

Executive Committee Minutes

February 3, 2005

3:00 – 5:00 Sue Jameson Room

Present: Melanie Dreisbach, Jan Beaulyn, Catherine Nelson, Sam Brannen, Tim Wandling, Brigitte Lahme, Elizabeth Stanny, John Wingard, Elaine McDonald, Susan McKillop, Bob Coleman, Ruben Arminañá

Guests: Barbara Chapman, Steve Orlick

Approval of Agenda – item 6 rescheduled for later meeting “Priority Registration Policy” – *Approved.*

Approval of Minutes of 12/9/05 – *Approved.*

Correspondence: The Chair noted an email from Faculty Trustee Kathy Kaiser expressing gratitude for being re-nominated for the Trustee position by the SSU Academic Senate.

Chair’s Report

The Chair noted she was going to the WASC workshop in San Mateo this weekend. She informed the body of the other faculty attending: Elaine McDonald, Carlos Benito and Paul Draper. The workshop is about assuring educational effectiveness and assessment of student learning. She noted the GE fair coming up on Feb. 15, 16 and 17. She’s been asked to moderate a panel on WASC. She just received today FAQ’s about Educational Effectiveness from WASC and will make the website available to the body. The Enrollment Management Council Chair’s designee will be Emiliano Ayala. The Chair typed up a summary of the faculty retreat breakout sessions and L. Holmstrom pulled from the summary concrete recommendations and took a first crack at where these recommendations would be best considered. The Chair, Past Chair and Chair-Elect are looking over this and will bring it to the Executive Committee for consideration. It was very clear at the faculty retreat that concrete results from the deliberations were desired. From Convocation we’ve received about 80 responses to the What Matters form regarding WASC. L. Holmstrom has begun analyzing the responses and categorizing them. We are still getting them back. On February 28, the Professional Development subcommittee is going to sponsor Conversations with recipients of the Excellence in Teaching Award. More advertising will go out.

Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – attachment

Francisco Gaona and Donna Yonash were submitted as eligible from Faculty Affairs. **MSP to send these names to the Senate.**

Faculty Governance Release Time for '05 – '06 – attachment

The Chair noted that the Provost was not in attendance so this was a preliminary discussion. The Chair noted that she was able to get two units from the Provost to add to the unused lecturer unit for the Past Chair for this semester only.

There was considerable discussion about the duties of the Past Chair. It was questioned whether the current Chair created new duties for the Past Chair. The Chair responded that the work of the Past Chair was already going on. It is only now being codified in the policy Structure & Functions is working on "Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters." It was noted that future Past Chairs may also require release time for these duties.

It was noted that if duties have been added to the Past Chair, the duty change needs to go through the by-laws.

The current Past Chair argued that the Past Chair position needs three units a year of release time or they should not do the duties.

It was suggested that if units can't be found, the faculty representation should remain on the committees the Past Chair sits on, but as at-large positions.

The Chair-Elect was asked how the Senate self study was going and whether at the end of the process there would be a conclusion about workload, duties and units. The Chair-Elect responded that she thought they would by the end of the semester.

Clarification was provided about how the Past Chair came to be asked to continue on the Campus Reengineering Committee which is not codified. It is being added to the Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters to be codified. That policy will go to the Senate for approval.

It was recommended that the Standing committee chairs absolutely need their units and that the Past Chair receive three units as well.

The Chair asked the body to reflect on the issue and make a recommendation next time.

Excellence in Teaching Committee – attachment

MSP to ask Bill Barnier and Sascha Von Meier for the Excellence in Teaching Committee for this year.

The policy was referred to FSAC to consider adding a third person to the committee.

Statewide Senator Report

The Statewide Senator asked that the Cornerstones report be given five minutes at the Senate for her to point out to the body that it is Trustee policy and behind many of the changes we are seeing.

The body agreed.

SB1212 implementation – B. Chapman – attachment

B. Chapman handed out packets. She introduced herself as an adjunct faculty member in the department of Biology at SSU.

The Chair stated that B. Chapman had asked for this issue to be discussed at the Faculty Retreat, but the Chair had offered her the opportunity to address the Executive Committee.

B. Chapman stated that there is a faculty rights statute that has been law for 40 years. It establishes the right to peer review of every grievance and disciplinary matter, the right to counsel, the right to a written record of the proceeding, and the right to unrestricted, binding arbitration paid for by the university. She pointed out the mandatory nature of the current law directing the CSU Board of Trustees to create grievance procedures for all academic employees including adjuncts. She noted the Chancellor has a mandatory duty to consult with the Academic Senate in the development of these procedures. She gave a history of the implementation of the statute so far in the CSU. Initially, procedures were passed by the Academic Senate. However, she argued that campus Presidents were opposed to the grievance procedure and over the years a series of Executive Orders “weaken” the procedures and removed all the rights of the faculty rights statute. She stated that SB1212 was necessitated because the legislature always believed that the collective bargaining agreements would provide more rights than the law. SB1212 provides a minimum level of rights for faculty that would only be superseded by a collective bargaining agreement if the bargaining agreement provides more rights. She argued that even though CFA supported the bill, it has not brought the information to the attention of the faculty. Neither has the Chancellor updated his Executive Orders to reflect the restoration of rights under SB1212. She asked that the Senate inform the faculty of their rights under the statute. She argued that we need to ensure that the Chancellor issues new Executive Orders that are fully consistent with the law. She thought the Senate should develop the procedures, give them to the Board of Trustees for adoption and then they could ask the Chancellor to implement. Also a system needs to be created to monitor that the administration is complying. She noted that there are also protections in HERRA against reprisals.

It was a members understanding that CFA and the CSU were in negotiations with each other on this issue and argued that it was inappropriate for the SSU Senate to act until those negotiations were completed.

B. Chapman strongly disagreed that any negotiations were going on between the CFA and CSU and stated that CFA had filed an Unfair Labor Practice against the CSU regarding this implementation. The first PERB hearing went in favor of CFA. CSU is appealing the ruling to the full PERB board and the issue is in abeyance until that hearing. She argued that the statute is in affect now.

It was noted that contradictory information was obtained very recently from CFA leadership and that negotiations are being held.

It was moved refer to FSAC the task of reviewing the current SSU policy on faculty grievances and compare it to SB1212 to see if there are any discrepancies. Second.

Points of discussion included the fact that the grievances procedures are in the union contract and having FSAC look at them was a waste of time; that it seemed important for faculty members to explore the possibility that a law may give them more rights than the union contract; the legal issues appeared cloudy.

Question called. Approved.

Vote on motion to refer – Yes = 4; No = 6, Failed.

It was noted that the issue could return when it has become clear what is happening between CFA and the CSU.

CSU and SSU Data Summary: SFR & Average Class Size – S. Orlick

S. Orlick presented information he had gathering from the CSU regarding comparing student faculty ratios and average class sizes. He wanted to get a handle on anecdotal information that people operate on about how hard a time we have here, and how that compares to other campuses. He discussed his diagrams. Points he made regarding the diagrams: SSU is third largest of the smaller campuses, in Fall 2003 SSU's SFR was the third highest.

A question was asked about the difference in SRF and class size and the Senator recalled that previously when S. Orlick brought similar information we were told that somehow SSU was different and could not be compared to the other campuses. He noted we may be told the same thing again.

The President gave a history of the issue. He noted that prior to 1994, there was the "orange book" with formulas. It was a system based on mode and level. In 1994, as we were in a deep recession, the system stopped using the "orange book" and went to marginal cost. Campuses that were older and had

a different history, managed more and level much better than SSU had done. He said he did a study that argued when the system stopped the “orange book,” the differences between campuses became cemented in the base. He argued that, if the amount of money that it took to open a campus and operate it, the basic amount, about \$11 million, if that was taken off the top and then the calculations were made, this campus compared to Humboldt was significantly disadvantaged. They had discussions about this with the Chancellor and Campus Presidents. At the end of the discussions, he was told, you win the argument. But there was no remedy available because it is a zero sum game. Those inadequacies have been perpetrated in our base and that will continue. If enrollment is allocated differentially, that might help the problem. He said he thought S. Orlick’s figures were right, but didn’t think that there is a remedy given the way money has been distributed from the system on marginal cost.

S. Orlick’s diagram points continued: SSU’s average class size is slightly below the CSU average; If Monterey Bay is eliminated, SSU has the highest SFR of comparable (smaller) campuses at all levels; SSU has the second highest average class size of comparable campuses; SSU’s SFR has been higher than the average CSU SFR historically except for 1998.

He elaborated on 1998. He began his term as Faculty Chair that year and asked the then Provost what it would take to at least bring SSU to the CSU average. He was told that every one point drop in SFR is approximately \$1 million in faculty salaries. He said he did not know, but it looked like in 1998 there was infusion of dollars. After that year, it has spiraled up. He argued that he thought it was possible to bring the SFR down because it has already happened.

S. Orlick’s diagram points continued: SSU’s average class size has gone up and down more dramatically than the CSU average.

It was moved to defer the item to the next Executive Committee meeting for completion. Second. *Approved.*

S. Orlick finished by discussing historical comparisons of how many students added, how many faculty added, SFR and CSU SFR. From 1989 – 2003 we’ve gone up almost 2000 students, added 22.6 faculty for a student faculty ratio of 88 to 1, the SFR has gone up 5.0 and the CSU SFR has gone up 2.2. We had a 127% higher increase in our SFR than the CSU.

A Senator asked for a key to the table.

A Senator asked for information about how the marginal cost formula is used at SSU. He also asked the President for his view on why the SFR declined in 1998.

Questions for the President

The Statewide Senator noted that the high SFR's are bigger than just our campus. If the CSU does not meet the growth targets set by the Legislature, we're in trouble. We are taking 5% instead of 2% to help out the whole system. Perhaps if faculty knew that they would be able to bear this burden better.

Questions for the Chair-Elect

A Senator asked the Chair-Elect about the search for the Director of Admissions. A constituent of his heard that the search failed. Has the job description changed, how are we proceeding forward if all of their candidates were deemed unworthy? Also there is a concern that we are only admitting on the basis of the eligibility index, and if that's the only criteria used, why do we need a Director of Admissions.

The Chair-Elect said she would look into it.

Senate Agenda - attachment

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Melanie Dreisbach
Correspondences:
Consent Items:

- Approval of the Agenda
- Approval of Minutes 12/16/04 – emailed

☛ Ongoing report: Update on WASC

BUSINESS

1. Course Outline Policy – Second Reading – E. McDonald – attachment
2. Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – First Reading – attachment

Approved.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom