatives at the Senate – L. Holmström

The Senate Analyst asked the Executive Committee to proctor a survey she created for School representatives to faculty governance committees at the Senate to assist in the development of an orientation to faculty governance program. **No objection.**

Electronic communication with faculty – L. Holmström

The Senate Analyst said she had become aware that the way she had been sending out Senate emails to all faculty was no longer viable and she is exploring other ways to do it. She wanted to know if anyone on the Executive Committee would have a problem being automatically subscribed to an email list or a listserv that would only be used for the kinds of emails sent out for the Senate now. The Executive Committee had no issues.

Engineering Program curriculum revision – M. Halavais

It was discovered that the wrong materials were in the agenda packet. M. Halavais spoke about the correct curriculum revision. It was moved that the item be moved to the next Senate agenda. **No objection.**

Discuss format of continuing conversation in the Senate re: consultation with faculty brought about by Business Department Accreditation

The Chair said she was not sure how to identify this item, but that the Senate had requested a continuing discussion about the issues brought up by the Business Department Accreditation concerning how the decision was made to divert resources from other Schools to the Business School. She wanted the Executive Committee to help decide how to structure the conversation at the Senate.

There was discussion. What follows are highlights.

It was argued that it is important to have an on-going conversation about consultation and decision-making.

The Chair suggested the title for the item be “Budgetary Consultation with Faculty – discussion”.

The President said we have a vehicle to do this. That is the President’s Budget Advisory Committee. The Senate is advisory only. He thought that the Senate kept trying expand the ir jurisdictions and that was not appropriate.

The Chair responded that she agreed about the role of the budget committees and was just trying to go with the will of the faculty and find a way to structure this conversation.

A member said that he thought the issue was coming to the Senate at the end of a process instead of before, not the expansion of jurisdictions. He noted that he

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:15 AM

Deleted: was the issue,

thought the faculty voice was not heard in the budget committees. He argued there were strategic planning issues involved.

A member said perhaps it would be useful to start with the Policy on Consultation and particularly the Policy on Faculty Consultation in Budgetary matters for the Senate to assess whether the policies are working. A suggestion was made to create a task force to assess the policies on consultation.

The Provost said perhaps the Senate needed to be briefed on the consultation and budgetary cycle that is relative new. There is a process in place.

The Chair said she thought that such a briefing would not speak to people's problems that were brought up at the Senate. They are having issues with the consultation process in budgetary matters.

The CFO said this is the first year the PBAC has followed the new policy and they have followed the budget cycle and topic meticulously. They made one change and did not discuss the campus reserve until February instead of December.

The Chair noted that the PBAC was working differently this year.

A member asked where the faculty should express dissenting opinions. He noted it was very clear where the faculty have no power, but they can still express an opinion. He said the budget committees are not like that.

The CFO noted that dissenting opinions were recorded in the minutes of the PBAC. And he lets the President know that such opinions were expressed.

It was suggested that faculty could bring formal resolutions to the PBAC. It was noted that a statement from the Senate has a different tone and role than an individual on a committee bringing a resolution. Both have their place.

A member said that the Senate can and should take positions and does set its own agenda. It's not that people don't say things in the PBAC or CRC, but they are not listened to. She expressed the frustration surrounding current budgetary matters – resources from the other Schools being used to fund the Business Department Accreditation, Schools having to make up the difference between 20% IDC and whatever a grant has for IDC and now paying for the hole left by CIHS.

The Chair suggested that in this conversation, the Senate have something to discuss that will lead to action.

The President said that being listened to and being agreed with are two different things. He listens. But he does not always agree.

A member said she agreed with the President about the difference between listening and agreeing, but noted that faculty influence seems to be absent.

A member noted the Senate wanted to talk to the Provost about this at the last meeting and **Senators** were frustrated that the Provost was not there. Perhaps the Provost could give a 5-minute briefing about how the decision was made, what consultation happened and how the decision fits in with the University Strategic Plan.

The Provost agreed to such a briefing.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Elaine McDonald-Newman

Correspondences

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes 3/8/07 – emailed

Revision of Counseling Curriculum, School Counselors - attachment



Ongoing report: Update on WASC

Special Guest: Vicki Vidak-Martinez, Mayor of Rohnert Park – T.C. 3:30

Faculty Governance Survey – L. Holmström T.C. 4:00

BUSINESS

1. Workload Resolution – Second Reading – T. Wandling
2. Resolution from San Bernardino on Access to Excellence – Second Reading – attachments
3. FYE resolution – Second Reading – attachment
4. Consultation with faculty re: Accreditation of Business Dept discussion continued
5. Discussion of impaction and related admissions issues
6. Advising Policy revision –First Reading - D. Jordan
7. Cost Sharing Policy revision – First Reading – C. Ayala
8. Formal Dispute Resolution Procedures – First Reading – D. Jordan – attachments

It was requested that the Provost provide information about the prioritizing of FYE. The Chair of EPC asked for the budget projections for EMT as well. It was noted that these two items were linked in the discussion at the Senate. There was discussion about the funding for Freshman Seminar from Academic Affairs.

The Chair noted that faculty governance had just discovered that the Freshman Seminar has changed drastically since it was approved through the curriculum committees and EPC originally. There were different budgets shown to APC and EPC on this matter in terms of how the courses are taught. There was considerable discussion about this matter and it was argued that the FYE item was not ready to

go forward to the Senate. The EPC chair made an impassioned argument about the inappropriateness of Student Service Personnel teaching over 1000 freshman and that directing money to FYE was questionable.

It was suggested that the Provost's report would be useful for this item.

Senate agenda above. *Approved.*

Chair-Elect Report

The Chair-Elect asked for the Executive Committee to approve committee appointments. For the Alternative Transportation committee – Michael Cohen, Biology; Search Committee for the Dean of Extended Education – Maria Hess, Psychology and Brian Wilson, Music. **All three appointments were approved.**

Good of the Order

C. Ayala noted that the appropriate signatures for the grant he was working on during the meeting were obtained in time.

Provost Report

The Provost reported that he gave a three page report to Gary Reichard on SSU's ideas about how the Access to Excellence process was going and he was appointed as co-chair to a writing group that will put together all the issues for the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström