

Senate Executive Committee
September 9, 2007
3:00 – 5:00, Sue Jameson Room

Present: Tim Wandling, Elaine McDonald, Scott Miller, Maria Hess, Thaine Stearns, Karen Thompson, Susan Moulton, Edith Mendez, John Wingard, Eduardo Ochoa, Ruben Armiñana, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

Absent: Robert McNamara

Guests: Steve Wilson, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Karina Nielsen, Joshua Schulz

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 8/23/07 – Approved.

Chair Report – T. Wandling

T. Wandling reported that in the Campus Reengineering Committee, it is being discussed to have faculty mentors live in the Residential community. He asked if the committee would like to have Chuck Rhodes come to talk about it. The body agreed. He then discussed how the Senate elects at-large members to the Executive Committee as well as appointing someone for the Associated Students Senate. He proposed that the election happen in the Spring instead of the Fall. The By-Laws are silent on when to hold these elections. He argued that this would help faculty planning and would have a full Executive Committee in the summer. There was some discussion and the Chair said he would agendize it in the Spring and see what happens.

President Report – R. Armiñana

No report.

Question for President

A member asked the President if the Army ad was still on the Athletics website. The President did not know. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that the Athletics site would be under the purview of Student Affairs. The Senate Analyst went online and verified that commercial links were still present on the Athletics and Project Censored websites.

Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – C. Blackshire-Belay

C. Blackshire-Belay reported to the body that the list presented at the last Senate meeting was accurate. She explained the status of each person questioned at the Senate. M. Dreisbach retired, T. Ormond retired and B. Jersky resigned. If someone resigns instead of retires, they are not eligible for emeritus status under the campus policy. She discussed the confusion around T. Ormond and said that he had changed his mind at the last minute to retire instead of resign. She recommended that the Emeritus Policy needed to be revised. The President recounted the history of the Emeritus policy as he remembered it. A member asked about the status of

Student Services Professional Emeritus and why they are designated as such. The financial component of the decision to retire or resign was discussed.

FSSP (Faculty Subcommittee on Sponsored Programs) Report – K. Nielsen and J. Schulz

K. Nielsen introduced herself as the Chair of FSSP this year. She also introduced J. Schulz from the Office of Sponsored Programs. She said that at the end of last year, the committee was charged by the Provost and FSAC with creating a rubric for considering grant activity with low IDC. She said that they additionally met with the Vice President of Administration and Finance who wanted feedback on new thinking about distributing IDC on campus. In reporting back to FSAC, as they were charged to do, FSAC ask them to report to the Executive Committee.

She then spoke to the rubric idea and said that the committee declined to create such a rubric because they believed the problem was not that grants and proposals brought by faculty were not aligned with our mission. The problem appears to be a financial one and they did not want to make a decision on financial issues. They did understand that there is an issue with grants that come in with not enough IDC to cover the expenses of the grant. They had additional concerns about how the rubric was going to be applied, whom was going to apply it, etc. They thought it might make another roadblock to getting grants approved through the university system. They did agree that an evaluation could occur and thought that was appropriate at the Dean level. She then referred the body to FSSP's recommended guidelines for evaluation in the agenda packet. She also noted a detailed report on meetings with the Provost and Vice President of Administration and Finance regarding the distribution of IDC. She reviewed FSSP's responses to various proposals put forward by the administration in regard to specific distributions of IDC. Included in these discussions were the grants in the University Preparatory and Support Services; the actual cost of Administration and Finance, where residual IDC should go, and charge backs to grants and contracts for CMS and network infrastructure. She said they were grateful to have the opportunity to discuss the distribution of IDC. FSSP approves the recommendations put forward in the packet and views them as an interim strategy. They thought there needed to be more consultation across campus. There was also an idea for a faculty oversight board for grants and contracts which FSSP supports.

A member suggested that the interim strategies be widely communicated to the faculty and noted that in the guidelines nothing is noted about work in the community training teachers. K. Nielsen made note of the remarks and noted that the guidelines were not meant to be exhaustive.

A member questioned whether in the report the term "volume" should be replaced with total grant and contract wages, salaries and benefits. J. Schulz noted that it is only federally negotiated grants that only return IDC on wages, salaries and benefits. Other grants return IDC on the entire grant. The member asked the body to consider who is bearing the burden. The Provost said there are lots of cross subsidies in the grants and contracts area. He gave an example of how it works on a global basis. The member argued that the actual cost of a grant should be understood and the IDC should be distributed where the cost is. She also asked where the IDC gets distributed first. A technical discussion ensued about the issues

of the cost of grants for various entities on campus. There was continued discussion about how residual IDC would be distributed.

There was a question about the interim policy and where it would go now. The Vice President of Administration and Finance said that the Chancellor's office has given authority to campus CFO's to write a cost allocation plan for auxiliaries for the campuses. He went to FSSP for guidance and will now write the plan.

The Provost said he saw the guidelines from FSSP as recommendations to Academic Affairs. A member argued that a policy needed to be created as this issue affects faculty greatly.

Motion to have the FSSP report made at the Senate on Oct. 11th. Second.
Approved.

A motion was made to move "Units for the Past Chair" to item 3. Second. No objections.

Provost Report – E. Ochoa

No report.

Chair-Elect Report – S. Miller

S. Miller updated the body on Structure and Functions work on recommendations. He noted they had a vigorous discussion about faculty on the DSS committee. This year they will continue with the previous faculty (E. McHugh and B. Lesch-McCaffry) and next year open it up. He reported on other appointment recommendations in process.

EPC report – T. Stearns

T. Stearns reported that EPC is working on the Chico resolution regarding the CLA and could come to the Executive Committee with that on Oct. 4th. The Academic Calendar Guidelines may come back in October or early November. He is working with the subcommittees about what they are doing and hoped to bring a written report to the Executive Committee next time. A member asked how many program reviews were coming through EPC this year. T. Stearns said he thought there were about 10 coming in this year and 2 leftover from last year.

FSAC report – M. Hess

M. Hess reported that C. Blackshire-Belay came to their committee to discuss her preliminary understanding of new faculty grievances procedures. The deadline for comments for the RTP document has been extended to September 20th. There has been a request for the history of why FSAC is looking at the policy at all. They plan to take until October 4th to incorporate the comments and editing.

SAC report – K. Thompson

K. Thompson reported that SAC is revising the Student Grievance Procedures, the Cheating and Plagiarism policy and the Grade Appeal policy to bring them into line with new procedures for hearing complaints, using the Fairness Board that was passed by the Senate last year. **She noted that the current attachment of the Cheating and Plagiarism policy on the agenda was not correct and asked to have the item removed from the agenda.**

Units for the Past Chair – E. McDonald

E. McDonald asked if there were any units for the Past Chair available. The Senate Analyst said she had been able to verify one unit from the lecturers that would not be used. The Chair-Elect said his units for this semester would also be available. Guest Wilson remarked that the lecturers units should be kept for the lecturers even though he supported the Past Chair having release time. He argued that one unit per year for each lecturer is not working and would rather have the lecturers units reserved for the lecturers who need them. There was further discussion.

Motion for the Executive Committee to recommend to the Provost that the immediate past Chair receive one course release in the spring. Second. Approved.

Questions for Vice President for Administration and Finance

The Vice President was asked about the removal of the mailbox by Zinfandel Market. The Vice President said he would look into it.

Questions regarding S. Moulton election to Executive Committee – S. Miller

S. Miller introduced the issue of S. Moulton's status on the Senate when she was elected to the Executive Committee. At that time she was not officially a member of the Senate, but rather acting as APC chair. So the motion for her nomination was out of order. S. Miller apologized to S. Moulton for the miscommunication. He thought that on the basis of professional courtesy, he thought the issue could be deferred until other matters are finalized. He gave various ideas about how the issue could be resolved. There was discussion. The Chair offered to bring it up in his report at the Senate and defer action until the following Senate meeting.

S&F recommendations on APC At-Large rep and Schlereth Review Committee – S. Miller

S. Miller began with the recommendation for the Schlereth Review Committee. Jim Christmann is the recommendation to replace a faculty member who left the committee. For the APC one semester At-Large rep, S&F recommended Susan McKillop. **MSP**

RTP Question from FSAC – M. Hess

M. Hess said a question is coming up about the following in the RTP protocol: if it is the Department that is working closely with the faculty member on moving through to tenure, and if the Departments supports the RTP process for the candidate, why

can the Dean or School overrule tenure for a person? The Provost responded that it is an established practice to have multiple levels of review and to look at a candidate from different perspectives. The problem of the existing policy, is that we do not spell out clearly what standards and criteria are being applied. Thus, different standards and criteria could be used at different levels. He wanted FSAC to develop a policy that has explicit standards for performance that are discipline based, so everyone is on the same page at all levels of review. If there are any philosophical differences at the different levels of review, they can be hashed out over the criteria document instead of over the candidate. M. Hess said that it's the idea of the committee that the department either supports or rejects the candidate. The Provost said that if the standards and criteria are clear in the department, then the next level of review will be able to readily tell if they were applied correctly.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Tim Wandling

Correspondences

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes

Special Report: Accessible Technology Initiative – Brett Christie – T. C. 3:45

☛ On-going report: Update on WASC

BUSINESS

1. From S&F: By-laws revision, Duties of the Chairs – Second Reading – (bring your 8/30 packet for attachment) – S. Miller
2. Faculty Eligible for Emeritus Status – (bring your 8/30 packet for attachment)

(This agenda was approved with the proviso that the Chair could schedule any report that was available. The ATI report shown was the one able to be presented at that particular Senate meeting – lh)

Question from the Provost

The Provost asked about his suggestion that the Chair-Elect of faculty keeps a running tab of what's happening at the Senate. S. Miller said both himself and the Senate Analyst were looking into it.

Adjourned

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström