

## Executive Committee Meeting

October 7, 2004

3:00 – 5:00 Sue Jameson

**Present:** Elizabeth Stanny, Eduardo Ochoa, Catherine Nelson, Brigitte Lahme, Tim Wandling, John Wingard, Sam Brannen, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Jan Beauly, Susan McKillop

**Absent:** Melanie Dreisbach, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Elaine McDonald, Brad Mumaw

The Chair was at a Chair's Committee meeting in Long Beach. The Chair-Elect presided over the meeting.

**Approval of Agenda** – item 3 removed from agenda - Endowed Chair's Policy. Added – Nominations for Campus Planning Committee; Procedures for Nominating Faculty Trustees – *Approved*.

**Approval of Minutes 9/23/04** – *Approved*.

### Chair's Report

E. Stanny stated that M. Dreisbach asked for members feedback on the Convocation Survey, if not already given.

### Provost Report

E. Ochoa mentioned the latest developments on YRO. He met with the CSU Academic Council last week and was surprised to find out that the decision was made that the campuses that have to make the transition to YRO yet are slated to do it in '06 including us. The other piece of unexpected news was that for '05 we would still get buy down money. However, the buy down money will be at the old salary rate. It's not enough of a subsidy to mount the kind of summer we did last year. How much smaller it would be without a deficit has to be estimated. There is flat compensation now, so there won't be classes of five or less students. He didn't know what the pattern of demand was, so couldn't predict the changes. He also found out that the '06 date was not mandatory, but a deadline. He thought that doing a self-support summer with buy down money wasn't much worse than full YRO and thought SSU would do self-support in '05.

A Senator asked about the idea for a small intercession as if that would happen they need to plan and think about it.

E. Ochoa said the discussion at the Academic Council was inconclusive. He had to follow up on that.

A Senator asked if faculty could still do independent study and get paid - would that work for very small classes.

The Provost responded that the only self-support that will be allowed during the summer are special sessions for degree programs that are fully in self-support. No more blended programs.

A Senator asked about how SSU became part of the arbitrator's decision.

The Provost outlined the process of the arbitrator's decision and subsequent interpretation of it which brought SSU into the group that had to give back pay to faculty who taught in the summer. A separate MOU was generated that the summer of '04 would proceed as normal and the arbitrator's decision would take affect in '05. A grievance was filed by CFA at SSU to nullify that MOU for summer '04. Now we're not only liable for back pay, but we might be liable for this summer as well.

The rumor that faculty were not yet paid for this back pay because it was not decided what the rate would be was denied.

### **Chair-Elect Report**

E. Stanny updated the body about Structure & Functions work on the Senate self-study. They have invited Robert McNamara and Susan McKillop for an overview of other campuses and what's going on at the Statewide level and if they have any suggestion for us. We've given them a list of question we're interested in having them address. We're also trying to get an institutional perspective on how the Senate has changed over time here. She's going to talk with Ken Marcus and Bill Poe about how the Senate has changed. There was a restructuring in '87 and the committee structure determined in 1987 is different than it is now. They are discussing how to structure the meetings with the Standing Committees and are open to feedback on that.

A Senator brought up a concern about the role of faculty governance and budgetary matters. He asked to be in the discussion when that comes before S&F.

The Statewide Senator said she was going to recommend that the Chair of the Budget committee sit on the Executive Committee.

E. Stanny said she thought his remark was about the policy S&F is considering on Faculty Consultation on Budgetary matters. She noted that this policy is separate from the self study.

A Senator noted the absence at Executive Committee and Senate meetings of administrators and asked that they send a proxy. He also asked the Chair-Elect to look into attendance rules.

E. Stanny reported on the Enrollment Management Council. So far they have only gotten one maybe. A faculty member is needed from each School. She reviewed the charge of the Council.

The Chair of SAC described their perspective on enrollment. ESAS representatives come to them to report and it seems we take what we get. It might make more sense to plan and see what programs we might want to grow and recruit more specifically. The Provost noted that the Enrollment Management Council was a committee he asked Vice Provost K. Crabbe to create. It is an area that is increasingly seen as a strategic area for universities because it largely determines what you can become as a university – your student body. There has been some planning in this area, but has been largely staff driven. There hasn't been any input from the programmatic side. We ought to have some systematic way to develop a strategy for managing enrollment.

A Senator asked that the Diversity Statement be added to the Enrollment Management Council's charge.

The Chair-Elect asked why the Vice Provost decides which faculty sit on the committee.

The Provost responded that the Council is advisory to the Vice Provost at this point. It has to be designed to be most useful to her.

A Senator voiced concern about administrators approving faculty for administrative committees and also was concerned about S&F selecting faculty to serve on committees. He argued that voting would be a better method.

The Chair-Elect noted that so far the voting turnout for the Search Committee for the AVP of Academic Affairs was 17%. She argued it would be difficult to implement elections for every committee.

A Senator noted that in SAC's charge it is explicit that they are the sole body to advise on enrollment policy. He argued that this new Council was taking power away from an existing committee.

A Senator thought that the Council should be seen as a task force and that is specifically would not be doing the work of SAC.

The Provost noted that his experience of Student Affairs committees at other campuses was that they developed policy about enrollment such as the procedure to drop, etc. He thought the Senate and its committee could map out a broad direction for the student body, but the Enrollment Management Council would develop strategies for this goals. It is something new and hasn't been done by Student Affairs committees in the past.

A Senator argued that since these faculty are to come from Schools, elections could be held in the Schools. He also wanted to see the policy formation concerning enrollment to be in the hands of the faculty.

The Chair of SAC reported what they had done with enrollment management in their committee. They obtained a list of low income student applicants and sent that list out to departments to call the students to encourage them to come. SAC was

actively discouraged to do that because we were overshooting our target. It's always the FTE target that seems to be driving everything and not who are we getting. She would welcome some other way to try to get students other than this number. She thought someone from SAC should be on the Council.

A Senator noted that the reason enrollment management was done in the past was so that the campus had more than two departments.

## **Business**

### **Revised concentration in Global Studies: Europe – E. McDonald**

E. McDonald was not present. E. Stanny introduced the item.

**Motion to send forward to the Senate. Second. Approved.**

**E. Stanny noted that the Global Studies concentration in Global Environmental Policy has not been acted on either. No objections were voiced for this item to move to the Senate agenda.**

### **Request to Call a Senate Committee & Subcommittee Chairs meeting – R. Coleman-Senghor**

R. Coleman-Senghor introduced the item. He wanted to make a separation between the question of looking at the effectiveness of the Senate and also the Senate having some kind of direction, a consensus on what would be our agenda for the next couple of years. As a body, we are not clear on where we want to go in the future. For shared governance, we need a shared vision. That is what the proposal for meeting is striving for. With our look into the operational character, this is an integral part of that.

The Chair-Elect asked what subcommittees the proposal refers to. R. Coleman-Senghor responded that he thought everyone should be there, all subcommittees.

A Senator commented that she thought the proposal asks the Senate to engage in planning. R. Coleman-Senghor responded yes. She argued that if the Senate was to engage in planning it should be at the Faculty Retreat. If this is going outside the rubric of what S&F is doing, she argued that having the Senate Committee Chairs to meet independently of the Senate or Executive Committee was an unnecessary step.

R. Coleman-Senghor argued that a very important function of the meeting proposed was improved communication. There is no proper reporting function for faculty sitting on administrative committees. There is no place for them to come and report. The administration meets weekly.

A Senator noted that it was hard to evaluate entities on the campus without some sense of priorities. We end up evaluating processes. He longed for a sense of collective purpose but he did not know if it could be assessed with the proposal. But

that's a whole other question than to the need to have faculty meet and consult on those processes on a regular basis.

A Senator noted that where all these things come together is in the Executive Committee. Putting together the Senate agenda is a procedural task. If the proposal is not the right way to do it, how can we get a function where people can sit down regularly and talk about how things are going and how what's going on here fits with what's going on there. We don't have the opportunity to find out what's really going on in the committees unless it comes to the Senate.

The Provost reminded everyone how this got started. He found that he needed to cut back on the number of assigned time units to the Senate because he thought we needed to tighten up resources across the board. Then in conversations with the Executive Committee we arrived at an understanding where he would restore the units back to where they were for this year provided that the Senate would agree to undertake a self- assessment of how it's structured to efficiently discharge it's responsibilities. That's it. A number of interesting issues have been raised that have merit independently of that understanding. He reminded the body of the agreement to make a good faith effort to look at the structure of the Senate during this academic year to see if we could achieve some efficiencies.

A Senator stated that he supported the proposal and noted that the Standing committee chairs are at the Executive Committee meeting. A possibility would be for the Chairs to meet for one hour after this meeting once a month.

A Senator stated that if this meeting is to be on-going and institutionalized, it would be under the rubric of what Structure and Functions is doing. If any group is getting together to plan, it should be under S&F because that's their job.

R. Coleman-Senghor argued that S&F's charge does not say they set agendas for the work of the committees as a whole. It's function is to look at the operation of the Senate internally. He also disagreed with the Provost. He said that his proposal was not prompted by the Provost's request last year. He has been talking about this for four years and wants the Senate to rethink how it could become a more effective body. He supported the idea that the Chairs meet after the Executive Committee.

A Senator spoke to the disintegration of what is done and wanted to speak in favor of the re-integration of our intellectual selves into work that we do on the campus. To the extent that there are limited resources we need to make sure there is greater alignment. For example, faculty appointed to the Enrollment Management Council could be people who have some expertise in that area.

A Senator voiced the opinion that it would be a good idea for the Chairs to meet, particularly at the beginning of the semester, when new Chairs are around to find out what you're supposed to do and how you do it. We could also talk about ways to get things done effectively and who is working on what issue.

A Senator noted that she had been on the Executive Committee and Senate since '92 and every year S&F made changes to the by-laws or constitution. What we have here is a basic proposal that should go to S&F for a by-laws or constitutional change.

A Senator voiced concern about the Senate being engaged in planning. She likened our Senate to the State Senate or House of Representatives. There is not one committee or group of people that says these are our goals and objectives or priorities. She sees the Academic Senate as the body to make sure that shared governance is happening on the campus. And members of the Academic Senate are elected by their Schools to make sure that a faculty voice is heard in all areas, not any one area. Her concern about planning is that people get locked into specific issues and she did not want to see the Senate do that.

The Chair-Elect noted that if the committee was to be on-going it would get complicated to update the by-laws or constitution. Could the meeting be informal?

R. Coleman-Senghor noted that we do not have parallels with the State Senate as we do not have a house whip or parties. The Senators do not belong to committees and that impairs our effectiveness. He argued that the proposal would give the Senate the opportunity to look over all the work of the committees to see if issues overlap and how to organize ourselves to realize any implicit tasks. That would lead to efficiency. **He made a motion to put the proposal on the Senate's agenda.**

A Senator asked if this would be an ad hoc committee. R. Coleman-Senghor responded that one meaning of ad hoc would be to meet as needed and that was how he saw this committee of Chairs. If it functions well, then a case can be made for a more permanent status.

**A Senator proposed a substitute motion – call for a monthly meeting of Standing committee and subcommittee Chairs to address issues relevant to faculty governance. Second.**

A Senator asked the body to be mindful of the charge from the Provost to complete an assessment of the Senate within this year. She was concerned that this meeting of Standing Committee Chairs not supplant or interfere with the process going on in Structure & Functions.

The Chair-Elect noted that the document was not ready to go forward if it is asking for an ad hoc committee. She enumerated what was required for an ad hoc committee. She noted that the charge could be withdrawn from Structure & Functions and given to some other committee.

The Provost noted that it seemed that the discussion showed that there was support for a meeting of the committee chairs on a more or less regular just because it would be good for the better functioning of faculty governance independently of the self – assessment.

**Motion was withdrawn with the body's consent.**

### **Nominations for Campus Planning Committee – E. Stanny**

E. Stanny reported there were originally ten nominees for the campus planning committee. Structure & Functions asked for statements from them and received only six. These were evaluated and S&F agreed to recommend Bill Poe and Mike Ezra. This has to go before the Senate.

No objections for these nominations to go to the Senate.

### **Procedures for Nominations for Faculty Trustees – E. Stanny**

E. Stanny noted that the procedure Structure & Functions agreed to was nomination by petition with 30 faculty signatures as suggested in the letter from the Statewide Senate.

A Senator asked if these procedures gave no formal role to the Executive Committee or the Senate. E. Stanny responded that that was correct.

No objection to this item on the Senate agenda.

### **Emeritus Dinner update**

L. Holmstrom noted that only one honoree responded to the Executive Committee and asked the body for help with the program.

**It was moved to invite the President to speak and invite someone from Lifelong Learning. Second. Approved.**

### **APC report**

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that APC requested from the body that APC's response to the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan be postponed to the next Senate agenda.

The Past Chair requested that this be the last time APC's response is postponed.

### **FSAC report**

J. Wingard reported that FSAC is making additional revisions to the Endowed Chairs policy based on late comments which they recently received. They are working now on suggested revisions to the RTP policy and are starting to address those.

### **SAC report**

No report.

## **Senate Agenda**

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Melanie Dreisbach

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

    Approval of the Agenda

    Approval of Minutes - 9/30/04 emailed

## **BUSINESS**

1. Course Outline Policy – J. Wingard – Second Reading – attachment – T. C. 3:10
2. Revised concentration in Global Studies: Europe – E. McDonald – First Reading – attachment – T.C. 3:30
3. New Concentration in Global Studies: Global Environmental Policy - E. McDonald – Second Reading – attachment – T. C. 3:45
4. Campus Planning Committee nominations - E. Stanny – T. C. 4:00
5. Procedures for Faculty Trustee nominations - E. Stanny – attachment – First Reading – T. C. 4:10

Meeting adjourned

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*