

Senate Executive Committee Minutes
April 9, 2015
3:00 – 5:00, Academic Affairs Conference Room

Abstract

Agenda approved. Chair Report. Minutes of 3/26/15 approved. Question for President. Question for Provost. CANDEL Discontinuance approved for Senate agenda. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. Proposed Constitutional change to definition of faculty referred to Structure and Functions. Senate Reorganization proposals approved for Senate agenda. Senate agenda approved.

Present: Richard J. Senghas, Margaret Purser, Melinda Milligan, Tom Targett, Richard Whitkus, Catherine Nelson, Kirsten Ely, Ruben Armiñana, Andrew Rogerson, Laura Watt, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Elaine Newman, Sam Brannen, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Julie Shulman

Guests: Christian George, Jason Wenrick, Carlos Ayala

Approval of Agenda – item added: Senate Reorganization presentation to Senate. Approved.

Chair Report – R. Senghas

R. Senghas reported that the Council of Academic Chairs would be reviewing the Community College BA degree awarding process. He reported on attending one of the programs funded by the GMC academic integration grants called “Harmonious Equations” and thought it was “terrific”. In his opinion this was exactly what should be happening in the GMC.

Minutes of 3/26/15 – Approved.

Question for the President

A member asked about the CSU lobby day at the Capitol recently and what the President might have learned. The President said that most legislators were supportive of an augmentation to the CSU budget. The Speaker had introduced a bill, SB 15, which would provide \$75 million each to the CSU and the UC in lieu of tuition increases and for greater enrollment access. He said it was not clear whether the \$75 million would be one time money or added to the base. He did not know where the money could come from. He noted that more money would be available to the Legislature due to higher revenues. The Governor’s interest for that money was to fulfill Prop 98 and reduce the debt load for California. The Legislature was committed to having a budget signed by June 15th.

Question for the Provost

A member asked for an update on faculty hires for next year. The Provost said as of that day, they were comfortable with six. He said that if they found more money, they would consider more hires. A member asked the Provost to discuss where more money might come from. The Provost said there was a possibility that more

money could come from the Chancellor's office or enrollment growth. He noted that money for salaries came from two sources – growth money or salary savings. The salary savings amount was a big unknown. A member asked if the six new hires included retirement replacements. The Provost said it did include retirement replacements.

CANDEL Discontinuance – M. Milligan, C. Ayala

The Chair invited members to bring out their laptops or tablets to view the documents for this item. M. Milligan introduced the item. She said EPC voted to support the proposal for discontinuance and described the process of gathering information to make their decision. The next phase was that EPC's recommendation and all supporting materials would go to the Senate, and the Senate would then make a recommendation to the President. She also thought the EPC minutes of 4/2 captured the discussion well.

Item postponed until later in the meeting.

Statewide Senator Report – C. Nelson

C. Nelson said she visited the Graduate Studies and GE subcommittees regarding the Statewide resolution on defining upper division GE and the request from CSU administration to distinguish a master's degree from a bachelor's degree in the CSU. She thanked the committees for interesting meetings. A member asked about the master's degree issue. C. Nelson said that conversations had been going on for about two years regarding revising the Title V requirements for master's degrees. Chris Mallon, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Faculty Professional Development said she was getting contrary information from campuses, Provosts and Presidents about what the changes should be and had decided to come up with a list of criteria or a definition that distinguishes master's from bachelor degrees. She would take that to a task force of all constituencies to see if that definition or criteria matched Title V.

Vice Chair Report – K. Ely

K. Ely reported that Structure and Functions had recommended her to serve on the Sonoma State Enterprises Board. She had not been in the room for that decision. She said there had been a number of write-ins for Lecturer Senator, so a run off election would be held soon.

CANDEL Discontinuance continued

C. Ayala made a statement about the proposed discontinuance. He said the Education Department did not make this decision lightly. They had had a lot of successes in the CANDEL program. When he encountered a difficult decision such as this, he always asked: "who are our students?" In this case, that question poses an interesting problem. When he thought of students, he immediately thought of the 30 students in the Educational Leadership program who wanted to become principals. These 30 students would be replacing current principals. He said every principal in Santa Rosa schools was either a current or previous student of the SSU Education School; noting that "That's the kind of impact the department has." He thought about the resources given to the CANDEL program for very few students and it

became clear that the School should focus on students at SSU. There was structural problem with the CANDEL program. There was no FTE associated with the joint program, UC Davis had been giving money for release time for faculty. Then in 2008 and 2009, UC Davis made dramatic cuts to the program. The School of Ed was not consulted and they had pushed back. Eventually, they decided to be “team players” and accept the reduced funding. This resulted in having to fire people in the School to allow them to take other positions. UC Davis charged a fee to the students and consolidated all administration at UC Davis. He noted that the website for CANDEL only had one mention of Sonoma State. He could not go to the Provost to ask for more faculty for CANDEL. He noted that there were huge process issues with the CANDEL program. He said that the two faculty involved in the program meet many times with him and he found that they were never going to make a decision, so he decided to move forward with the discontinuance. He went to the SSU President and the President at UC Davis, his School graduate committee, his School curriculum committee, the Graduate Studies committee and EPC. He said he thought he had followed the policy and the intent of the policy.

The President said that the CANDEL program was, historically, the result of a collaboration between the UC and CSU. When the program was begun, it was a true tripartite relationship between Sacramento State, Sonoma State and UC Davis. When permission was given for the CSU to grant doctorate degrees, Sacramento left the CANDEL program to pursue their own degree. Things had gone very well until UC Davis, under new leadership, had decided to “beef up” their graduate programs in significant and independent ways. They changed the rules and this discontinuance was a result of that. No programs of this nature had survived in the CSU, except San Diego State and UC San Diego. He thought the UC no-longer had and interest in pursuing these partnerships at all.

There was discussion about how to prepare the Senate for the lengthy document. A member said he had been contacted by faculty wondering why the proposal did not come from the CANDEL faculty and that there was an MOU that made them a separate structure from the School of Educational. C. Ayala said he had asked the Educational Leadership faculty whether anyone else at the campus could be in charge of the program and they said no. He realized that the control, oversight, and significant decision making about the program need to occur in that department. He reiterated that he followed the policy and the intent of the policy. He thought everyone had been given the chance to weigh in. M. Milligan noted that the discontinuance policy allows anyone to bring a proposal for discontinuance. She said EPC thought the policy could be clarified more with information such as alerting all the Schools earlier in the process and stating Academic Affairs’ role.

There was discussion about how EPC’s recommendation document was written. M. Milligan said the document was meant to note what issues had been raised about the discontinuance from all perspectives. A member wanted references for where to find the information about the perspectives. A member suggested how to frame the discussion in terms of what EPC took seriously in making their decision. A member suggested a table of contents for the document. A member suggested that Senators be reminded that this would be a first reading for clarifications or questions. M. Milligan noted that the Senate could ask for more information and that the policy was open ended that way. **Approved for the Senate agenda.**

Proposed Constitutional change to definition of faculty – R. Whitkus

R. Whitkus introduced the item. FSAC had noted that the Emeritus policy granted emeritus status to four classes of faculty as defined in the Senate Constitution. Reviewing the Constitution Article II, Section I.3 they noted that it includes Student Service Professional II and above. FSAC thought this article did not define faculty clearly. They then looked at the Collective Bargaining agreement and found that all Unit 3 employees are considered faculty. This lead them to look at the CSU Class Codes. Neither the Collective Bargaining Agreement or the Class Code for faculty include Student Services Professionals. The union contract is very clear defining faculty. It is Unit 3 people and no one else. Looking at the CSU Classification Standards, there are two classes of Student Service Professionals – Student Service Professionals, Academic Related in Unit 3 and Student Service Professionals in Unit 4. They also looked at how other CSU's define faculty and found that fourteen actually interpret the definition of faculty and the others do not define. He noted that on campuses that include SSPs in their definition of faculty, two include only SSP – Academic Related and two include all SSPs. Nine of the campus either include or restrict to SSP – Academic Related. He said that there were approximately 61 SSPs at SSU – and noted where they work, such as financial aid, academic advising, student admissions, etc. These positions are important, but not directly related to academic issues. In the SSP classification code general information shows that SSPs are focused more on administrative and/or professional activities than academics. Given this background, FSAC thought it was time to reexamine the issue of the definition of faculty. The rationale provided for the change: Modifying the definition of “faculty” in the Constitution to the definition as recognized by the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the California State University maintains the distinctive nature of faculty as individuals who have advanced professional training, experience and comprehensive knowledge of academic-related fields, and are engaging in complex duties which require advanced training typically gained through a terminal degree such as a doctorate in the field in which the individual is working.

R. Whitkus said this does not exclude SSPs from serving on the Senate. It just excludes them being defined as faculty.

The proposed constitutional amendment was:

1.3 Those individuals who hold written appointments at the rank of Student Services Professional, Academic-Related II or above.

Additionally, FSAC proposed to further amend the constitution:

Subsection 1.2 – Representative Members

Senators are chosen by each of the Schools, and the University Library and the Student Services Professionals, according to the following formula: one Senator for each 20 FTEF, and one additional Senator if the remaining number of FTEF exceeds 10. However, each unit represented shall have at least one representative Senator.

Subsection 1.10 – Student Service Professionals
Language TBD

The Emeritus faculty policy would also need to be modified. The proposal was: Qualifications for Emeritus(a) Status. An additional criterion could be included that individuals who have taught as lecturers for at least 5 years would be eligible for emeritus status.

A member said she was not clear about why this change was needed and thought that needed to be clear for readiness for the Senate. A member wanted an explanation of how SSP-Academic Related differed from the other SSPs. The Senate Analyst provided historical background. SSPs appear in the first faculty governance Constitution. She thought at that beginning they were a small group on campus. Quite awhile ago the SSP classification was expanded to include many other kind of work that did not include teaching. SSPs-Academic Related go through the RTP process. A member also wanted to know more about why this was being proposed pointing to the wide variation among campuses. R. Whitkus said that FSAC did discuss these issues and he thought that the question of who are faculty needed to be answered. He thought that once faculty knew who they were, there was power and strength in that. A member asked for what some of the other reasons were. R. Whitkus said currently, all SSPs were eligible for emeritus status and that was a financial issue. He thought this was a critical conversation to have in concert with the potential Senate reorganization. A member noted her new understanding while attending FSAC that some SSPIIs were not teaching or advising students and understood FSAC's rationale for the proposal. A member suggested that the framing of this issue should be linked to the reorganization process and that all groups should be honored in the process of this change. It was clarified that FSAC was making a recommendation to the Senate and that it was up to the Senate to implement it. The Chair suggested that the To Be Determined language be stated as "to be determined by Structure and Functions." **Motion to include item on Senate agenda. Second.** A member argued that the language from Structure and Functions should go forward with this proposal due to the difficulty attaining the requirements for a Constitutional vote. A member suggested to roll this discussion into the Senate restructure process. R. Whitkus said FSAC was bringing this forward and it was up to the Ex Com and Senate to decide what to do. They had finished their due diligence. **Vote on including on Senate agenda. Failed. Motion to refer recommendation to Structure and Functions. Second. Approved.**

Senate Reorganization presentation to Senate – R. Senghas

R. Senghas said they wanted to present to the Senate the process of the task force, discuss the progress on the project and get input from the Senate. A member suggested that the packet for the Senate needed to include more about the process. A member was concerned about EPC seeming to report to a new standing committee and wondered how the new standing committee was different from APC. The Chair noted that the task force was working in a vacuum without EPC's input. He wondered if at the Senate, EPC's perspective could be discussed and that could help the task force craft a proposal. There was more discussion about what the packet should include and not include. A member asked what task force wanted to get out of bringing this to Senate. **Motion to include item on the Senate agenda as a discussion item. Second.** A member argued that the task force had done a great job of consultation and that it was time to bring forward a proposal. A member asked if EPC could provide a response by the next Ex Com meeting. The EPC chair said that another discontinuance was coming through along with other curricular items and said that it their ability to respond was a matter of priorities. A member suggested

just bringing the change to the Senate forward and not the ideas for committee structure change. **Vote on item as a discussion item – Failed. The Chair asked if the Ex Com would prefer the task force just bringing the Senate membership change forward and note that more would be coming in the fall. Approved.**

The Chair asked L. Furukawa-Schlereth to provide information from PBAC about where the money could come for the equity program. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he would provide a written report to the Senate.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Richard J. Senghas
Approval of Agenda
Approval of Minutes - emailed

Consent Items:

Special Report – Classroom upgrades – S. Horstein TC 4:30

Special Guest: Dr. Stephen Stepanek, Faculty Trustee TC 4:00

BUSINESS

1. CANDEL discontinuance recommendation from EPC – M. Milligan – attached/emailed – First Reading TC 3:15
2. Proposal to change Senate formula for representation and duties of Senators – First Reading - R. Senghas, R. Whitkus, L. Holmstrom-Keyes TC 3:30

Approved.

Adjourned.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes