

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 18, 2001

Present: Rick Luttmann, Noel Byrne, Phil McGough, Peter Phillips, Tim Wandling, Catherine Nelson, Susan Moulton, Art Warmoth, William Poe, Michael Litle, Ruben Armiñana, Bernie Goldstein, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

Absent: Susan McKillop

Guest: Jeff Langley

Meeting began 3:05

Approval of the Agenda - Approved with additions to Business of Academic Freedom Committee, and consent items from EPC - Blended BA from Hutchins and New Theater Arts course.

Approval of Minutes - Not Approved. Additional language needed from Peter Phillips regarding his recommendation that the Senate secretary attend Executive cabinet meetings and the Enterprises board. P. Phillips will send language to Senate office for inclusion in the minutes. The remarks belong in the section on APC's report.

Correspondence Received - none

REPORTS - all reports postponed

Chair of the Faculty - (R. Luttmann)
President of the University - (R. Armiñana)
Provost/Vice President (B. Goldstein)
Statewide Senator - (S. McKillop)
Chair-Elect of the Senate - (N. Byrne)
Vice President, Admin. & Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)
Chairs, Standing Committees - (Moulton, Warmoth -attachments, Litle, Poe)

BUSINESS

1. Electronic Voting

R. Luttmann - Laurel has discovered that we could move to Senate elections run electronically. People could vote only once, we could identify who voted, but votes would be anonymous. It would also allow totaling the vote very quickly. The way the system works is that faculty members could vote on any computer. We talked in Structures & Functions about this and the idea came up that Laurel could give instruction to all the AC's so any faculty who had trouble could get local help. We did an experiment through Structures & Functions to see how it would work. We certainly would not want to put this in place without the Senate's approval. Laurel has worked out a comprehensive presentation on Power Point. Let's schedule this for a Senate agenda. It

wouldn't work on the next agenda, especially if we hear reports on the Green Center. I suggest we have it on the meeting three weeks from today.

2. Fee Advisory committee rep from Senate - past Chair or SAC Chair?

R. Luttmann - This was discussed last year and at Phil's suggestion, he had reached an agreement with Melanie that it was a good idea. Phil's recollection is that it was done, but can't find it in a record. The replacement of him with Michael Litle has already been approved by the President, but we need to plug the hole in the paper trail. It was discussed at Structures & Functions.

P. McGough - It was my recollection that we discussed it here - that's why it was a done deal.

R. Luttmann - We're hoping this would be non-controversial and receive favorable support from those who have looked at it. Are we willing to adopt it formally?

W. Poe - So moved.

Seconded

P. McGough - Is there any record that Melanie discussed this with SAC?

M. Litle - We discuss it and favored it.

No objections.

3. University-Wide Lectures Forum, recommendation from S & F

N. Byrne - Buzz Kellogg has agreed to chair the University-wide Lecture forum. I have sent names of people that would be useful on such a committee and have willingness to serve. Myrna Goodman has agreed. The business before us is to confirm Buzz as chair.

R. Luttmann - Also that the University-wide Lecture forum go forward. We can contribute more names of people who might serve and provide a useful perspective.

W. Poe - Is this a new organizational entity?

J. Langley - It's form is an exploratory committee to look at the idea of a Senate sanctioned committee to see if it is feasible to have a university-wide lecture series. It is not a forgone conclusion. Should it exist in a centralized way or could it be decentralized? The Green Center might be venue for this.

W. Poe - Is it an add hoc committee of Structures & Functions or the Executive Committee?

R. Luttmann - It was brought to the Senate. The Senate didn't formally endorse it and it was referred to Structures & Functions.

P. McGough - Whose committee was it to be?

W. Poe - It makes sense as an ad hoc committee of Structures & Functions. We need to know whose it is.

R. Luttmann - Let's agree that it is part of Structures & Functions.

P. McGough - Will Buzz make recommendations on who the rest of the members are?

N. Bryne - He would forward names of people who have agreed to serve.

P. McGough - We wanted more consultation, this seems less.

N. Byrne - The idea was that a range of names be suggested and others could be added. Structures & Functions upon reflection determined it didn't want to forward names of people who hadn't agreed. Structures & Functions will select from the names and forward them to the Executive Committee. It was my idea to delegate this to Buzz.

P. McGough - The list was refused last spring because the committee wanted more consultation. If we now entrust to it one person, are we doing that?

N. Byrne - Instead of having Buzz do this I could.

R. Luttmann - Bring this back in two weeks. You can contact people and bring to this body a list of people who have agreed. If the Executive Committee approves they will serve. Any objection?

No objections.

4. Consent Calendar items

R. Luttmann - On your agenda this is numbers 2, 11, the Hutchins/Education blended BA and the new Theater Arts course. #2 is a trailer bill. Remember we approved 120 units degree with one exception. Biology's B.S. at 123 should have been 126. Rather than make them go through a brand new approval process to we thought to put it back where it was. In the conversation between Phil Northern, Art and myself, we thought we should just be able to correct this.

A. Warmoth - I suggested we should inform EPC so they could raise concerns. If no one on EPC objects we could go on.

R. Luttmann - The next EPC meeting is Thursday morning. Our action could be tentatively to put this on the consent calendar.

W. Poe - I have no problem with this one, but are we clearly closing the door? I don't want to see another one come forward.

A. Warmoth - Business may come with an issue too.

W. Poe - Yes, I was thinking of that. Any person who voted for this at the last meeting could ask for reconsideration. We would open the reconsiderations at the same time. Can we have a process where everyone is considered by EPC and we close the door?

R. Luttmann - My understanding about this is that the only one that would qualify was a mistake. We made clear that this decision is now and everyone else would have to go through EPC.

P. McGough - Business does intend to come forward, so the door has closed?

R. Luttmann - I don't know what you're planning. When we were at the Senate, from Duane's comments, Business is in a different position. We have exceptions for those where there wasn't enough elective to reduce degrees to 120. Business has a cushion of 14 units of electives and that has now been reduced to 10. It was EPC that discussed this at length and decided that they did not want to protect the cushion of electives and the Senate agreed. If my facts are correct I don't see that Business could qualify as a mistake. They are welcome to apply for a change.

P. McGough - I understood any major that wanted more than 120 could ask for it. Everyone I hear it from on campus, it sounds different.

A. Warmoth - In reality Business had a B.S. of 128 units. They could have forwarded it and it would have been accepted. Business was under the mistake that they had to reduce to 120, so they did. The ambiguity in language in the one from Math raised some of the same kinds of issues. The intention of EPC was basically to support rationales of departments in the B.S. area if they seemed reasonable. I'm not sure that Business doesn't have a similar argument.

N. Byrne - If Business is in this situation for misunderstanding, perhaps it is best to provide a reconsideration that the door be closed.

R. Luttmann - The action being proposed here is to let Biology move its degree from 123 - 126. We could stop there.

W. Poe - It has to do with being on the consent calendar only if further requests will go through EPC. I'm not willing to deal with it as a consent calendar item if we find another consent in two weeks from Business. Phil really did change his mind. It wasn't an error on anyone's part. They changed their argument.

1. Warmoth - I suggest we proceed following the suggestion that EPC needs to look it.

R. Luttmann - So we'll tentatively put it on the consent calendar so EPC has a chance to object. If it does we will pull it. Any objections?

No objection.

Hutchins/Education Blended BA

A. Warmoth - The Hutchins blended BA is designed for students to get in 4 years a 126 unit BA and teaching credential. There was a considerable amount of work done by Hutchins and Education faculty. They got a lot out of the process. It's kinda lock step, but unanimously approved by EPC.

S. Moulton - We need to get Jeannie Thompson's name off before it goes forward.

C. Nelson - I have a question about the proposed allocation for faculty on page 7. What is the source of money and will it be made prior to a comparison with requests from other schools? Will it come off the top?

B. Goldstein - I requested all the Deans to give me plans for future faculty needs, so it comes from proposals set by Deans.

C. Nelson - How far in future does it go?

B. Goldstein - That was a more permanent commitment. We were not able to get from each Dean further than 5 - 6 years down the road.

C. Nelson - Is this a commitment made no matter what budget we have?

B. Goldstein - It was made in conjunction with the request to Deans. This one came forth as a priority coming from the school.

C. Nelson - But it says every year after.

B. Goldstein - We had to make that commitment.

C. Nelson - Is that appropriate? It is normal policy?

B. Goldstein - It's a judgement call.

C. Nelson - Will this come off the top of school requests?

B. Goldstein - I have not made any other commitments.

S. Moulton - There are two programs, Hutchins and Education and two Deans involved. Maybe different language needs to be put in there qualifying that it will be up for grabs.

A. Warmoth - My sense is that the reality is that the allocation is always up for grabs every year. What is really going on is going on in administrative discussion between Deans and Provost and EPC chair. Looking at this is this question do we want to raise it in the senate and ask them to revise the proposal?

R. Luttmann - We would be approving this as a program, not the budget aspect. It is not appropriate that this information be there, but often the Senate wants to know.

C. Nelson - Dealing with the language in here, could it not be read as implicit that the Senate had agreed to this budget format?

R. Luttmann - The Senate doesn't do that.

Wandling - It seems to me we come to this point a lot - where budget impacts curriculum. The best place for this to happen is at the schools and in chair meetings, not the Senate, maybe the Budget committee.

S. Moulton - Maybe it is inappropriate in the proposal and would be better as an appendix.

C. Nelson - It is an action item as long a budget item is in there. I still think it needs to be discussed in that kind of forum.

The body approved this as an action item.

A. Warmoth - Theater Arts 200 - Seeing Theatre Today. This is a new course for viewing performances and going through a rich, critique process. The proposal was approved by the GE committee and EPC unanimously.

R. Luttmann - Any objection to putting this on the consent calendar?

No objections.

6. Women's and Gender Studies; a Department

R. Luttmann - This was approved by the Council of Department Chairs, Structures & Functions looked at it, are we willing to put it on the consent calendar?

P. McGough - Have they given an estimate of the cost of the change?

N. Byrne - Not to my knowledge. It is the case that it does have a stable core of faculty and permanent support. They did not identify a cost. In the Social Sciences Council of Department Chairs there is a high degree of scrutiny of anything that requires added cost. It is the first thing we ask of such a proposal as this.

P. McGough - When this goes to the Senate can there be a appendix for cost? It would be good policy for understanding the implications of change.

W. Poe - The cost would be administration cost, currently time assigned is to coordination. If there is no addition, no cost. The answer is cost potential is zero to some.

P. McGough - If this is your program, what would I expect over the next 5 years?

W. Poe - It has all the hallmarks of a department, stable faculty, stable core courses. They can have a chair without additional time.

T. Wandling - I'm not sure if it should be on the consent calendar. I don't know the difference between a program and a department. I know that I would be in favor of it, but am interested in having a public discussion just for educative purposes.

W. Poe - Very often departments had permanent faculty assigned to it as well a curriculum. A program has curriculum and courses but no permanent faculty. That's the most common distinction. This has had permanent faculty for some length of time. It's strange as a program.

C. Nelson - I support it wholeheartedly.

M. Little - In my experience as coordinator of COMS when it changed to a department - the possibility for more release time became more real. We did not have rooms that were assigned departmentally. We had more support to get more leverage in room assignment. There are also subtle power differences.

B. Goldstein - We need a policy statements about what is a department and what is program, there's some truth to what you said, but it is subjective. It would be nice to have some way to identify that.

M. Little - In those days it took a long time.

R. Luttmann - Whatever measures Bernie suggests we do - that would be quite an undertaking. I pose the question - if you want to do that before sending it to the Senate.

B. Goldstein - I didn't suggest that. I just think it would be good to have a policy.

R. Luttmann - One possibility is to charge Structures & Functions to look in to it.

C. Nelson - Does anyone have objections for this being on consent calendar?

P. McGough - I move that it goes as an action item for reason that I've brought up.

R. Luttmann - Is there an objection to this going on next Senate agenda a business item?

W. Poe - I appreciate that you want to become educated about programs and departments, but I don't like using Senate time to have a discussion about the history of SSU. If you think this is subject to debate and controversy, it is right to have it off consent calendar, but not just for the sake of learning about departments and programs.

P. McGough - Our one major job is to oversee the curriculum.

W. Poe - If no one speaks against it at the meeting, we'll pass it.

C. Nelson - Can we send an email to WGS with specific question so they know the questions and we can expedite any debate?

R. Luttmann - So, what is the difference between a program and a department and what resources will be used in the future.

S. Moulton - It is not appropriate for WGS to decide the difference between a department and a program.

T. Wandling - This is my own ignorance, and its not fair to put it on a particular program. I'd like to know what's been done in the past. It seems a good idea that Structure & Functions look at it. We should follow precedent. A department is a major thing. It's not like a course number change.

A. Warmoth - In the first paragraph it lists all these factors that merit it becoming a department. But it needs to come as a more formal program proposal, so there is a certain dignity to the proceedings.

M. Little - A 5-year program review was done previously. That was a pretty rigorous evaluation of where COMS stood. Have they done that? That's what we had to do. I still would not object. It's a great program. I just want to clarify steps taken in the past. Structures & Functions actually approved the status.

N. Byrne - I think Michael made an excellent point. We've identified four criteria - holder of a BA program, critical mass of faculty, clerical support , and facilities. Are those exhaustive? It could be a question, but those were the criteria identified.

A. Warmoth - All programs are going through the interim program review process.

R. Luttmann - We've agreed to ask Structures & Functions look more formally at the question of what a department and program are. We will get a more formal statement from WGS for the Senate. If we do both of these, can it go on the consent calendar?

P. McGough - Objection.

Faculty Retreat -

R. Luttmann - This would be on either the 23rd or 24th of January. The question to deal with today is would we be willing to agree that GE be the focus. APC and EPC have been talking about this. A draft discussion was given out at convocation. There is a general consensus that this would be a useful topic at the retreat. The GE subcommittee has agreed as well.

P. McGough - What do you see the outcome of this retreat?

A. Warmoth - Hopefully the outcome would be a fairly wide-spread discussion about possibilities for GE to be organized into a set of options and come up with policy proposals. The basic idea is to generate a broad campus discussion then funnel that into regular policy making process. Action could happen in the spring semester. The GE subcommittee is very much oriented to action and want to be involved in the design of the retreat.

P. McGough - So much policy is at stake. It needs to be focused more.

A. Warmoth - The start would be a vision statement that came out of the Asheville report. Other pieces worth mentioning. Asheville talks about mission and assessment. We would

pull out the mission part and not get in to assessment until we have consensus about mission. If this committee approves this topic, I'm happy to take it back to GE and other people interested and come back with a formal proposal.

P. Phillips - I've been to a number of faculty retreats. Some are fun and some did not really result in anything. The GE focus would be the same as well. Are we talking about classroom activity or policy of the university? I'd like to see us focus the faculty retreat on something that we can share and take back and use.

R. Luttmann - Is that impossible to accomplish with this topic?

P. Phillips - Not impossible, maybe a component that could fit in to any course if we have strong understanding of what that means and could commit to a philosophy in various ways throughout classrooms.

A. Warmoth - The strategy is aimed at getting a philosophy and oriented to getting some policy and practical things to take back to the classroom. We are trying to get information about what is going on in the classroom to help GE and EPC to find out what should be the policy and what would be needed to be assessed.

P. Phillips - That doesn't excite me so much. Something I could bring back holistically to students, that makes more sense to me.

A. Warmoth - We're coming from the sense that we could engage the faculty in some kind of consultation to generate that holistic understanding to give back to the classroom.

T. Wandling - I support those ideas, but GE can't be unlinked from assessment. It's a question of where we have a holistic program, the difference between breadth requirements and programs, different things for connection and coherence. It's good for us to think about a number of connections between programs or breadth requirements. I'd like to see some implementation.

R. Luttmann - Any work done on this has been volunteer. We haven't appointed anybody to be a committee. We could - are these three names the ringleaders?

A. Warmoth - Yes you can say that. Debora may need to bow out but Saul Eisen would replace her.

R. Luttmann - I have the view that we could accommodate this by dealing with the structure of this. I'm a biased member of the GE task force this year. I was excited by the document we brought back and would like to see this institution move forward on it. The retreat is good for a broad based discussion.

M. Little - Is this how it was brought forward. This list of skills?

A. Warmoth - It is what we brought to convocation.

R. Luttmann - It is a tentative list. It was never our intention that GE courses deal with all those issues. But our view was we really ought to talk about what the goals of courses are

and programs are. If a department says out of list of a dozen possible goals we do 5, 7 and 11 then they would be judged on that.

M. Little - A little bit like critical thinking, infusing critical thinking throughout programs.

R. Luttmann - I don't know whether to say yes or no. There a difference between breadth requirements and a GE program. We seem divided about this. As an institution we talk about it as though we have an integrated program and if you really look it, it is just breadth.

A. Warmoth - Also end saying student have a choice between an integrated program and a breadth program. On an operational level, there is a very general question whether or not we should have a set of goals for the GE program. A number of us have felt the statement provided by the Asheville group is a great start of a discussion. We'd like to move this along to get different points of view. Anything appropriate would be reported back for consultation, if the topic is approved.

W. Poe - I've watched this for 25 years and its always the same. It seems to me we have two distinct approaches and it's time to name them. Program or breadth. Those interested in an integrated program always claim breadth is a bad way to go. Those that want to have workshops are interested in a GE program. What happens is huge frustration. They run the forum and are all excited because they don't hear any opposition and those who prefer breadth programs are attaching anchors and by time it gets to governance nothing has changed. Unless it is extremely special. Like Peter, I would like to know how to do something I didn't know how to do before.

B. Goldstein - I think you can combine all of the things talked about there. The goal and objectives in the original sheet are useful to begin but we can take pedagogical aspects that can be included in this retreat. I think GE is perfect for an academic discussion.

S. Moulton - Dress it up little bit. I think GE can mean many things - there may be something for everybody. Get it refined, how to make GE real in a curriculum, how can communication around GE improve - a statement about ways to get information to student -that would be good.

P. McGough - It would be wonderful if Peter, Bill and Tim would join the planning committee.

R. Luttmann - This is an interesting discussion but I haven't heard any alternative proposal. I suggest we go ahead and authorize this. Fair enough.

A. Warmoth - For once I'm glad we take such thorough minutes.

Compensation for Lecturers

P. McGough - Could Executive committee point out to the Senate how the six units would be reallocated?

R. Luttmann - At the request of the Senate Laurel has contacted other Senates throughout the system. She asked - do they have a staff member on their senate, but I don't want to deal with that now. And questioned - do they have lecturers seats on their Senate and if so are they compensated. Nobody gives lecturers compensation. The problem with doing it by schools or departments, is that it is not uniform around campus, those that do get compensation are a burden on their departments. Since they are elected at large they have no particular service for a department.

A. Warmoth - I think we should bite the bullet and do it because it the right thing to do. We should not try to do it for the spring. We could say we will iron out the details and get back to the Senate when we figure it out in the fall. We could look at doing the reallocation of our current 54 WTU's - 1/2 units might be appropriate. I would like to see us go ahead and approve the principle then create the space to figure out how to implement it in the fall.

P. McGough - We should have our current allocation for the Senate and show where we would take units out. We don't need time to figure that out, it's straight forward. If we are going to implement it in the fall it has to be soon.

R. Luttmann - Yes, early in the spring term we will be setting the fall term.

A. Warmoth - Also the reason we're discussing it is that more information is available. It is appropriate to bring forward with additional information now available. If Phil is correct we could decide relatively simply we should bring that forward. It is appropriate to give information and go ahead and adopt the principle.

T. Wandling - Three question - Who decides? Lecturers need compensation, but it is more controversial to take it out of the existing allocation. Is it the process of this body or the Senate or Structures & Functions to decide how to divide up differently the present allocation? It's not fair for this issue. We need to address them separately.

C. Nelson - Bob Coleman raised the issue of who should be making the decision. For the current allocation who does have authority to make that decision? In his perusal of the constitution it is not up to the Executive Committee. We should address that. I'm not sure we can make a recommendation without knowing who should make it. Finally my understanding of the original motion that FSAC put forward is that it is structured in such a way that they don't want to separate out principle and action.

W. Poe - Yes.

C. Nelson - As the motion sits, we can't separate them out.

A. Warmoth - I think Bob Coleman's concern is addressed if we recommend revised release time and ask the Senate to approve it. The Senate then tends to support the principle.

N. Byrne - I note that Laurel has done some research this and did find something in the minutes of Feb 29 1968. They read " It was moved, seconded and passed that the Senate direct the Executive Committee to determine the allocation of release time for faculty

officers for 1968-69 and that the College Services Council develop a permanent policy on the allocation of release time." Now if we can just find the College Services Council's policy. I would like to add to Art's observation. The 54 WTU's currently allocated for faculty governance release time is fairly well established for this year. We know that this cannot be addressed in next academic year. Are we able to augment the 54 WTU's?

B. Goldstein - There is no way I could offer it next year with budget the way it is.

R. Armiñana - We can address it. There is a plus for Armiñana. Be careful what you ask for next year as it is a brutal year. Opening this discussion next year might not be the best year. We might address it at 22 hours instead of 54.

W. Poe - We very much need to separate this issue. Allocation to the Senate is a major item for the Executive Committee. It's never been part of the Senate's jurisdiction. We can't be directed by the Senate to do anything. We need to address the issue of 54 units. When I tell you I see 18 sections in that 54 units, my opinion is that academic governance is not worth 18 sections. I think we should try to cut this list in half. The chair of EPC works harder than the chair of FSAC. I'm not sure I warrant time at all. This list has gotten seriously inflated, some warrant release time and some do not.

R. Luttmann - And this is only the beginning. We have to pay for Laurel and overhead and office costs that go with faculty governance. I agree with Bill. I've been in several of these positions, but even as chair of EPC I thought I was over compensated.

M. Little - This is my first semester to enjoy the privilege of release time. I've seen enough time for me agree with what you just said. The work I have had to do on SAC is not the same as a course. We should divide it up into portions, so there is some sharing with lecturers. Our responsibility is as teachers first and administrators second.

A. Warmoth - Now that we've open the Pandora's box for this list, are we going to have the approach where everyone receives units? We're not really ready to do this today. We need a couple of readings of that. We could inform the Senate that we are prepared to come back with recommendations for release time for lecturers for the fall and do approve release time for lecturers. This body can come back with a revised release time template. We need to give ourselves time to do that in deliberate fashion.

R. Luttmann - That's what I'm thinking too. I support lecturers getting compensation. From a practical point of view this year we can not yet pare down and carve out six units for lecturers. My question is how to we pose this? We could just pull this from the agenda and tell the Senate we decided that we need to bring them some information and are not prepare to do that yet.

W. Poe - It is already on the agenda. It is the Senate's, document not ours. You can move it at the Senate, but not in the Executive Committee.

P. McGough - If the senate is voting on the principle and six units will be given, how can you vote on that if you can't see what you're voting on?

The Body decided that Rick will ask that the Executive Committee have more time to present more information.

Senate Agenda - attachment

Consent Items:

New GE Course: THAR 200 - attachment

Biology Dept request for 126 unit B.S. - attachment

BUSINESS

1. Women's and Gender Studies as a Department proposal - attachment - TC 3:15
2. Hutchins/Education Blended B.A. & Elementary Teaching Credential Program - attachment - TC 3:30
3. Resolution supporting Living Wage Campaign - Second Reading - P. Phillips - attachment
4. Lecturer's Compensation - Second Reading - attachment of original resolution & results of survey
5. Financial Report on the Green Music Center - L. Furukawa-Schlereth, T.C. 4:00 - attachment

R. Luttmann - I asked for all to be present at both Senates for Green Music Center presentations.

Business items rolled over to next Agenda:

Diversity Vision Statement Proposal, response from standing committees

Discuss "Diversity" Presentation for Statewide Conference in Nov

APC recommendations

Calendar issues: Cesar Chavez Day; Summer 2002; Summers 2003 ->

Academic Freedom Subcommittee

ADJOURNMENT 5:04

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström