

**Senate Executive Committee**

3/11/04

Sue Jameson Room 3:00-5:00

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

**Absent:** Phil McGough

**Agenda** – item added: Request for Budget Report from President. This item came to the body from the Senate Budget Committee. *Approved.*

**Minutes of 2/12/04 – Approved.**

**Chair's report**

C. Nelson noted she had been at Long Beach the last couple of days for a Budget Summit made up of all the campus Presidents, Senate Chairs, Associated Students Presidents and people from the Statewide Executive Committee. She will have a full report in written form for the Senate next week. She described the organization of the meeting. The morning was spent updating the status of the CSU budget. The afternoon had breakout sessions concerning how to communicate the message of the CSU to Legislators. She said the strategy was to go to the Legislature and sell the CSU as a positive contribution to the state. We cannot take more cuts nor teach students we are not funded to teach. We have already picked all the fruit off the bottom of the tree, there is no more left. We're at the point where we can't take any more hits, let's sell that to the Legislature. Without going negative, because going negative doesn't work. We're going to say we are not going to compromise quality, so what we have to do is cut back on access. But that is all that's said about quality. There was no discussion of campus budgets. There are some parallel initiatives going on. The California State Students Association and the Statewide Academic Senate are both planning visits to state legislative districts. There seems to be some consternation at the Chancellor's office, where they want all efforts to be of a piece, but the students and statewide are going ahead with what they want to do. Herself, Phil McGough, Susan McKillop, Bob Karlsrud (as Chair of the Senate Budget Committee) and Melanie Dreisbach have all been asked to join in a visit on April 23 at Joe Nation's district office. We are paralleling what the community colleges have so effectively done. They are asking us to take the message to our local Legislators. Joe Nation is Chair of the one of the appropriations committees. R. Luttmann volunteered to go. E. Stanny suggested having a marketing class work on it to educate other students. C. Nelson noted that the California State Student Association's motto in their statewide initiative is "Education, not Incarceration." They are saying we need to educate, so people don't end up incarcerated. C. Nelson reported that she received a letter from Statewide Senate Chair Bob Cherny concerning their Legislative efforts. They are targeting their visits for March and April because of the May revise of the budget. Also the Institute for Teaching and Learning which is largely funded by the statewide general fund is, in consultation

with the Statewide Senate, deferring bringing in a new ITL director and suspending the Teacher/Scholar Summer Institute, but they are continuing the online journal Exchanges, providing funds for regional faculty development workshops and continuing to seek external funding. There is a new brochure out from the Senior Director for Technology Advice and Policy, "Measures of Success." In the Executive Summary it notices revisions to the Integrated Technology Strategy. She noted that Greg Tichava, the staff representative to the Senate has been ill. He sent an email saying he hopes to be back in a couple of weeks. She noted in the packet an information item - SSU's policy on discontinuance of academic programs which is in a booklet called the Curriculum Guide. This policy was approved in 1985. E. Sundberg asked at the Chancellor's office if the policy had been superseded and it had not. She thought it was important for the Executive Committee to have this as there is talk in every School and department about whether graduate programs are going to have to go self-support, whether we are going to have to combine departments or majors, etc. She wanted to make sure the Chairs of EPC and APC had a copy of it. (The policy is online at <http://www.sonoma.edu/ap/discontinue.html>.) She said her understanding is that if anyone starts talking about discontinuing program or modifying programs they are supposed to use this policy to do so, budget cuts or no budget cuts. The policy was referred to EPC for them to include the information from 1991 that Chancellor's office approval is no longer needed to discontinue programs.

### **Invitation to Rohnert Park and Cotati Mayors**

It was decided to invite the Mayor of Cotati for the Spring semester and the Mayor of Rohnert Park for the Fall semester.

### **Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status**

**It was approved for the list of Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status to appear on the Senate agenda as a consent item.** M. Dreisbach announced that George Elliot passed away this week. He was Faculty Emeritus in the School of Education.

### **Revised Cover Letter for Psychology Changes – E. McDonald**

E. McDonald said that since the changes proposed by the Psychology department had not been addressed at the last Senate, EPC had time to review a revision of the cover letter which addressed concerns raised about the program concerning cross-listed courses. The revised cover letter clarifies that there has been no change to Psychology's cross-listed courses. With this clarification the proposal from Psychology was approved unanimously by EPC. Previously, it had not been unanimously approved.

Discussion points:

- A parliamentary question. The proposal had previously been on the Senate's agenda as a business item. Was it possible to move it to the Consent Calendar at this point? It was noted that since the Senate did not get to it at that last meeting, the Executive Committee could put it on the Consent Calendar.

- A faculty member brought a question to the Chair about the Psychology proposal. The bottom line was that Psychology was going to “make out like a bandit” on FTES. It was noted that this was an issue between departments. Cross-listing would provide a certain kind of flexibility.
- It was clarified that the Psychology proposal was not about cross-listing courses, but about changes to their major to streamline advising that had incidentally talked about cross-listed courses.
- If faculty have issues with cross-listing courses in general, that is a separate issue and should not block Psychology’s proposal.

**It was approved for the item to go to the Senate as a consent item.**

#### **Faculty Representation on Campus Reengineering Committee – M. Dreisbach**

Richard Senghas has been Andy Merrifield’s proxy on the Campus Reengineering Committee for this year. Andy Merrifield cannot continue on the committee. Richard Senghas is being recommended to continue as A. Merrifield’s replacement. The School of Social Sciences confirmed R. Senghas as A. Merrifield’s replacement. M. Dreisbach reported that Schools recommend to L. Furukawa-Schlereth who has final say on the composition of the committee and there are no term limits. There is a faculty At-Large position on the committee that is vacant. **It was moved to send the item of the vacant At-Large position to Structure and Functions. Second.**

*Approved.*

#### **Request for a Budget Report from the President to the Senate from the Senate Budget Committee – C. Nelson**

C. Nelson handed out minutes from the last Senate Budget committee. The Senate Budget committee would like to suggest to the Executive Committee of the Senate that they request a special report from the President on the budget at the March 18<sup>th</sup> Senate meeting. Consensus in the Senate Budget Committee emerged about the following requests: Information about the reductions in each general fund supported division in percentages, dollars, positions lost and impacted programs and services across the university and for each non-school cost center in Academic Affairs. She noted there is in the planning stages a campus wide budget summit on Tuesday, March 30<sup>th</sup> from 1-5pm in Person Theater. R. Armiñana, L. Furukawa-Schlereth and E. Ochoa made the following points:

- The timeline was too short.
- It would be impossible to give the number of positions lost. Budgeting is not done by position, but by dollars.
- The report would be based on the Governor’s Budget at this point in time and thus would not be final, nor would it show any trade-offs.

- There was doubt that the Vice-Presidents of the two larger divisions would be able to tell the impact on programs and services at this point. In May, the information might be clearer.
- E. Ochoa planned to give a report, but new information keeps coming in and the picture keeps changing. Academic Affairs will not really know the impact until the end of the fiscal year.

Discussion points:

- The class schedule is due in one month. The bond measure passed. We should be going full ahead with a plan.
- April 15<sup>th</sup> is the deadline for schedule creation.
- It has been asserted at the Dean level that all lecturers and all FERPs are going to go. Comment was requested on that assertion.
- The magnitude of the cuts is such that the dollar amount would exhaust the lecturer budget and almost, but not all of the FERP budget.

R. Armiñana said he would provide the budget based on the Governor's budget and the proposed budgetary reductions for '04 - '05 in each general fund division in the university both in absolute and in percentage dollars.

C. Nelson asked if E. Ochoa could provide a sense of what the Schools parameters are. E. Ochoa responded that the worst case scenario seems more likely now as they have not been able to identify any large pots of money to help the Schools. C. Nelson asked for the information on a School by School basis, also for ESAS, the Library and the Provost's office. E. Ochoa responded he would do that.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth asked for clarification as to whether the Senate wanted to see budget reductions as well as mandatory costs. R. Armiñana said they would show both together.

Discussion points:

- There is continued uncertainty regarding what schedule will be able to be offered. Would the budget report address the uncertainty?
- People are working on alternative ways to deliver instruction and generate the same level of enrollment as two years ago with 20% fewer resources. The information is still preliminary. Schools are working to see how they can make their targets. The Schools are having to work through structural change that normally would have been thought through and planned for a much longer time. It is a hard job.
- It was asked how do we reduce the angst on campus. What kinds of information can place people in the disposition to be patient and more alert to emerging

possibilities. It was noted that discussions of the discontinuance of programs and programs going to self-support was fueling the angst. It was suggested that the faculty need to see that these are some possibilities among many and what the ranking is in terms of implementation. Where do we need to think about change occurring? What is missing from the administration is a context for change which is intelligible and emotionally available.

- The need for good communication in situations like this was affirmed. The budget summit was identified as a forum for that communication. E. Ochoa has offered to visit the Chair's Councils so they can hear directly from him.
- It was noted that it has only been a week since Proposition 57 and 58 passed. The Governor's budget, while lousy, is still the best scenario. There are some parameters in the Governor's budget for each campus – are across the board cuts made with the explicit purpose of preventing the layoff of permanent employees or does the campus engage in a two to three year process of making deep and narrow cuts, i.e. the elimination of entire programs which requires laying off permanent faculty and others. There are restraints in the contracts about how to reduce personnel. We have to make enrollment target within 1% or lose more funding. This does not seem to be a permanent state of affairs. It may last two to three years at most. The economy of California is not declining. This was not a deep recession. This was a governmentally created crisis. Some people that are here today will not be here in the Fall. There are deadlines for informing people. R. Armiñana said he did not see that there would be a real plan until mid May. He can give the macro, but not the micro and the plan we have in May will be different by August. We will do everything possible to keep permanent people here in the Fall.
- It was clarified from Vice Chancellor Spence and the Provosts to actively investigate moving suitable graduate programs to self-support models. The rationale is that it would expand the pool of resources available to deliver on our mission. Moving to self-support was not intended to be a cover for discontinuing programs.
- It was requested that the information presented be helpful for planning. It was noted that the Faculty Trustee, K. Kaiser's remarks at the last Senate meeting portrayed the current budget situation as not improving years down the line and we will have to get used to doing things differently.
- It was affirmed that things will not go back to the way they were. The state cannot sustain over more than a year or two the CSU turning down thousands and thousands of eligible students. Long Beach State this week sent 13,000 rejection letters to qualified applicants. SSU has sent 1300 rejection letters. That is unsustainable. At some point in the next 24 months, there will be additional resources coming to higher education. It may not be in the amount or form we like, but it is politically and economically unsustainable to restrict access. Our ally is the business sector which says they need an educated workforce to produce the taxes needed.

- The President was thanked for his response to the request particularly concerning the procedural constraints on the process. This is what faculty need to hear. However, it needs to be marked off from the debate between the faculty and the President concerning fiscal decisions.
- At one of the presentations at the Budget Summit Long Beach, Patrick Lenz, Associate Vice Chancellor, said the one of the causalities of the budget problems was planning.

**It was agreed that at the next Senate meeting there would be a budget report from President Armiñana, Provost Ochoa and Vice President L. Furukawa-Schlereth and we will expect the information that was just discussed to be provided. C. Nelson asked the President to also explain the constraints at the Senate.**

C. Nelson noted that the first half of the next Executive Committee meeting will be spent with the WASC team.

### **President's Report**

R. Armiñana noted that Proposition 55 passed. He expects by next week the Board of Trustees will have approved the Capital Expenditure Program for the second year of the bond issue. A Music/Faculty office building is included. There will be eight to nine months to academically plan what goes in that building. A good example of how hard it is to plan is evidenced by the previous report that there would be a fee recommendation to the Board of Trustees at their March meeting. However, now there will not be a fee recommendation. It may come before the Board in May. There was a conversation between the Governor, the Director of Finance and Chief of Staff, two of our Trustees about what to do with Teacher Ed. We needed to lower it down from 40% to 25% and that meant that undergraduate fee would go from 10% to 11%. Everybody agreed to do that, but it didn't translate. There is a bill moving in the Legislature to do the Governor's former proposal, so now it has to be repaired. The Governor says don't have the Trustees pass a fee recommendation different than mine. He will reshape his and that will take some time. This is a good example of how certainty was there a few days ago and now it is not. That creates another problem in that students who are finishing in mid May will not know for certain what their fees are going to be. He also alerted the body to another significant issue. The Legislative Analysts Report on the Governor's budget says that the CSU with the resources available to them does not have to reject any applicants who are fully qualified because the CSU has accepted about 8%, what they call, unqualified students. They are right. If we followed the Master Plan strictly, we wouldn't have admitted them, but we did and many of them have done quite well. We are going to have to work ourselves through that as both are right and both are a bit wrong. Last, but not least, we will soon be engaged in due diligence over 90 acres of land for faculty housing in the Petaluma Hill road area. Two contracts are out for two parcels, each about 45 acres roughly and we have to go through due diligence. We have an agreement on price, etc.

It was asked if the Green Music Center proposal was being brought to the Board of Trustees meeting in March. The President responded that no, it would go forward in

May. The President thought it was now fully funded and it has not gone out to bid yet, but it will go out to three or four qualified bidders tomorrow. There needs to be a successful bid before it goes to the Board of Trustees. All the pieces of financing have to be enacted - the letters of credit between the donors and bankers.

Technically, it is not sealed. At the March meeting we are bringing to the Board three items: acceptance by the Board of 3500 acres of a wildlife preserve in Mendocino county, the Bachelors in Computer Science and Engineering and the schematics for the renovation of Darwin Hall.

### **Provost report**

E. Ochoa reiterated that planning needs to get going on the Phase Two of the Green Music Center, the Music and Faculty offices building.

The Provost was asked for his argument on the FTE of that building and how the money and resources will flow. The Provost said they have not done that for Phase Two yet.

### **Chair-Elect report**

M. Dreisbach reported that Structure and Functions continues to work on the Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters policy. They are looking at the staggering of memberships on APC and EPC as charged by the Executive Committee. It appears that the main issue will be next year's turnover.

### **Vice President of Administration and Finance report**

L. Furukawa-Schlereth reported that in Administration and Finance they have a \$1,300,000 reduction to address. We don't have any temporary employees. Figuring out how to do that without moving into laying off permanent employees is a bit of a challenge. He gave a sense of what they are thinking about. It's quite clear that services provided to the campus will be substantially less. At the budget summit we will be able to share more of what that will be. Services that you have come to expect from the Financial area, the Payroll area, the Human Resources area, the Custodial area, the Information Technology area, or the Facilities area, all will be substantially impacted and simply will not be able to deliver the same type of things they do now. He also explained the current format for the campus Budget Summit on March 30<sup>th</sup>. They are expecting a large attendance. He reported he was invited to the Student Affairs committee of the Senate to talk about the Excess Unit Task Force. He has a sense that this will be a significant issue for the Academic Senate as there will be a set of recommendations that come out of the task force for the development and enforcement of policies at the campus level to encourage students not to obtain excess units. The magnitude of the dollars, for example, that a student will pay is about five times the tuition that they currently pay if they go over the excess unit cap. It's a substantial number. The task force is waiting for a definition from the Statewide Academic Senate about what is an excess unit which then has to be sold to the Department of Finance. He thinks policies on advising, repeating courses, unauthorized withdrawals, all these issues are what Statewide Academic Senators on the task force are recommending that campuses have. To the degree we have

them or not, or enforce them or not will have an impact on how students manage their time to degree. He reported that it will be very tricky to execute the plan for employee housing on the 90 acres in these budget times, but it is an opportune moment. If we get the land, then we have to do a revision to the master plan which will take about a year, get the Board to approve it and it will cost a lot. If the project gets to go, it will require an investment, of course. How to do it in these difficult times is tricky, however, when we come out of it and start to grow again, we will hire faculty again and all the more need to be ready at that moment. It's an interesting challenge and he may come back to the Executive Committee for guidance on how to approach the campus from their perspective on this issue as it is an interesting dilemma.

It was asked whether the cuts in Administration and Finance would be dealt with by not replacing people who leave. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded yes.

It was asked what percentage of the Administration and Finance budget was salaries. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said it is close to 80 - 86%. Operating expenses are things like light bulbs, paint, gasoline, etc.

It was asked if there will be a discussion with the Provost and faculty regarding reductions in Information Technology as it will impact the curriculum. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that instructional technology is the most cuttable. The rest of technology is phone lines and other core stuff. The areas where there's discretionary and flexible items, where we have lots of temporary employees, students assistants, is in the area of instructional technology and media services.

It was noted that it would be useful to start a discussion of excess units so that when it comes from the Statewide Senate, SSU has a response.

It was noted that at SSU the average number of units students take is around 140 units. The SSU transfer students come with more units and take more units. People who change majors also add to the excess units.

### **APC report**

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that the Provost came to APC, spoke with them about planning and departed. The Provost's Chief Assessment Officer came and spoke about the WEPT and departed.

### **EPC report**

E. McDonald reported on outcomes of the Interim Program Reviews that are just now being completed. The departments are reporting, especially in the recent semesters, a dramatic growth in the General Education demands on their departments and how that is really impacting their majors with enough courses, with a wide variety of courses. We're seeing a push and pull with GE and the major. One example is that one department had to cancel a core course in their major because they had no one to teach it. They all agreed to touch on the topic in their other courses, but this seemed very dramatic to EPC. The growth of seminar size

classes has gotten so extreme we're not able to give the same kind of assessment to students that we have in the past. All of this speaks to her of the eroding of quality in the major. Les Adler came to their committee to report on Extended Education and this emphasized to the committee what's happening with the privatization of graduate education. Departments are pushing programs into Extended Education and we're not having a university wide discussion about whether we want all our graduate programs to go into a self-support mode or not. Also from the IPR's, programs are feeling a lack of support for the assessment programs. We're struggling to get the task force for Program Reviews off the ground as it is just another thing we're asking people to do with their three units.

### **FSAC report**

E. Stanny reported that FSAC reviewed the Lobbying policy today which will be forwarded to the Executive Committee. They also looked at the Misconduct in Research policy and are still working on it.

### **SAC report**

B. Lahme reported SAC keeps looking at Advising. The Associated Student Senators are talking to their Deans and giving more concrete feedback to us on where the problems lie in advising from the perspective of students. We received a list of the policies that need looking into due to the Excess Units issue. They will start looking at those next week. One more topic they will address is the new student admissions restrictions at CSU and what impact that will have to our student body, things like diversity.

## **Senate Agenda**

### **AGENDA**

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

#### **Consent Items:**

Approval of the Agenda  
Approval of Minutes – 2/5/04 emailed  
Potential Emeritus Faculty Spring 2004 – attachment  
Changes in Psychology Major - attachment

Budget Report from R. Armiñana, E. Ochoa, and L. Furukawa-Schlereth T.C. 3:40

### **BUSINESS**

#### 1. Resolutions regarding Lecturers:

- a. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3.10 of By-Laws; Replacement of Lecturer Senators – Second Reading –M. Dreisbach – attachment – T. C. 3:10
- b. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3 of By-Laws regarding election of Lecturer Senators –First Reading - M. Dreisbach – attachment – T. C. 3:25

2. Resolution to Assess Faculty Confidence in SSU Academic Senate and Administration - Second Reading - P. Phillips – attachment – T. C. 4:20
3. Draft Vision and Mission statement from AASPC – Second Reading - C. Nelson – attachment – T. C. 4:45

Adjourned.

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*