

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, September 28, 2000

Sue Jameson Room

Present: P. McGough (presiding), L. Brooks, B. Goldstein, L. Furukawa-Schlereth, A. Merrifield, V. Garlin, S. Moulton, S. Heft, C. Nelson, R. Luttmann, S. McKillop, M. Dreisbach
Absent: J. Filp, R. Armíñana
Guest: B. Poe

oMeeting called to order at 3:05

oMSP to approve the Agenda

oB. Poe: Robert's Rules of Order Discussion

B. Poe presented a summary view of Robert's Rules of Order to facilitate our discussions. He noted that the majority always rules; the minority has a right to be heard; the audience has the right to participate; the body should discuss one thing at a time. When a group agrees to an agenda, the items are discussed in that order. A motion is not needed to put an item on the floor if it is on the agenda. A Standing Committee Chair speaks to an item on the agenda first if the item concerns his/her committee.

V. Garlin explained that sometimes an item is on the agenda for discussion. In the course of the discussion motions emerge. Those must be properly moved and discussed.

B. Poe clarified that a body is either listening to Reports or dealing with Action Items. When you have a discussion item it is presented without action. Moving to a committee of the whole prohibits taking action.

P. McGough: Regarding Fresno's Constitution: Consent Items; Agenda Items> Is a motion that comes out of a report is agendized? When we make a motion do we change the Agenda? This can happen only when the Chair of the Senate and the Senate agree. A motion is needed to go into or come out of a Committee of the Whole.

B. Poe: Any motion to limit the right of the minority to be heard must be passed by 2/3. You can't debate a motion to adjourn immediately. For example: points of Order and Information take precedence over everything. To close debate you can move to vote immediately if there are no objections.

L. Brooks: Unless there are extraordinary circumstances, we should follow Robert's Rules of Order.

S. McKillop noted that in earlier Senates one could only speak twice to a motion.

A. Merrifield: Robert's Rules says everyone can speak once. After everyone has spoken you can speak twice. There needs to be special action to speak 3 times. The body can waive the rules.

R. Luttmann: The motion to place staff members on Search Committees was not on the Agenda when it came up.

P. McGough: New motions can be put on the agenda subject to the body changing it.

B. Poe: The First and Second Reading are local rules which need consultation time. V. Garlin had no standing to make a motion because it was in the middle of a report.

V. Garlin: Most organizations had a structure which included New Business and Old Business. The President's Report stimulated the desire to discuss this matter. He wanted to make this a legitimate topic of debate. It was done because after he made a statement about faculty housing he was asked if there was a question in that statement. R. Arminana's report includes inquiries about inquiries. One interpretation is that this is the opportunity to dialogue on the substance of the report. Is the President inviting discussion or merely clarifying inquiries? We need to clarify this.

S. McKillop: At Statewide, C. Reed invites questions of any topic after his statement. It is an opportunity for us to ask him a direct question.

V. Garlin: Is it appropriate for a Senator to make an affirmative statement about a report and to make an interrogative?

P. McGough: It is not appropriate to take a report and make it into a personal discussion. But it is appropriate to ask questions on any topic which was discussed or not.

L. Brooks: V. Garlin was within the rules to make his motion.

S. McKillop: If you move an item to New Business, it won't come up that day.

P. McGough: You can make a motion to put it first.

A. Merrifield: In the House of Commons there is a red line in the carpet. You can't cross the line during a speech so that no one could be attacked with a sword.

R. Luttmann: Did we postpone the issue of the Emeritus on the Agenda?

S. Heft asked about the Statewide Senate Resolution regarding School Vouchers.

Correspondence: (P. McGough)

1. Stanislaus Resolution on FMIs.

2. P. McGough will be at Long Beach on Monday and R. Luttmann will chair the Senate meeting.

3. E. Martinez's term as Senate Representative to the Academic Council of International Programs is expiring and she is willing to be reappointed.

oMSP to reappoint E. Martinez as Senate Representative to ACIP.

4. The Executive Committee asked P. McGough to ask other campuses about their budget processes. He has 10 email responses. This will be included in his longer report.

1. Chair's Report: (P. McGough)

1.1. There is a conference on Managing Finances for Effective Learning which includes the dynamics of academic budget generation within the university budget planning process. This is a workshop in Washington,

D.C. He is considering attending. It was agreed that this would be a good program for him to attend.

1.2. He solicited ideas for the Faculty Retreat. He has received a request from Elaine McHugh to discuss Pedagogy and Approaches.

S. Moulton reminded that we had discussed focusing on Academic Planning and Priorities at the retreat. C. Benito has a planning model that he is developing for APC.

A. Merrifield suggested that we develop a new Senate budget committee that would articulate with the administration as well as work with APC and the Executive Committee and the Senate. At Cal Poly Long Range Planning was changed to budget and Long Range Planning. The committee went from reviewing the operational budget to giving input for decision making on policy. Fullerton concurred and did the same. It became the most important standing committee on campus. SDSU has a Senate committee on Academic Resources and Planning. This helps to minimize the diversion of funds to activities tangential to or peripheral to the goals and mission of the university. Fresno has a University Budget Committee which is a Standing Committee of the Senate. SJSU is educating its faculty with a power point presentation to the Senate and a 5 hour retreat each fall.

S. Moulton noted we need consistent, articulate rationales and assumptions for planning and budgeting and they need to be integrated and part of a collaborative process.

S. McKillop: The mode and level staffing formula for the faculty used to be in place. The state now does marginal funding. Perhaps we could use the mode and level model as an ideal point of departure.

L. Brooks: The combination might be appropriate eventually. We need to jump start the thinking on this. There is a learning curve for a budget committee. APC needs to get going on its articulation with the budget process and he would like to hear more of A. Merrifield's proposal.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth: The question is what budget is the Senate advising on? SSU has blue paper policy which guides its process. The President's Budget Committee is the primary body. The Senate crafted this policy which was modified by D. Farish and L. Furukawa-Schlereth. If there is a Senate committee, it becomes confusing about which is the legislative body that gives advice to the president. There needs to be a structure which identifies how advice gets forwarded.

L. Brooks: The committee proposed was to advise the Senate and its Standing Committees about the budget.

P. McGough has been on all 3 budget committees. There is a need for planning advice on these.

Merrifield: Proposed a 7 person committee as a way to get it started: 3 ex officio. One member from CRC, one from VPBAC, past Chair of the Faculty, 4 people at large who serve rotating 4 year terms (every year we would elect one new person). L. Furukawa-Schlereth would play the same role he has at every meeting, to answer questions. The purpose of the committee is the opportunity to advise the Senate and Executive Committee and to get information to faculty governance.

P. McGough: Following the S. Luis Obispo model: the Chair, Chair elect,

past Chair might need to sit on that committee. They all need to be connected to the budget. If there is less money what should the instructional programs look like? There needs to be faculty vision of instructional programs.

C. Nelson: When is it proper for the Senate to create a budget committee?

S. McKillop noted a budget committee doesn't deny APC the ability to create planning models.

A. Merrifield: The most positive aspect of merging them is that budget representatives bring knowledge of planning.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth: PBAC/CRC both committees will move away from operational into planning mode. There is the issue of the bullet points (on a handout from L. Furukawa-Schlereth). They have changed since last Thursday. They are conversation points alerting the Executive Committee.

S. Moulton: APC needs articulated assumptions and rationales for budget decisions. We need to involve a broad constituency in the strategic planning and priorities and budgetary processes.

B. Goldstein noted priorities are Student Language Labs, Service Learning, Faculty Recruitment, a Multi-cultural Center. The budget has preempted discussions which his VPBAC overlaps.

L. Brooks: We're at a point when Administrative Planning is going on but there isn't an equivalent basis for integrating faculty planning.

Faculty need more information. We need a Budgetary Advisory Committee which should be started as soon as possible.

P. McGough will research this.

It was decided that the Faculty Retreat will cover Academic Planning and Priorities and there will be a separate retreat on Diversity.

L. Brooks: We aren't effectively recruiting to achieve our goal of diversity.

V. Garlin: Strategic Academic Planning should be connected to Strategic University planning. Academic Planning now takes place in an external environment. To address the next level of planning for 10,000 students needs Strategic Academic Planning as well as non-Academic Planning.

Merrifield: Discussion of Academic Planning is a reasonable size for a 1 day faculty retreat. Everything we focus on gets bigger.

C. Nelson asked what are the issues for the Budget Committee?

P. McGough noted there are 2 issues: Budget and APC; Budget Committee. He suggested the Executive Committee adopt a proposal and send it to Structure and Functions.

2. President's Report (absent)

3. Provost/Vice-President's Report (B. Goldstein)

3.1. He was at Los Angeles this week attending a WorkLoad study committee with statewide VPs, CAs, and Academic Senate members.

3.2. There is a search process for Deans. He will meet with each

committee and charge them. Each committee selects the chair of its committee. They still want staff involvement and he will appoint staff members as administrative support positions (non-voting, consultative). L. Furukawa-Schlereth won't provide support. B. Goldstein wanted voting members. The key issue is having a staff voice.

V. Garlin noted there are 2 issues: the consultative relationship with the staff and assigning the work that goes along with the search. It isn't appropriate to mix these two functions. Have the staff been consulted about this?

B. Goldstein noted there is no Staff Council. He has talked with a number of staff. They need administrative support for 4-5 searches.

M. Dreisbach said there are other ways to get staff input. Staff, students, faculty can be invited to attend and give verbal feedback.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth explained there is a tradition of an "open forum" as part of the format of these searches. Anyone can come, meet the person and provide feedback. The reason R. Armiñana appoints administrators to these committees is because the administration has the staff to help the committees.

A. Merrifield assumed that within the school the staff member is reassigned to these duties and that they are not an "add on" to their regular functions. There needs to be back fill for their usual responsibilities. Staff opinions should be seriously considered in the discussions.

V. Garlin noted a person who may do the best job in support may not do the best job as a member of the committee.

4. Vice President, A & F (L. Furukawa Schlereth)

4.1. He reported the result of searches last week in CRC. Larry Linn was the CMS project Director. He joined Peoplesoft. Steve Wilson has been reassigned. After consultation with CRC they need to back fill his position. They have come up with a Risk manager. It isn't covered by a blue paper policy and he feels we should have 2 faculty on this committee. Melinda Barnard has volunteered.

L. Brooks noted this isn't one of the scheduled appointments. There is no procedure for making it.

A. Merrifield: A few years ago he and Larry discussed formalizing these kinds of things.

4.2. It is true that SSU has been invited to be a pilot campus along with Fresno for CMS. They haven't accepted the invitation. We need to know how much money will be given as help from the state. There will be several weeks of discussion. You will hear from the CSU that we have been selected, but we have not accepted this.

A. Merrifield noted that there has to be enough money to make this feasible.

BUSINESS

1. R. Luttmann suggested the Emeritus issue be included on the Agenda as a 2nd Reading. There are questions about 3 people.
2. It was recommended we include endorsing the statewide resolution on vouchers.
3. The issue of the Mascot was discussed. It was suggested we also include this on the agenda.

Meeting adjourned 5:15 pm
S. Moulton