

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 28, 2002

Present: Rick Luttmann, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Art Warmoth, Catherine Nelson, Noel Byrne, Sam Brannen, William Poe, Peter Phillips, Phil McGough, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Susan McKillop, Tim Wandling, Bernie Goldstein, Ruben Armiñana

Meeting began at 3:04pm

Approval of the Agenda –

R. Luttmann - I'd like to add to the agenda "Replace member of Structures and Functions" as number one.

P. Phillips – On this committee will we be discussing the evaluation of the president of this campus? I propose it.

R. Luttmann - Any objection?

No objection - Approved

Approval of Minutes -Approved

Correspondence Received: None

REPORTS

Chair of the Faculty - (R. Luttmann)

R. Luttmann - I was in Sacramento yesterday as part of lobby day, not as Chair of the Faculty, but as a CFA member. It was interesting to learn that nobody at the Capitol can think of anything but the 17 billion dollar budget deficit. When we brought up the negative effect the budget proposed by the Governor on campus, they said you haven't seen anything yet. The budget that was released in January was for political consumption. The actual budget will be worse.

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

No report. (*but see last item of meeting*)

Provost/Vice President (B. Goldstein)-

B. Goldstein - I just came from the second conference in one week on service learning. This conference was an all CSU wide conference. We had beautiful weather and they were all very impressed. Last week we had a more local conference on this. Service learning people were full of enthusiasm. It was a pleasure meeting them. Bob Coleman and I met awhile ago and have good

things planned. April 19th we are going to try to have diversity steering type gathering for discussion of the implementation of the diversity vision stement. That's a Friday, from 1-4 or 9-1. It would be fantastic to have a member of this group be part of that. It won't work if we don't have the leadership of the faculty there. I will get back to you on that.

Statewide Senator - (S. McKillop)

S. McKillop - Things are still coming to a head. When they begin funding by individual students it becomes like a voucher. The fear is that it would be up to \$9500 you can take to any qualified institution, that means Stanford and Claremont. They get \$900 to help them, we can't get near that. Students might be able transfer to private institution in a way that we haven't had before. There's real concern about that. Just catching up to accountability material - when I talked to the consultant whose writing the master plan. He believes about the outcome funding performance budget is that if the committee thinks our way and has goals that's fine, but some funding for certain takes that view extremely narrowly. That's not the kind of academic freedom we are used to. Will see David Spence this week. His job is to tell me what they don't want to see there.

Chair-Elect of the Senate - (N. Byrne)

N. Byrne - There is a small change in the membership of Structures and Functions. Janeen Olsen cannot continue and Armand Gilinsky will serve in her stead.

R. Luttmann – Janeen Olsen is leaving Structures and Functions and Armand Gilinsky is willing to serve in her stead as the representative from Business and Economic. He has been at some meetings already. Any objection?

Approved.

Vice President, Admin. & Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - The PBAC will make a report at the Senate on the recommendations that have preceded from the PBAC and from the President, 15 minutes.

R. Luttmann – Will we get a report from you on the matter of faculty getting their university email accounts from off campus? I heard that the machine was too old.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – I am happy to re-raise the issue at the IT Advisory committee. We haven't had that meeting yet.

R. Luttmann - I do keep hearing from faculty who have relied on this service in the past. They are anxious to have something in its place. It seems to me an ongoing problem that needs solutions.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – IT Advisory committee was convened for this purpose.

P. McGough – This came up at the CRC and the issue is basically the campus has provided free internet service, it would cost \$100,000 or more to buy a new machine, and faculty agreed that this is was not a good use of \$100,000 dollars. It is much better for people to buy a 12 month internet service.

T. Wandling – I did raise the issue at the Senate and it turned out IT came to Arts & Humanities. From an economic point of view it makes sense. Whose going to pay for that service? But little things add up for new faculty. At other universities it just gets paid for. Unless IT provides it, the cost goes to Academic Affairs and then it would be only for professors, no lecturers, like travel money. I use email all the time to keep in touch with students and colleagues. I hate to see that passed on to new faculty.

W. Poe – The IT Advisory committee's advice about replacing the machine was that the machine is a low priority or providing services with limited funds was a low priority. Obviously, we need to look at it. The questions of who should pay the costs seems to me a benefits issue, not an Academic Senate issue. A fair number of people have a separate ISP from the university.

R. Coleman-Senghor – At least visit the issue. It's not solely about money. It's also about having access to my files. Half the work I do, I do between 4-6am. What kinds of service can I get - not just email, but to my files. We're talking about being able to communicate with students. It's not about \$20 a month for me, but issues of access to business. I can print from here. That is not available to me at home. For a technologically adept society and university with distance learning, professionals cannot be locked down to their office and cannot be charged for doing the business of the university.

R. Luttmann – This is not on our agenda today, but I ask those on the IT Advisory committee to please give due consideration to the issues raised.

P. Phillips – A question about the Salazar rebuilding. Two weeks ago there were picket lines downtown for the electrical workers. Both the electricians and painters are concerned about us contracting non-union companies and whether people are getting prevailing wages. Are we sure all contractors are in compliance?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - We do not believe that the contractors are out of compliance. I've asked those concerned if any specifics they are aware of, make those known and we will look into it. No one has communicated to me that this is an issue. Don't expect it would delay the project substantially. If it was found we were not paying prevailing wages we would take appropriate action. I just haven't heard from anyone.

Chairs, Standing Committees - (Coleman-Senghor, Warmoth, Brannen, Poe)

APC

R. Coleman-Senghor – I have a playful request of the President. Where is Hill College?

R. Armiñana – Texas.

R. Coleman-Senghor – The committee is moving ahead in terms of the forums. We are inviting members of faculty who have gone to small liberal arts colleges to join in the "What does it mean to be a residential liberal arts university" symposium. That is on March 26 from 11-2:30 and lunch will be provided. We're hoping to have a working group of 21 participants with APC and its membership at hand. The second meeting on April 16 meeting will be on PB Views to see whether that instrument is appropriate or useful for our aims and definition of ourselves as a liberal arts institution. The 3rd meeting is to prepare for interdisciplinary and technology and the sense of ourselves as a liberal arts institution. The committee sent invitations to Dean Rahimi and Dean Leader who will be coming. Dean Babula and Dean Butler were invited to our last meeting along with other officers of the administration to talk about ways of conceiving long range plans. We are very much into a synergistic mode now. I've been reading Larry Schlereth's articles on synergy to look at your budget philosophy in connection with planning issues. I've been looking at the President's dissertation too. Interesting to find out how you think through your dissertation. So that is the direction of APC. We really would like the support of this body. I've asked Rick to serve a speaker at this gathering as he graduated from Amherst, Art also who graduated from Reed which is also a COPLAC school, and they have technology program that interests me a great deal. Bill Poe and Sam will be there. We will try to stay away from politics and just have people who went to small liberal arts colleges.

EPC

A. Warmoth – EPC is mainly doing the reports for interim program reviews that are calendared. The most interesting thing is the EMT and freshman seminar evaluation. It is mainly a report.

SAC

S. Brannen – I mentioned that SAC is looking at the recruitment policy. One member is concerned the campus is seeking richer and richer students and somehow that means no education for lower income students. That's one person's opinion. We decided to see if we could find any evidence for or against that. We got information from Rose Bruce about what students think their parents income is. What students say has gone up. 32% say their parents earn over \$100,000 year. We asked has there been any comparison with the other CSU campuses. She said we do have information on other schools in California, but none of that was adjusted for. She has agreed to come to the

next meeting and we are going to get some kind of comparison. There are mitigating circumstances. Parents that are going to send their kids to live in dorms need to have money. We are trying to determine this rationally.

S. McKillop – Comparisons should be made in more rural small campuses. What kinds of student - it isn't right to compare us to L.A. State It is very difficult to transfer from L.A. State to here.

S. Brannen – We just don't have that information.

FSAC

W. Poe – In response to the Chair's request, next year Elizabeth Stanny will be chair of FSAC. When the Senate passed the procedures for the Excellence in Teaching award it included a clause asking FSAC to review it two years hence. We are looking at that now.

R. Coleman-Senghor – A word about memberships on APC – Tim Huston is being replaced by Paula Hammett, and Elizabeth Thatcher has replaced Lynn Stauffer. We do not have our representative from Education.

R. Luttmann - If someone is to be elected for a unit then the unit is responsible for that. I suggest you contact Dean Furland and ask her to call to her attention to the election committee that a vacancy exists. By the way Noel, when will you have results of the election?

N. Byrne – It is out on email.

S. Brannen – I have a question for Bill. On the Excellence in Teaching award, we received email and flyers, but I have not seen where students might see it. How about an ad in the Star?

T. Wandling – About the timing of a policy of campus - as soon as we get another contract will discrepancies be dealt with? Do we have a way to make sure? How does that get instigated? I'm thinking about the policy about part time faculty evaluations - is there a mechanism at some level when contracts come down, if there are discrepancies, we can address them sooner?

W. Poe – Nothing is being bargained now on that issue.

T. Wandling – Should there be something else is there a way to address it fairly quickly?

W. Poe - What do you mean by quickly? FSAC doesn't interpret contracts. Typically Judith Hunt recognizes that policies need to be changed to come in to compliance with the MOU.

R. Luttmann – My assumption that Judith Hunt would call attention any discrepancies and bring it to the appropriate committee.

BUSINESS

Senate Honoring of Jim Meyer, 21 March

R Luttmann - I was quite impressed with the standing ovation at the Senate for Jim Meyer in December. Since he is leaving it has been suggested that the Senate find some way to honor him. He is leaving on March 22 and we have meeting on March 21. One idea is to collect money from the faculty to get a gift, but given faculty salaries as they are we might end up with enough to buy an ashtray. Something that might be less tangible is we might stop our business early at 4:30 and have time for people who wish to speak in his honor and perhaps we might break up for a reception for half an hour. That's a starting point.

R. Coleman-Senghor – A good bottle of wine never hurt anyone. If faculty can't raise \$25 bucks I'll buy it and present it to Mr. Meyer. I think that would be a most desirable kind of gift - to take the pleasure off campus as well.

W. Poe – All the ideas are nice and appropriate. There should be a resolution of appreciation. That is the central item of this kind of thing.

N. Byrne – It seems all these are good ideas. We could do them all.

R. Luttmann - Shall we proceed in this direction?

Agreement from the body.

Item from Modern Languages Department

R. Luttmann - My apologies. There is an item that I didn't put on the agenda. Suzanne Toczyski is here. We're doing this on an emergency basis as there is a vote pending at Statewide on March 6th and 7th. Suzanne, please fill us in on what is happening and what you would like for us to do.

S. Toczyski - I'm here for the Modern Language department and the Modern Language Council. Reads: "The Academic Senate of the CSU will be voting at its March 6-7 meeting on resolution AS-2553-02 / AA, which provides for the exclusion of first term language courses offered at Community Colleges from consideration for GE C2." What this is basically saying is that first term language courses will only affect the JCs and will not transfer to CSU universities. The rationale is it takes time to individually assess those classes as for GE C2 credit they need substantive cultural content. It's too time consuming. The UC doesn't accept them and neither should we. Both groups object to this idea. We are asking for your support. On the argument that in fact it would make the course review committee's work easier, is not a good reason. All my classes contain considerable cultural content so it is not an acceptable reason to exclude. Students take these classes because they want to know about other cultures through the language. Every freshman textbook contains cultural content. Another reason not to exclude is soon the CSU will require that to be admitted students will need 2 years of foreign language. For students going to a community college who may

not have had any language it makes sense to let them take it here at SSU. Our suggestion is that first semester language, if not done before, can be used as a GE class. We share a lot of our instructional material with SRJC, the same class with the same textbooks. If students take it here it is worth GE credit and but not if they take it at the community college. That doesn't make sense. My department and the Foreign Language council ask your support.

R. Luttmann – Normally I would ask that this go through EPC and then before the Senate, but because it is moving rapidly to a conclusion, if we are going to have any input at all is going to have to go to the Senate.

S. McKillop – We are on the Academic Affairs committee.

P. McGough – Suzanne, I argued against this, but one issue that was raised that you have not raised in your statement is that we don't give credit if I took 3 years of Spanish at high school. Community colleges don't check and we don't check when they come here.

S. McKillop – That is the fundamental argument. But in fact what they have seen at community colleges is that they take the language in high school and they take it again to get their grades up and use it for humanities credit here which we wouldn't do. We have not control over what the community colleges do.

S. Toczyski – The President of the Foreign Language Council communicated with the community colleges and asked them if they do placement exams. We don't want students in 101 that know everything. It skews the whole class. People said yes they do placement.

P. McGough – That's not the point. We check high school transcripts, the community colleges don't, and when they come to us from the JC's, then we don't.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Phil, is this an accounting problem or a pedagogical one?

P. McGough - Neither. We don't want to give them GE credit if they'd had it.

R. Coleman-Senghor – If it is an accounting problem, someone is not doing their job of advising. What side of curriculum do you penalize? Do students benefit from this?

P. McGough - I have no idea how common the subterfuge is.

T. Wandling – I move that we leave this. We could invite Suzanne to come to the Senate. If you want to put forth a resolution I would bring it forward.

P. McGough - This may be voted on before the Senate meeting. If campus has a position we can vote and represent the campus.

P. Phillips - Is it an Academic Affairs meeting or the full Senate?

S. McKillop – The full Senate. There's a lot of stuff we may make corrections to she'd be pleased with.

W. Poe - It seems to me if the problem is why students are re-doing things this is the wrong way to go about the problem, if the community college checked with high school transcripts. If, on other hand, it sounds to me like noting substantial cultural content that's smoke there. Do we have any guidelines for substantial cultural content we apply to our own courses?

P. McGough – They read it to me and it sounded like Homer. A lot of puffery.

W. Poe - As a language teacher and student, I've never seen a first year text that didn't have cultural information.

S. Brannen – I echo what Bill said. The problem is we're not checking students who come from community colleges. It's an easy solution, check. If community colleges certified them and they completed then we don't have to do that. It's part of the articulation agreement.

A. Warmoth - Bill's approach is the right one addressed in that direction. People who are close to the problem, in fact say there is not a problem, and this will seem to me a the very least to take some position on the basis of what is going on our service area. The Senate may be doing stuff without information or consualtion with community colleges which would be appropriate. I support passing a resolution. I basically support the position Suzanne is bringing to us.

S. McKillop – Art, are you suggesting they provide data that there is not a problem in our service area? Some of them do.

S. Toczyski – As I understand it a lot of community colleges do placement and checking. I don't have a specific list. There is no evidence that they check transcripts.

A. Warmoth – Can we address the position Suzanne has articulated? Our foreign language faculty are reasonably certain the community colleges we deal with are on the right track. If that's the situation for the state to pass something to make it worse rather than getting more information, it is not good for statewide to do. I argue to support our foreign language faculty.

B. Coleman-Senghor – I can assure you as former German teacher in Berkeley, people can have an A in school and cannot begin a basic conversation, because of the method or orientation they had with the language. This should be left in hands of language teaching experts. The Council is saying this is bad idea. If we can't listen to experts who can we listen to? If we are going to go to individual motives we are left with how good is the advising and counseling at the site where credit is given for the course. I support this resolution of our foreign language faculty.

W. Poe – I move that the Executive Committee endorse this letter of the Foreign Language to Robert Snyder.

Second.

S. McKillop – You know that you are not allowed to double count high school math, in English it is not permitted. Why should language be different?

S. Brannen – I took calculus in high school and I took calculus at college again.

R. Luttmann – In math we draw a line. This stuff is high school and this is post BA, even if in high school that we call post BA you can take again here and get credit for it. Also we offer classes less than 100 and they don't count for BA credit.

C. Nelson – I call the question.

P. McGough – This good for us at statewide.

Vote – Approved; 1 abstained.

EMT evaluation update - A. Warmoth

A. Warmoth - I have a progress report reading of draft of report on EMT and freshman seminar. At our last meeting it was not a first reading, but a draft reading. It is scheduled for the next two meetings. If anyone is interested in being part of that, the meeting is open. And some background on the way things are going. I don't want to complicate the discussion. There was some confusion between the Interim Program Review and a formal program review as EMT has not been through the latter process. We have decided that the Interim Program Review is complete. However, we have also decided that it is appropriate to look at recommending that the Freshman Seminar be moved from experimental to permanent program status. This is partly on the basis of the fact that the Freshman Seminar Curriculum Committee and the EMT Steering Committee are exercising direction over the programs and have been very forthcoming to EPC with the information. When it become a permanent program it would be placed on the calendar for the regular program review process. The issue of a cost/benefit analysis has been raised informally and it is our inclination not to do this cost/benefit analysis. We need direction from SBC and APC what an analysis would look like. There will be considerable information in the report about staffing. It will be a relatively comprehensive report. If people have concerns come to the EPC meeting and be heard or hold it until the formal report comes forward in the Senate.

R. Luttmann – Bernie is working on ways to try to cut down the cost of this program.

B. Goldstein – That faculty committee is working on that issue. They may have some recommendations.

R. Coleman-Senghor – It is important to understand when this program came forward in '94 we requested a 3 year period in which it would be reviewed. That review never took place. We never conceived of it as a full review. More as one being initiated and then placed in cycle of program reviews. Having completed such an assessment, we moved to completing a long awaited review of the program and to

recommend to the Senate that it be put on a regular cycle. Then we can consider infrastructure and funding.

APC recommendations revisit

R. Coleman-Senghor – We did review these reports of Catherine's and had a good discussion. We looked at the items and decided on them with the exception of two items. We will make a formal request to President Armiñana to provide us with the agenda of the meetings of the cabinet when items come up with academic import. We would like to be there at those times. We're not asking for a place on the committee, but for matters that are of planning importance we would like an invitation to be present and share in the discussion. The AIR we continue to develop. We are reflecting in the subcommittee about PB Views. Looking at other items, we felt were the business of SBC or other committees.

C. Nelson – My understanding at the meeting of the Executive Committee had begun review of APC recommendations which the Executive Committee had forwarded to SBC for a response. If the Executive wants to continue that process, I'm happy to bring back what I can.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I had assumed that was in effect what we would be doing, trying to resolve issues that we do in tandem and bring it back to this committee. Recommendations were made to this body and it was referred back to this body through SBC for APC to create its position that can be reported to the Senate.

C. Nelson - If we want it to go to the Senate we can do this as a report.

R. Luttmann – It would be appropriate to be agendized for next Executive Committee. It would be useful to have either a report jointly by you two or by each of you summarizing where are and where to go.

R. Coleman-Senghor – It is the business of the committee what it will do. We will send the letter to the President and continue our work on the AIR. Doesn't not need be reported out.

C. Nelson - I will make available another copy of our recommendation and put a memo on top of it saying this is the status.

R. Luttmann –Some of the recommendations sounds like actions. Presumption that APC did not have or is not assuming authority for the members asking for this body or the Senate to act or not. If that 's changed, fine.

R. Coleman-Senghor – If this body had a resolution to that involved a certain committee, this body cannot have the committee take action. APC identified what it would take up. In that sense I reported back what we will take up and act on within our mandate. The other things do not belong to our mandate and committee business. Now that we have a budget committee, some are probably in that committee.

W. Poe – Talking about implementing the AIR, I would think that would go through the Senate. It's a new device to review academic programs.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Once we fashion it, yes. But the business of deciding if we are going to discuss it is in house. My proper role is to report the nature of our business to this body.

R. Luttmann - May I ask that you in confer with Catherine if you wish to prepare a document for the packet that lays out clearly what you're actions have been and if any what recommendations you have that you want us to take forward.

C. Nelson – All the recommendations originally came from APC.

R. Coleman-Senghor – They did not come out of APC. That was the thinking of the Chair but not the body. I will bring clear information to the next meeting.

Faculty consultation on budget issues - attachment

R. Luttmann - This matter came up a couple of meetings ago. In addition to that Tim Wandling called to our attention this policy language on faculty budgetary consultation. What is reproduced here is material from a policy issued in 1991 when Benson was President. I note that the policy is under review. I don't know who is reviewing it. I did have a chance to go through it and there's quite a discrepancy between what it is saying and what actually happens. For example, the President is chair of the PBAC and the list of memberships is out of phase with what we actually do.

W. Poe - I believe I may have triggered part of this. Many of the resolutions before the Senate were items that should have been part of a candid discussion with the President at this table. What Tim has done in finding this is that we have in place a policy context where this body is empowered have those kinds of discussions. This is body were budget committees report. This further strengthens the idea that this is the appropriate forum before something goes to the Senate.

T. Wandling – I agree. The part of it that I want to look at really is the third part. What are we doing as faculty to communicate to President Armiñana? In here we are supposed to be hearing a report from the Chair-Elect. I would like to see a more unified sense that we can communicate early and on the record. I would like to see a discussion about what is meant by consultation, what do you think of consultation. At what point does faculty begin to think, well is this really consultation. What do we accept as meaningful?

R. Luttmann - President Armiñana, can you comment on the policy being under review?

R. Armiñana – It was not written under me and is not under review by me.

R. Luttmann - You're under the impression that this policy is in place?

R. Armiñana - Yes, some of the titles need to be changed.

P. McGough - It was being reviewed by members of PBAC, and the VPBAC. We gave up in the throes of budget battles beyond the review of this policy.

B. Goldstein – We were adjusting titles.

T. Wandling – I found this in the collection of policies in the department. I think the one in the department is dated 1995.

R. Armiñana – A lot of policies were reviewed for adjustment of titles.

R. Luttmann – There are discrepancies between what we do and what we should be doing. We need to fix that. How? Do we bring practice in to compliance with policy or bring policy in compliance with practice. Whose job would it be to do that?

R. Coleman-Senghor – I want to take up Tim's point by way of saying we cannot discuss this until we establish what is the official policy. Note at the top it says recommended by the Academic Senate. If there is a policy with a date later than here then the Academic Senate has acted on it. Otherwise this is the standing policy. We need to work out compliance. In order to work that out what does it mean for us to consult? Some important documents have glossaries. This should have a glossary. What we agree upon as a body maybe different than what the President has in mind. There are a number of terms here to provide a glossary for. Let's find out if a more current version of policy exists and where the Senate has approved it.

A. Warmoth – I think it is helpful to know what is the current version of the policy, etc. Whatever that document is, it is clear we are not in compliance on the faculty governance side and administration side. I would support Bill's point. It seems like this committee is a good place for faculty to engage in discussion with President Armiñana. What the policy should be can be determined in consultation with SBC and other constituencies in faculty governance. Makes sense where something gets worked out then could be sent forward to the Senate as an updated policy. I support this committee to take on the charge to work out something.

R. Armiñana – In the last couple of years, the joint work of Dennis Harris and Lynne McIntyre is that a number of policies were reviewed to bring them back into compliance, not with the language, but with titles. Lots of titles had changed. They made a strong effort on significant policies to update them to match titles. I have a feeling this might be one of those.

P. McGough - Did they go to the Senate when they concerned the Senate?

R. Armiñana - My understanding is that is was just an adjustment of titles, no changes in the policy. We no longer have a director of fiscal services, we have a vice president. Those simply are technical changes with no impact on the policy. That doesn't go back for re-approval.

R. Coleman-Senghor – They do not go back to re-approve, but for this basic binding kind of agreement between faculty and a president a change would be reported. It is certainly appropriate even if it is titles - titles lead to identity and identity leads to structures. At least report out.

R. Armiñana – I don't know what happened. For that time the records of the Senate were lacking. I'll check on my side.

R. Coleman-Senghor –That's exactly the point. If you have a record and we don't, we can come to some kind of agreement. We still should seek to align ourselves.

B. Goldstein – With respect to members of the VPBAC, there are some corrections that need to be made it to titles. We recently added the concept of communication to capture major decisions and issues that have gone to the President and committees. Most of the other items we attempt to address. We won't address them at every meeting. We have not had lottery money for a long time.

R. Luttmann - There is a great deal that is considerably at variance with what we do. Each fall the VPBAC is supposed to open up their meeting once for comments. Annually the President is supposed to invite the university community to an open meeting of the PBAC. We don't do that. I think its clear you don't make a policy and not do it, if we like this we should do it or change it.

W. Poe – We receive reports from the Chair or Chair -Elect. I've not been a part of the PBAC in the recent decade. Aside from the matter of reports and the matter of titles being corrected to reflect clarity, where do we have discrepancy between practice and policy here? Clear to membership here that the President regarded this list as a minimal list. As an advisory committee, he could add any member to seek advice. It is not a policy making body, but an advisory body. There may be discrepancies in membership. I view this as a minimal list.

C. Nelson – I want to hear what Tim has to say.

T. Wandling –The reason I went to dig this up in the first place is that the level of discourse is frustrating. I like the about idea where consultation should happen. I like the idea the Chair-Elect reports on faculty positions. Where this specifically came up was about the search to replace Jim Meyer. He said the committee was in favor of that. I said how can that be? We can say faculty recommends on a particular issue, not a veto. But more in form of a recommendation. Over time if we never see recommendation we make taken we can ask why. We need to recognize our collective voice as faculty.

C. Nelson – Your communication is intriguing. The process you suggest could be cumbersome in times when we need to make a decision. Faculty on committees are given decisions that have to be made, but I find your comments thoughtful and intriguing. SBC is the logical place for the policy to go. If the committee can figure out exactly what it wants done, I'll take it back to SBC. We will look at any change we can make and we have the budget process from Dennis Harris last fall, this will get the process started. Unless this committee wants to take it on itself.

R. Armiñana - The question of who you consult is the ultimate question. It is one that has never been resolved and I'm not sure this is the way to do it. In terms of budget I rely on advice from one place and that is the PBAC. The SBC is to deal with the Senate. I don't recognize the SBC as an advisory committee. And in that sense I also am not going look at micro advice. I'm going to look at macro advice. I'm going to look at broad categories. For example, I ask the PBAC for the reserve amount that is available for support. Once that is established, expenditures within those bands, once I go beyond that amount I ask for advice. Within that band for line item expenditures, I won't look for advice. Let me be very clear. CSU got rid of the infamous orange book that had line item expenditure that had to be approved by the Department of Finance. My advice to the then Chancellor was a major contribution to the management of the CSU. Some people will strongly disagree with that. Let me make it perfectly clear I'm not going make the orange book at the local level. If this policy needs to be reviewed to meet present practices I'm perfectly happy with that. Policy and practice should be as close as possible. The fact that you create new structures which are not new structures I'm going to recognize and use, and is not a structure that I have called for advise. I look for this advice at the macro level. More important I will not take advice at the micro level. Larry, do you remember if Dennis was working on this policy?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – Dennis said it might need updating. Something did happen. But the policy didn't get changed. A small committee met and chose not make any adjustments. The composition of the committee is not reflected here. Dennis pointed that out. When we discussed it we couldn't be in agreement about what to do. So it just sat.

R. Coleman-Senghor - I think if I'm correct about this, it is a document to lead or guide what to do. It doesn't lead to prerogatives about what we are going to do. When we have membership on the committees and the charge we can go on. For a faculty member appropriate for this on the Executive committee, it should be our SBC chair. We want to have our voice. You are not obliged to take the advice of anybody. But how do we communicate as a faculty on important issues if we feel level of consultation is there. Part of it is to get communication down. I'd like to see us use this as a way to being to think about nature of communication and the persons we want to be in a position to speak for faculty. It's key for that to have our chair of SBC present. That 's a crucial element we should revise.

R. Armiñana – My main body is the PBAC. There have been two occasions where I have rejected their recommendation because I felt they were too draconian against the teaching element. That they went too far. I think that at the end of the day, it was of benefit to the faculty. Those things will happen. It is the nature of consultation. Do not always presume I reject things in favor of the faculty. In '95 or '96 they wanted me to cut remediation. There were some really draconian ideas that I didn't feel were necessary at that time. It's the nature of the process.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I will conclude by saying to the President, I think the Executive committee and the administration have to deal with perception and perception leads to morale. The faculty feel its voice is not being heard and the particular place I would really suggest that we look to is the composition of your PBAC and bring balance in. There are people there serving at your pleasure. It would increase morale to have our

chair of the budget committee as part of a deliberative body. That would go a long way to improving communication and morale.

R. Armiñana – The policy needs to be revised. That's premature. I'm not rejecting it at all, but I think work has to be done before it gets approved.

T. Wandling – I'm in favor of macro and not in favor of micro issues. Faculty do not get to have macro advice. I think it is appropriate for us to formulate and for you to come to us to advise to you on the macro level.

R. Armiñana – Tim, I'm delighted that you said that. In all budgets at the end of the day arguments are not over macro issues, arguments are over micro issues. That tension between advice being given at micro level is where you get in to trouble. If we practice your statement, we would have no problems. Where we get into problem with one another is the natural tendency to deal at the micro level. To large extent the budget resolution #5 deals with micro issues not macro issues. We tend to agree pretty much at the macro level. One thing you find in budget discussions is the inability for the committee under difficult financial constraints to come up with a plan. Every year where we have that, the committee cannot do it and they delegate it to the two vice presidents. Because it gets into micro issues, most people are not particularly good and knowledgeable. How does the budget sustain the values? Fixing a budget is not an easy process.

C. Nelson – I would like to move that the Executive committee refer the faculty consultation on budget policy to SBC to begin the process of revising it and bringing it into compliance with existing practice in consultation with members of the faculty and administration. Or **refer a review of this policy to the SBC.**

Second.

R. Luttmann – It is 5:00, do you want to extend the meeting?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – There is nothing here that is representative for staff. It's not appropriate for SBC to recommend to the PBAC when there are no staff or students on the SBC. A group should get together, but I don't think that body is the SBC. It's one committee that goes beyond the faculty of university. It would be sending the wrong message.

N. Byrne – I understand some of your point Larry, but I would direct particular emphasis on the title of the policy - faculty consultation in budget matters and the SBC is a proper place to offer that side of things. The point you raise is valid, we wouldn't want get in the purview of staff representation, but I do support the motion that you have make in second formulation.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – Maybe it is needed for the administration through the President to engage with other groups. Faculty could bring forth their issues.

R. Armiñana – I see this as a beginning of a process to develop a policy. Back to Tim's consultation? I'm not expecting in any shape SBC will bring to me the final document. I plan to bring in other points of view. Might take a year.

S. Brannen – I was just going to caution that about this document, there two ideas here. One is to bring the policy into compliance with reality and reality in compliance with the policy. Sounds like you are bringing the policy into compliance. May be there are items in here we aren't doing but should be doing. Maybe better if practice is brought into line with the policy.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Larry, I'm going to have to agree and disagree. I cite the diversity statement which began in Provost's office and eventually came to the faculty for input. We can do exactly the same thing. Have SBC have its take on it. This is a university document and must have full university discussion and final approval by the President. It is recommended by the Senate and in that function the Senate is appropriate to initiate the process. We can work it that way. If all areas cannot be covered by the Senate then it needs to go to other bodies.

T. Wandling – It's simple to deal with the last third which is exclusively faculty. The budget committee is where we have our voice. SBC needs to look at that. It needs to go Bernie's and Larry's committees at the same time. Groups need to be represented at the PBAC have those bodies look at the document too. Eventually has to come through the Senate and President Armiñana.

B. Goldstein – You are assuming in this process what the PBAC will go through is parallel. We always want staff to be on the committee and always had students. 3.1, 3.2, - be very clear if you are not sure all that is taking place now.

R. Armiñana – We may need two policies. We may be trying to put too much in the same document. One dealing with PBAC and one dealing with policy principles with another piece of the university. I'm not the president of the faculty, their managing with another set of principles or guidelines in that policy. The entire policy not just about faculty participation. Too many things can create ambiguity.

R. Luttmann – We have a motion before us. To refer revision of the policy to SBC.

Vote - Approved.

R. Luttmann – This was a useful discussion. But the major issue was not touched on as you may recall the genesis for this concern was on particular issues of serious concern that the President indicated he had not heard clearly the faculty voice.

R. Armiñana – I have never been able to hear the faculty voice. You don't speak with that level of unanimity on any subject, therefore I have not heard it. This is one of the problems - that level of unanimity does not exist. I didn't hear from faculty personally on that issue. I heard from some faculty when I did talk to members of the search committee. There are 4 faculty I heard from then. I want to be clear in how we use the language. I did not hear from faculty beside those 4 faculty. I didn't receive any phone

calls or email letters from other members concerned about that matter. As I don't hear from faculty on 99% of other matters.

R. Luttmann - It is clear there is a problem. The remarks you just made, you feel it is appropriate to get advice from faculty members by getting it personally, somehow this body and the Senate, somehow we don't seem to be utilizing these mechanisms to get faculty opinion on matters across to you. I think this is a problem that merits further discussion.

R. Armiñana – I have made myself available twice to be at this meeting to address that matter. Against doctor's orders I am here. The matter is always put at the end of the agenda and not addressed. I might not be able deal with it. If it is that important and I have made myself available, bring it up early enough to do that.

R. Luttmann – I appreciate your effort to be here with your injury. You are a standing member of this body.

W. Poe – It seem to me its going to be the natural condition of any group voice that are heard as containing disagreement. It's also the case and would disturb me if faculty spoke with unity on anything. It's in our nature to have a variety of opinions all the time. The key is where you feel consultation is there, or whether you have not been heard. In this situation I have always felt I was heard. On a number of occasions I was not agreed with.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Bill, as a student of language and Dr. Armiñana, faculty and faculty are two words where we can see it in the collective and singularity. When we look toward faculty in the collective that is the Senate. When the Senate speaks, it represents that voice. We have an important need to communicate to you about the representativeness of the Senate. When you hear the Senate vote, the Senate is acting on behalf on entire faculty. The President has come here and an issue has come on the boards. As a body let's extend our time and deal with it today. The VP search memo in the packet suggests issues of a smoking gun and I strongly object to this being brought forward. I'd like the body to extend the time to resolve the issue. I'd like to drop that language in this document so that document doesn't go forward.

T. Wandling - I second extending the meeting.

The body agreed to extend the meeting.

A two minute recess was called.

VP for Development recruitment, new information – attachment

P. Phillips -There are a lot of concerns on campus about this issue. People felt it was excessive, and this memo has lead to further discussion. Larry has been helpful saying that recruitment firms have been used at other similar positions, Bernie's in particular. There has been different search firms in the past that the university did sole source. There has been

considerable discussion that there was a personal relationship between search firm's executives and your prior history. Many possibly perceive a conflict of interest. There have been rumors and talk about it among faculty, staff and off campus. Anytime there's a perception of a possible conflict it does not serve the university. This needs to be explored.

R. Armiñana – First the issue of conflict of interest – I understand the concerns of many people about what it seems a fairly large expenditure they aren't particularly familiar with. We don't use search firms for faculty positions. This is something which is different work from most faculty. It is not a new utilization in the CSU, not a new utilization at SSU. We've used search firms four times in the past 10 years at SSU. At that time Korn Ferry was used in my search for President. We used a search firm for the second search for the Dean of the Business school after the first search failed. That search brought Larry Clark back. Other times it has been AP Kearny and Associates. The search firm for provost was Korn Ferry again. In the person of Ira Krinsky we are using a search firm for VP of Development with the firm of Heidrick & Struggles, the fellow working on it I knew in Charleston. He was former President of University of Georgia. Yes, we worked together at Tulane University. In terms of friendships, I know intimately the heads of the educational practices of 5 or 6 national search firms. I get calls from these individuals on a weekly basis. I know all of these individuals personally. I am a friend to each one of them and am called weekly. In terms of recommendations for President jobs, recommendations for Vice President of Development, etc. Yesterday Ira Krinsky called me just to say hello. Do I have relationships, yes I do, most university presidents have that relationship. It is going to happen. Therefore I know all of them intimately, one relationship is no different than another. We have used Korn Ferry, apc coury, Heidrick & Struggles. It's the same as the top 5 accounting firms. We don't want to use the same people. You don't want the same search firm selecting a VP for Development for Sonoma and for Fullerton and Dominguez Hills. Do I know these people? Intimately, personally. There are two positions open right now and it is the policy of the Trustees to use search firms for Presidents. In case of the Provost, I was asked specifically to use a search firm as there was a strong internal candidate to ensure we were not stacking the deck. The two most sought after positions in higher education are the VP for Development and Athletic Director. The pool for Presidents and the pool for Provosts is greater than those two. In recent months, there have been failed searches for development. As soon as we finish ours another campus will use the same search firm. Cost. The standard cost for a search firm is 1/3 of the first year of total compensation and bonuses. Total compensation, not just salary - salary, benefits and related costs. Do that math and it comes to be around \$65,000. We are using \$100,000 for expenses that are incurred. I hope we will not expend that money. The pools are very difficult to get especially for a VP of Development. An advantage of a search firm is they can get certain information and details that are not necessarily public knowledge, but very important to have. That's why search firms have friendships with Presidents. They can ask x person you know the person, tell me what went on separate and apart from what's on the record. That's where some of the knowledge is. We have that case. Therefore I think that this VP of Development job is probably a most sought after position. The match is very important. If that person doesn't recoup the costs in first few months we have got the wrong person. I was extremely pleased with both decisions. I had a

conversation with the search committee, which includes 4 faculty, and the opinion of the search committee was to agree with the recommendation. Phil, is that correct?

P. McGough – 100%, but the decision to use the search firm not the budget decisions.

R. Armiñana – Your piece was to approve the search firm as the search committee.

P. McGough – It was not a budget decision, but it was reasonable to have input.

R. Armiñana – In my estimation once the decision to get search firm was made the cost clearly had to come from somewhere, they are not doing the job for free. I made the decision that the appropriate expenditure source was the reserves. The budget being approved at 1/2 million in reserve. Other search firms, yes, there are only a handful who are national education practitioners, another search firm could do it cheaply, etc., but they probably do not have the ability to get that pool of people. Almost all people I have mentioned are all former university presidents. In that sense it is an incestuous relationship. That's how they get to you, that's why they call you. I made that decision. I consulted with the search committee. I knew where the money would come from. I am extremely pleased with the resulting decision. It's not arrogance, but there is no person in this university who has more knowledge about the field of development, the search process in development or better contacts than I do. You all have a great deal of expertise in your area, this is my area. How could my knowledge of this side of the house and the processes of search firms be on par with anybody in this part of California? Why? Because I've been in the field and in weekly contact wth these people. This is what I know. At some point or other as it goes through the consultation process, I have to trust my knowledge. I have to trust that after hearing consultation I do what I think is the right despite the popularity of the decision. I will not do my job well, I will not be able to face myself, in this area, I know more than anybody else in this institution. Only a handful of people do these search firms call weekly on this matter. You who have been in my office, you know how many phone calls I get. That is an experience that I think most of you, because of what you do, don't have. But I do. Therefore my decisions to go with a search firm at this time was by far the best decision and I am not apologizing. I have done what I think is the best thing and I hope at the end of the day it will be a wonderful decision. The cost of housing is very high in this area, the demand is very high and the supply for this job is very small. There are a lot of charlatans in this business. There is inadequate staff and budget in that office. The suggestion that came from the Senate Budget committee budge at one time was why don't you name an acting VP of Development. I did consider it. I don't have that person. It doesn't exist. It has been a fabulous one man show. Some deanships I have had interims and others I have not had that. You cannot put a crown if there isn't a head to put the crown on. That's the explanation. 1/3 of compensation plus bonuses is the cost of expenses. I think the expenses will be \$35,000 so you budget up to that amount. This is no different than the decisions I made this week changing the mascot name, cost of it, where will it come from, same process. We will use a tech firm to figure what the seawolf will look like. It will cost approximately \$30,000. We don't have that technical capability here. Some might think it is expensive, but that's what it costs. You don't have any resolutions on the cost of the Cossacks. This is the difference between macro and micro. When you support the idea and when you don't. If you are so concerned about spending money, challenge

me in the same way spending up to \$30,000 for the mascot. In my mind it's the same thing. I don't hear from most of you yet. I know that for faculty these are extraordinary costs. I appreciate your concerns. But we live sometimes in slightly different worlds.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Your explanation is totally reasonable to me. I see what we have is a search, and a decision had to be made as a search has a cost. A member of the committee is here who said we agreed to a search firm. I don't want to debate the amount of the search. I assume you are comfortable with the fiscal availability of campus resources. Look at a small thing that is connected to large things this has to do with your style of administration that is creating concern. It's a question of the capital culture of the university. The faculty community was with you and didn't want micro mange you. We have to go to a higher level of concern. I want us to report to the Senate that we received an explanation for your decision of cost of the search recommended by faculty. I do think it is the business of APC to look at buildings like the Green Center and ask what is that going to do to the curriculum? We're looking at a 40 million dollar project.

R. Armiñana –The number is about 42 million dollars. Housing is 43.7 and on the Darwin remodel , 25 – 27 million. What may seem to some people big numbers, if you put them in relation to each other they are pretty consistent.

R. Coleman-Senghor – The money that you spent on the library the faculty sought funding for that from the state before you came. You did want a President is supposed to do take the funding base and see if you can complete the project. Faculty thought of that building and fought for years for that building. The Chancellor needs to know that.

R. Armiñana – My frustration is I hear the same voices oppose to everything. With the music center look at the statements made. I could hear same arguments on the name change, we don't need it, it's a monument to Armiñana, same for housing. I heard the same arguments by the same groups and the same people, just the title of project changed. I expect to hear it on Darwin hall. At some time you get to the point, you hear the same things - it's like crying wolf, you become immune to it.

N. Byrne – Actually so many issue have arisen during your explanation, I could take up the whole evening. I'd like to make a comment with respect to the apparent fact that same voice seems to rise in objection repeatedly. One of underlying difficulties in these two matters are replicated. On the merit part of the decision, objections arise not simply about the merits of the decision, but also the process. You've made it clear that our position on consultation is quite different than the view of consultation that the faculty hold to. I want to address the search itself. The reason this has come before us is not simply because a head hunter was selected, or because this would result in expenditure of \$100,000. In discussion in the Executive committee I was puzzled that faculty had not alerted you about disagreements and this had already had gotten to the point of a resolution. The reasons this was brought to the Senate actually had to do with the payback to the state that had emerged as a consideration after all this had become known. Within context of the payback, it was felt by many that this was not the right time to use a head hunter firm at that expense. I know that I and others feel

we have been extremely clear on that. We had we felt that the consultation process really hadn't been attended to in any respect. This prompted a resolution before the Senate. I want to place it in this context. Another point of fact is that the resolution that has come before the Senate didn't regard micro level decision making. I understand your point about micro level decision making. I regard the resolution that is before the senate valid. The Senate does have a right to take positions.

P. McGough – I want to say that the budget committees are an outward design of an inward process. Faculty like to feel that their position is heard and listen to and respected. This meeting today has been an example of that.

P. Phillips –I felt what you said was informative and I appreciate it. It opened a door to understanding and a high level of communication. A point I'd like to make is that the sole sourcing of a \$100,000 contract to a long term personal friend has the appearance of a possible conflict of interest and evolves into rumors more than your explanation warrants. It seems to me, I have had 30 year of government management work, whenever the appearance arises, it is good policy to at least have a competitive bidding process or evaluation of different firms, but for public understanding be wary of the impression of a conflict of interest.

R. Armiñana – I appreciate that very much and thank you. It is good advice. In reality these types of contracts do not go out for public bidding. When we did the Dean of Business, that didn't go to public bidding. These contracts aren't generally public. It's the nature of that particular market. I fully appreciate that people will say why is that different. But it doesn't go, it's a very different story. The total level of confidence needed doesn't allow for public bidding. Some information doesn't come through normal process in the public domain. You have to trust that information is truthful. Example. A major issue now is does the candidate have a drinking or drug problem? When I became President of this institution, I'm sure that they asked does he drink, does he drink excessively, has he ever had an inhaling problem, those are questions that under normal human resource process are very difficult to ask. Those are essential questions. A significant number of university Presidents had wonderful references and the Board of Trustees says he's the best we ever had to get rid of them. These are usually sole source contracts in order to be able to extract that information. I have some ethical concerns with how that industry works. But that's how it works. If I get back in the market those questions will be asked about me. Particularly of that market. In last 5 or 6 years I have been highly instrumental getting 6 or 7 university Presidents. I have recommended then. That's why I know this business in a way that none of you have the opportunity. This is an area where I really know my stuff.

R. Coleman-Senghor - The document in the packet is the one I referred to. Can we excise the letter from Dr. Jensen?

W. Poe – That is not going to the Senate agenda.

R. Luttmann – There is no proposal to take this to the Senate.

P. McGough - Ruben, congratulations on the seawolves.

R. Armiñana – You are about the seventh person to approve the seawolves. Fifty have condemned me, some are insulting.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Thanks Laurel for staying.

R. Luttmann – The Senate will be pleased that the mascot action was passed.

ADJOURNMENT 6:30pm

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom