

**Executive Committee**  
10/23/03  
3:00 – 5:00 Sue Jameson Room

**Present:** Catherine Nelson, Janet Swing, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Rick Luttmann, Noel Byrne, Melanie Dreisbach, Robert McNamara, Elaine McDonald, Elizabeth Stanny, Robert Coleman-Senghor

**Absent:** Ruben Armiñana, Phil McGough, Robert Karlsrud

**Chair's Report**

C. Nelson reported on items from the Trustees meeting. They will be reviewing the proposed '04-'05 budget that will go to the Governor's office and the Department of Finance. They sent along a calendar of the budget process, starting in November and December with conferences with the Governors office and DOF staff, then the Governor's budget in January, budget analyst review in February and etc, etc.

**Provost Ochoa Report**

E. Ochoa addressed the issue of the call from the Chancellor's Office about what the campus is doing for improvement in graduation rates and retention. We have a first draft of the report. It was developed by Rose Bruce and he has directed her contact C. Nelson for her input. Based on the Provost's Academic Council in the CSU, we believe that's the level of response that is called for. Something very brief that a Trustee can actually read and because our campus is in much better shape than many others in this area and the intent of the report is to assess what progress, if any has been made, or what measures are being taken to improve success in this area, this is the appropriate level of response, he believed. On the student success conference, the Chancellor's office has called for a team of faculty and administrators to come from each campus to attend the conference and he asked E. McDonald if she had been contacted about it. She replied yes, she has. He continued stating we are working on finalizing the membership of that group. We are going to send 9 people out of a possible 12 which seems plenty given the size of our campus.

E. McDonald asked if the draft about the graduation and retention rates could be sent to EPC as well. She noted they will be meeting on October 30<sup>th</sup> and would like to look at it then. She asked to have the draft in time for the EPC packet agenda. R. McNamara asked about the Strategic Planning Meeting and if there were any updates the faculty needed to know about and would it be talked about at the Senate meeting? C. Nelson responded that they are finalizing the last few members of the actual planning committee. Several community people we wanted couldn't make it. So we're filling those slots and we did finalize the membership of the committee of the whole at the smaller committee meeting and the decision was made there to not include faculty on the VPBAC, rather to go to the Schools for representatives outside of VPBAC membership. The rationale for that, as she understood it, was that a planning process such as this, the idea is go as deep as possible into the campus community and since this is an ad hoc thing the idea is to try to get outside the lines of faculty governance if possible and get people that may

have a perspective rather than being the official representative of a group. The same would hold true for example the President of the union, we may want a union member, but not the President of the union because you don't want official constituencies represented because you are trying to get beyond official constituencies and get to a large conversation about values and the nature of the university. The second reason for that was that the VPBAC has a separate function from the planning process. At the time it seemed to be the sense of the faculty leadership that the leadership wanted to keep the two functions separate. Keep the VPBAC meeting on it's own, doing what it's supposed to be responsible for, keeping us grounded in the budget process and have the planning committee doing the more philosophical discussion at the same time. R. McNamara stated he brought it up to find out if it will be on the Senate agenda. E. Ochoa said he could discuss it at his report. R. McNamara clarified that he was interested in hearing about the planning for the first two meetings specifically. C. Nelson said after introductions the meeting will be run like a town hall, with individual people speaking, etc. N. Byrne asked if the faculty members would be outside of those participating in the governance process, how would they be selected or identified? C. Nelson responded that the small committee identified who did we know in the campus community and who was recommended to us from other parties and we came up with a list of people. N. Byrne asked if it was appropriate to learn who the persons are yet? E. Ochoa responded that not all people have responded and did not want to put anyone on the spot if they haven't agreed to serve yet. As soon as it is finalized, we'll make it public.

R. Luttmann asked APC chair R. Coleman-Senghor if he had any comment. (R. Coleman-Senghor has just arrived to the meeting.) R. Coleman-Senghor stated that the position of APC, there was concern that the Long Range Planning document which is now before the Senate, that the date should be moved up. He resisted that and moved and spoke to the fact that we're engaged in our on-going process, that fits with our schedule. He also informed them that the Strategic Planning process is an initiative of the Provost and it is for the Division and we've spoken about the differences between the division plan and the plan for the university and there needs to be time for the plan to develop in its own way, the Provost's plan. Our plan will continue on. He reminded that the university does have an academic plan that has been approved by the Senate and by the former VP and he spoke about the difference between the Strategic Planning and the Long Range Plan. He also spoke to APC about the need for a strategic posture and his metaphor was the difference between having a map of the territory, which is the Long Range Plan, and the strategic plan which is what you have to navigate from one point to another. And then the need for a plan to deal with the storm. Using that sort of thinking, what he presented to the committee was that the Strategic Planning Process from the Provost will go on. We will reach stage one in December. And that will be an on-going process which the Provost has agreed to continue informing the body as a whole including the Senate of what is going on in that process. APC will be sending forth a small statement to the Provost that speaks to our readiness as a committee work with him and our concern that in the this process there is a constant reminder that we do have a Long Range Plan and part of this is already manifest is that in the planning documents is the Long Range Plan, both the other one and the revised one. M. Dreisbach suggested that glimpses into the process be put on the web. R.

Coleman-Senghor stated that when he came in he heard discussion about the membership of the committee and although there were differences, he thought they were very productive. We did agree to have newer faculty members on the committee and there are 13 faculty members on the list. Through good fortune, 4 of those are participants in APC. E. Ochoa stated that the information in the Strategic Planning binder, that is in electronic format, is being put on the web. We readily accept the suggestion that we have a copy available for review at our office and the Senate office. The facilitator will try to summarize the outcome of the discussion after each session and bring it to the committee for approval, so we can post them after they are approved.

## **Business**

### **1. Filing Vacancies after election before taking office – M. Dreisbach**

M. Dreisbach stated that Structure and Functions finalized its work on two business items that were begun last semester. This was about filing replacements on the Academic Senate, specifically officers of the Senate and Lecturer Senators. Our by-laws provide for replacement of At-Large Senators, School representative Senators, but not officers or Lecturer Senators. So for Article II, Section 1 of our by-laws we are proposing adding section 1.7 dealing specifically with replacement of officers and describing what currently has been happening. She described the addition. The second part has to do with the replacement of Lecturer Senators. Structure and Functions spent considerable time on this last year and then the constitutional amendment passed giving lecturers three year terms and it really complicated the issue as it arrives at the same time they we have budgetary restraints and Lecturer Senators suddenly in jeopardy of not having sufficient WTU's to serve continue serving on the Senate. What we're proposing is that in the section 3.10 dealing with replacement of Statewide Senator and At-Large Senator that we actually add a second paragraph dealing with Lecturer Senators. She described the proposal. Clarification questions were posed by E. Ochoa and R. Luttmann and R. Coleman-Senghor. R. Coleman-Senghor questioned the readiness of the document since there are so many issues regarding the Lecturer Senators being worked on at this time. He asked to see all the documents related to status of part timers in the Senate at once to be able to see the structural and procedural relationship between them. C. Nelson asked if he was asking for all the documents in a package. R. Coleman-Senghor responded yes. **C. Nelson suggested that the replacement of officers go forward to the Senate and that the replacement of Lecturer Senators be held back until FSAC is finished debating the issue of compensation. Then the compensation, replacement and constitutional amendment on eligibility can be brought to the Senate as a package. No objection.**

### **2. Conflict: By-Laws and Grade Appeal Policy – M. Dreisbach**

M. Dreisbach stated that work was begun on this item by Structure and Functions last spring and they have finalized their work. There was a conflict between the by-laws and our grade appeal policy regarding who is responsible for actually selecting the members of the Grade Appeal Panel and selecting the Chair of the panel. The By-Laws designate the Chair-Elect of the Faculty as the person who is responsible

for selecting the members of the panel and appointing the chair. Whereas the Grade Appeal Procedures designate the Structure and Functions subcommittee as responsible for selecting the faculty members and for selecting a member of Structure and Functions to serve as chair. We are desirous of resolving the conflict and the easiest way to do it is to actually change the by-laws to go with the Grade Appeal Policy. R. Luttmann has informed us that blue paper policy trumps the by-laws. She presented the Academic Senate by-laws under 1.3F the duty of selecting a grade appeal panel and appointing the chair and just deleting that and going with the Grade Appeal procedures set in blue paper policy whereby the subcommittee selects the panel and designates one of the members of Structure and Functions as serve as non-voting chair. R. Luttmann suggested revising part E as well. M. Dreisbach responded that as she was typing the document up she realized the list of duties did not accurately reflect the actual duties of the Chair-Elect, so at another time she will return with that cleaned up. She noted that this action is in response to a grievance last year. **It was agreed to put the item on the Senate's agenda.**

### **3. EPC: last minute addition to catalog copy – E. McDonald**

E. McDonald stated she heard that the date for the next catalog copy is November 7<sup>th</sup> and there is only one EPC meeting between now and then. She just received word from the Physics department that they have some changes to their major that they would like to have in the new catalog. It hasn't come before EPC yet. She asked for advice on this. She would like to work with them as best as possible, but she wasn't sure what they could do about it. The changes would have to fly through EPC, somebody would have to waive the first reading, we would have to approve their proposal unanimously, it would have to go to the Senate as a consent item. A lot would have to happen for them to get approval at the October 30<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting.

M. Dreisbach stated it was her understanding that this catalog is going to be on the web and not in hardcopy. If that is correct, it seems we would be able to update it and revise it more frequently than every two years. She was not in favor of rushing it through in one week. E. McDonald responded that she had heard that even if it goes into electronic form only that there will be a deadline that says any students who begins their major before a certain time follows these particular rules. E. Ochoa asked if he was correct that the catalog cycle was two years? That was affirmed. E. Ochoa said that one thing you can get out of a web based catalog is you can go to a one year cycle. So students could be ruled by an annual marker rather than a bi-annual marker. That would require all of us to have review cycles for programs to fall within that one year cycle. If that's possible, then it's desirable in this day and age when certain programs need to keep up with changes that are occurring in the discipline. R. Coleman-Senghor stated he was not in agreement with a rushed catalog. A major change in their program - that's such an essential part of the curriculum here. Physics is basically an inter-disciplinary program on this campus, if you look at all the programs that use Physics classes in one way or the other, he was reluctant to have it rushed through the Senate. He stated the catalog year begins with the calendar in the fall. Therefore the contractual relationship begins with the calendar of 2004. There's plenty of time given the new electronic processes to make changes. R. Luttmann agreed not to rush the item because it would be on the web

and wouldn't be effective until people started here next fall. R. Coleman-Senghor pointed out that having two readings in EPC with unanimous approval would be more persuasive than it coming with one reading to the Senate. N. Byrne asked whether the web-based catalog deadline still needs to be in the fall. E. McDonald asked for a determination that the catalog becomes effective in the fall. Is it Provost Ochoa's office that creates those deadlines and is it for sure going to only be an electronic version this fall? E. Ochoa stated he had a meeting this morning and found out the President has already given the go ahead to do this. There's continuing reservations being expressed by Susan Kashack, presumably those may be a barometer of some concern of some faculty about the lack of a hard copy catalog. We will talk to the Dean's about any concerns there may be and try to address those concerns and mitigating whatever fallout comes from switching to a web based catalog. If there are advising faculty that are going to be hampered in their traditional way of advising because of the lack of a hard copy catalog, we would make sure they have adequate computers and that they were trained in the use of the web based or CD rom based catalog so we would mitigate any adverse consequences. But the decision stands. M. Dreisbach noted that part of the catalog that is not brought up to date is the listing of faculty in the back and that the departments are not given that section to update. How can they get their portion of that? E. Stanny asked if the deadline for catalog copy could be moved. E. Ochoa said he didn't see any reason why it couldn't, but he couldn't do that now. R. McNamara noted that the November 7<sup>th</sup> deadline was for the first draft.

#### **4. Spring Faculty Retreat**

C. Nelson introduced this item and asked the Executive Committee for input. Topics already brought up have been Shared Governance and What is a Liberal Arts Education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. There was a wide ranging discussion and the following ideas were also offered: General Education continued, Panel with new faculty (what the experience is like for them, what are their issues), Shared Governance in creating a 21<sup>st</sup> century Liberal Arts University, How to integrate the demands of governance, teaching and research, What makes us come to work on the deepest level. M. Dreisbach suggested a subcommittee to work on it. C. Nelson said she would rather not go to another committee and was happy to work on it via email. E. Ochoa noted that the idea of Liberal Arts in the 21<sup>st</sup> century worked well with his Strategic Planning effort. It was suggested that Rick Marks be contacted for input as well.

#### **Reports continued**

##### **Chair-Elect – M. Dreisbach**

M. Dreisbach reported about faculty representation on the search committee for the Director of Admissions and Recruitment. She forwarded the recommendation as discussed at the last Executive Committee meeting to VP Crabbe, and cc'd the Provost and the President and she has set up a meeting with K. Crabbe to discuss faculty interest in this committee incorporating three faculty members. In terms of the Disabled Students Services Advisory Committee, she did receive two emails from faculty asking questions, but no strong nominations have come forth. **She**

would like the Senate to approve Elaine McHugh and Barbara Lesch-McCaffry appointment to the DSS committee on the year basis. C. Nelson asked if there was any objection to putting this on the Senate agenda as a consent item. No objection.

#### **Vice-President of Administration and Finance – L. Furukawa-Schlereth**

L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he wanted to alert this committee and asked for time at the Senate to talk about faculty and staff housing. It's his sense by next Thursday, Sonoma State through Enterprises will have made an offer on two parcels of land. The committee meet Monday and got consensus on this and he has to talk to the President for final approval. He stated it was a significant event in campus history and there was a long way to go before breaking ground on the first house, but it would be a fairly exciting development.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked who was in charge of the move for Darwin Hall? He stated that the Campus Planning Committee is asking people not to change the unit value of their courses because of the effect that might have. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded the Campus Planning Committee has taken no action. They have not met. They will receive an information time from the Space Committee about the interim plan. The interim space plan is the purview of the Space Committee. E. Ochoa stated he needed to call that committee. R. Coleman-Senghor asked if E. Ochoa's office was ready to bring to the Senate any kind of report with respect to the Darwin move? E. Ochoa said no. We have to go through that committee first. The School of Science and Technology has come up with a plan of what they think they will need to function in the intervening period, that estimate was reviewed by the facilities people, and they came back with something thing tighter and more cost effective so that may well be the last word because of the resource issue. He said he hasn't heard a clear enough signal from the School that they can live with that, that's the first thing he wants to get covered. Once there is a, probably grudging, consent he will convene the Space committee. The amount of space they are going to get will have implications for everyone else. R. Coleman-Senghor clarified that the money coming for the renovation is coming from the state and the money is committed, the timing can't change, but the cost of the move is coming out of general funds. How much will that be? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that he estimated it will be in the neighborhood of \$1.5 million. R. Coleman-Senghor asked if there were risk management issues that compel us now too? L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded yes, when you have to reconfigure space for science curriculum there's all sorts of health and safety issues that you would not have in the Humanities, so it's more complicated. R. Luttmann noted that in the CRC the Darwin move was discussed and the limited availability of class room space was brought up and there was some discussion of postponing unit changes until that was over, but only discussion. R. McNamara suggested that the full Senate should have the benefit of this discussion. E. Ochoa said he could provide the steps and where we were are in the process, but wouldn't want to make the details of the plan known now because we still haven't gotten agreement. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he could discuss the financial aspect of how we're going to afford it.

## **APC**

R. Coleman-Senghor reported the Provost is coming to APC's next meeting. They met with people from Education today about the joint doctorate. They will be coming forward with a proposal. It looks as though they've done some really good work over the last year. They've solved a lot of technical problems. But one problem that still exists is something like the library and access rules. Here is an example of a joint project and having to think about joint constraints and shared technological needs to provide our students with the educational resources that they need.

## **EPC**

E. McDonald reported that besides work that comes from departments, etc. EPC is working on two main issues. One is the GE reform process, we'll be looking closely at the GE path that was presented to the Dean's Council last semester in our meeting next week. She hopes in a few weeks there will be response from EPC to the Senate about that process. The other process we are finally concluding is the interim program review process. We're dealing with the last programs this semester. Then the regular program review process will have to be developed and we'll be working in consultation with various interested parties on that and it will probably be a fairly involved process.

## **FSAC**

E. Stanny reported that FSAC passed a resolution on lecturer compensation. It will be included in the next meeting's packet. We had Tom Nolan in to talk about evaluating online courses and we decided to use the same questions as on the SETE because he said those were applicable.

## **SAC**

J. Swing reported that SAC has been discussing heavily the recruitment issue and advisement and we've come up with an initiative with the Advising subcommittee to have a "Lucy" booth in the Library. Part of this is in response to the AS concerns about advising from the faculty. We're going to have an advising trail balloon a few weeks before registration and the Library is thrilled as they get asked constantly questions about academic advising. So this booth will be staffed by faculty and Student Services Professionals who do advising.

R. McNamara asked E. Stanny about the online course evaluations and if the people who teach online were consulted. E. Stanny responded yes. We brought Tom Nolan in who teaches online and he talked with the person in Nursing who teaches exclusively online.

## **5. Senate Agenda**

### **AGENDA**

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes

Appointment of Elaine McHugh and Barbara Lesch-McCaffry to Disability Services Advisory Committee

*Mayor Armando Flores will visit the Senate*

### **BUSINESS**

1. From S&F: Conflict with By-Laws and Grade Appeal Policy – First Reading – attachment – M. Dreisbach T. C. 4:20

2. From S&F: By-Laws change regarding replacement of officers – First Reading – attachment – M. Dreisbach T. C. 4:35

8. Senate Budget Committee – A. Merrifield T. C. 3:10

*MS Approved*

### **Good of the Order**

M. Dreisbach reminded the committee about the dinner at her home on November 15<sup>th</sup> to welcome the Provost and his wife. The committee discussed the time of the event and other details of the event.

**Adjourned 5:00**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*