

Executive Committee Minutes

Sue Jameson Room 3:00 – 5:00

1/29/04

Present: Noel Byrne, Melanie Dreisbach, Catherine Nelson, Phil McGough, Robert McNamara, Brigitte Lahme, Rick Luttmann, Ruben Armiñana, Elizabeth Stanny, Elaine McDonald, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Eduardo Ochoa

Absent: Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

Guests: Lynn McIntyre, Steve Wilson, Tony Apolloni

(Operator error – the first 15 or so minutes of the meeting were lost on the tape. An outline of those minutes is provided.)

Agenda amended and approved.

Minutes of 12/11/03 approved.

Chair's report

President's report

Resolution supporting Proposition 55 – C. Nelson (*partial*)

L. McIntyre offered to give all the breakdown detail for the money K-12, JC, UC, etc. C. Nelson noted that the money is rolled out over two years. R. Luttmann questioned the figures used for need in the CSU. C. Nelson clarified that CPEC estimates that the state will need approximately \$1.5 billion for about seven years and what the bond initiative does is give us \$1.15 billion for two years. C. Nelson offered to include the monetary breakdown in the resolution. **There were no objections to sending the resolution forward to the Senate with these minor changes.**

Back to Reports

Provost Ochoa

Provost Ochoa gave a slightly elaborated update on the budget situation in Academic Affairs. The Governor's budget proposes cuts to the CSU budget that would amount to just about \$5 million for our campus. Given the combination of enrollment driven cuts and across the board cuts, the share of Academic Affairs is a mixture of both types of pro-rations, and it comes out to about \$3.4 million. That's the nut we have to crack, \$3.4 million and a 348 FTES reduction. We have a couple of different ways of looking at that in terms of our ability to absorb it. We did an exercise in the VPBAC of looking at the worst case scenario where we are forced to take every bit of that cut out of direct instruction. Part of this is directly related to the FTES reduction. Reducing classes to reduce enrollment by 348 FTES would net us about a million dollars in savings, \$994,000 was the figure using an SFR of 22.05. In

the more recent exercises we are doing, we are testing out using an SFR of 20.9. With 20.9 SFR it's slightly more than one million dollars we would save. Basically, about \$2.4 million remain. So we did an exercise estimating what it would look like if we took that all out of instruction. We found it raised the SFR by a few points and it lead to a reduction of temporary instructors of about 50 FTES and we observed that in Fall of '03 we had 148 FTES of temporary and FERP faculty, so it seemed that there was room for something like that even if we found limited alternatives to direct instruction for cuts, we could still do it. Since then and in the course of the conversation in the VPBAC, it was pointed out that the part time budget as a line item in Academic Affairs was far below the amount that it would take to hire 130, if we don't address the FERPs, but just the temporaries, 130 FTES at \$63,000 a year which is the average rate if you include benefits. So there was a discrepancy here depending on how you look at it - if you looked at from a line item dollar side or whether you look at it from actual positions. We have since hunted down the source of the apparent discrepancy and it has to do with the fact that for a variety of reasons we hire more temporary than we have a line item for. There were several sources for that. One is grant related replacement faculty, so the grant supplies the money for that. Another is positions that are funded directly out of Academic Affairs, that are tied to different activities. Another is difference in pay leaves. Another is the \$1.3 million patch which accounts for about 20 of those positions - that's not available anymore. Another is Schools that are literally hiring faculty out of other parts of their budget beyond what their part time budget line item budget has. Our sense is that we still have a cushion there, it's just not as big as we thought at first by looking at that 148 figure. We will be able to do it, but it's going to be tough. Not only will it raise SFR probably by 2 or 2.5, but also we may run into situations in individual departments where there's a mismatch because temporary faculty are not evenly distributed throughout programs, if you ratchet back by a certain percentage, you run into a wall sooner in some departments. That's something the Dean's are still working on to see where we are. We have quantified the parameters of what the FTES target for the Schools would be and what the dollar reduction would be and that information will be made available tomorrow to the Deans at our retreat and they will have to go back and work through their budgets and consult with their chairs to see how and if they can handle the cuts. We are looking at two polar extremes and we'll try to figure out some way to do it. One would be to take the remaining 2.4 million in cuts and take it all out of instruction or allocate it across the board throughout the division which would then be sizable 6 digit cuts for ESAS and the Library. We don't think they have the room to absorb those so we know that's the other end of the spectrum which we probably can't reach. Particularly given that we're trying to do this without laying off any permanent employees. The amount of temporary staff we have in Academic Affairs now is quite small. In view of all that, given these kinds of restraints, he will make a request from this committee.

Grants and Contracts Policy – E. Stanny

E. Stanny stated that Tony Apolloni was present and he brought the Grants and Contracts Policy to FSAC. FSAC reviewed it to the best of our abilities which might not be that great since this is not our field. She asked T. Apolloni to talk the committee through the Executive Summary.

T. Apolloni stated that this is an overarching policy that covers the “rules” regarding submitting and accepting proposals and implementing proposals on behalf of the university. It covers the general overarching policies. There are others such as Misconduct, Cost Share, in more detailed sorts of aspects, that are referred to in this policy. The basic underpinning of the policy in terms of the CSU system is Executive Order 168 which is now 890, a revision was issued in January. It was modified based on a series of audits the Chancellor’s office did a year or so ago. It lays out what shall be in place on the campus and then the other policy is Executive Order 753 which says the campuses’ grants and contract activity and all auxiliary activity shall be self-supportive. The policy we’ve crafted is in response to 890 and the cover memo from 890 says the President shall provide a report to the Chancellor’s office by July this coming year saying that all these policies are in place including the one we are talking about today. The one we are talking about today specifies that grants coming to campus, through PI’s are really grants to the campus, it specifies who should be in charge of administering grants, it specifies that there shall be indirect. It goes through all the details related to the approval of campus. When you boil that all down really what the Executive Order says and what this policy says is that the President is responsible to approve every proposal and to oversee this activity directly and the CFO is responsible for the financial aspects of it. Dr. Armiñana has delegated the approval ability to T. Apolloni. Larry Schlereth has delegated the approval of administration and finance to Steve Wilson. There is a routing process where it’s looked at by a variety of officials in Administration and Finance and on the Academic side by PI’s, Department Chairs, Dean, Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs within Academic Affairs. Every grant is different and there’s a lot of judgment calls that we look at approving a grant, but the most important things we look at are - is there cost share, is there adequate indirect to cover this grant and if there’s not adequate indirect in this grant to cover itself, is there enough indirect overall being generated by grants and contracts to allow us to accept this given that it has academic merit or merit on behalf of the university. Those are the real fundamental judgment calls, baseline economic calls we make because Executive Order 753 says this activity is supposed to be self-supporting. He offered to answer any questions. E. Stanny said FASC approved it unanimously and it went through the Sponsored Programs subcommittee and was approved there.

R. Luttmann asked if the committee had seen the updated version. T. Apolloni said no, that Professor Luttmann sent him some revisions the other day and he did make those revisions and sent them back to R. Luttmann. R. Luttmann said they were mostly minor things like tense, and “shalls” and “wills” and things like that and that T. Apolloni responded remarkably rapidly to his suggestions. He actually put something before R. Luttmann that incorporates a lot of those things. M. Dreisbach asked if the policy was in alignment with policies on other CSU campuses. T. Apolloni responded yes, and they did review policies on other campuses, but more importantly it is in line with the requirements of the Chancellor’s office. Many of the CSU’s will be changing their policies to come into alignment with the Executive Order. M. Dreisbach asked if the Executive Order stipulates the responsibility or is that a campus decision? T. Apolloni answered that the Executive Order does stipulate that. It says there shall be a program administrative authority. On many campuses, as you know, the Foundation is used to administer grants and contracts.

We're not unique, but we're among a very few that administer ours through the stateside operation. It has some big advantages doing it that way from his perspective. M. Dreisbach asked if in looking at other campuses, do they have the equivalent of a division of Administration and Finance taking responsibility for the grants? T. Apolloni answered yes, they do. On all campuses the division of Administration and Finance would have oversight responsibility, but on most campuses in the CSU grants and contracts are administered through the Foundation. Ourselves, SF State, CSU Channel Islands, San Marcos are the ones administering through stateside trust accounts. M. Dreisbach asked if it had been reviewed by the CSU attorney. T. Apolloni responded that this policy was submitted to the CSU attorney, so he assumes it was. R. Armiñana noted that the policy was created by a task force that had Presidents, people like Tony, faculty individuals, etc. and included the General Counsel.

P. McGough asked what was the meaning of "interim" here? Is this an interim policy that is going to become the policy? T. Apolloni responded it will become the policy once it has full review through shared governance and any revisions that are made. We felt it important since we didn't have many of the policies stateside that were essential to have in place to administer grants and contracts. So when this audit report came out about a year ago, it was real clear we had some gaps we needed to clean up, so we moved ahead awhile ago in collaboration with the Faculty Subcommittee on Sponsored Programs to give us faculty input to design some interim policies to put in place and now plan to bring each of them forward to the Senate for review and revision. His understanding is that it will be a recommendation to the President and the President will decide what goes in place.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked about the issue of indirect for very small grants. Historically, it is the case that the Humanities do not receive huge amounts of money. He was looking for a place that addressed the issue of smaller grants of \$10,000 or \$29,000 or \$30,000, how the university is going to address those. He didn't see it articulated in the policy. T. Apolloni answered that we have a policy that we should garner all the indirect that's possible from the funding source. Our position has been to get up the effective indirect rate overall because that's important to generate some revenue that can be returned back to academic programs. We have not turned down a proposal, in the last four years, because of lack of indirect. And our effective rate has gone up from about 8% up to 11% overall which allows us to have sufficient revenue to cover the full gamut of grants. Fortunately, on some we're up much higher, some we can't get any. But at this point we've balanced those. It's a matter of subsidizing one thing for another and that's what we do. It's important we do push to get all the indirect that's allowable under the grant so we do have enough revenue to be able cover them and return money back to the academic units because they have costs in their units administering grants as well. R. Coleman-Senghor stated that his point is that there are grants in the Humanities where it's specifically said there will be no indirect and you're not supposed to spend any money on indirect. He would want to see an element in the policy that acknowledges that condition so that those of us in the Humanities are not just hanging out there waiting for the beneficent gaze of T. Apolloni which he appreciates greatly. T. Apolloni referred him to the place in the policy where it talks about indirect, page 4, VII, Indirect Costs – it is the policy of SSU to apply the

maximum indirect cost rate allowable by the funding agency. At a minimum the project director is to apply the university's fully negotiated IDC rate which is based on a percentage of salaries, wages, and benefits or an establish percentage of the total direct project cost. It varies depending on the rate permitted by the funding source, so if they don't permit anything, it's zero, the importance of the project to the university and the university's determination of the cost of it administrating grants and contracts. There could conceivably come a time when we couldn't take a zero percent grant because we can't comply with Executive Order 753. It's our job in ORSP to help the faculty make sure we don't reach that point. That's why we will push to get indirect when it's allowable. He used to be on the other side of this and he would push back, but it's important that we get what's allowable. He pushed CIHS rates up from 8% to 12%. You have to push back with funding sources. We're in good shape in this regard. He doesn't see in the foreseeable future that we are going to turn a grant down because it doesn't have IDC. He thinks this language covers that.

R. McNamara asked if T. Apolloni will be at the Senate when the policy comes up. He thinks this issue of indirect cost is going to come up and perhaps there's some real misperception amongst faculty on this issue. C. Nelson asked that if there is some remedy to the policy that folks think should be made, please bring it to the Senate. E. Ochoa commented that the concerns R. Coleman-Senghor was addressing are reflected in the preamble to this policy and the purpose of grants and contracts, how grants and contracts contribute to the mission of the university and then a statement of encouragement for grants that move forward these goals. On the other hand, looking at it from the fiscal side he would be concerned if the proportion of grants we are applying for that have no indirect grows to the point where indirect cost recovery to the Schools and departments is reduced to a very low point. So it's a balancing act that you have to carry out in the context of the overall mission and objectives of the grants program. **P. McGough suggested that the title of the document stated *Proposed Grants and Contracts Policy*. No objection to sending the policy forward to the Senate with the corrections suggested by R. Luttmann.**

Return to questions for Provost Ochoa

P. McGough recalled that at the last Executive Committee meeting before the break the number mentioned was a reduction of 700 FTES, is that correct and why the change? E. Ochoa responded that was before the Governor's budget. R. Luttmann stated he attended the VPBAC on Tuesday and then he had an email exchange with E. Ochoa about it and shared the email with a number of other faculty and the main thing people are concerned about is the increase SFR. Both for selfish reasons, workload, but also from a professional point of view that we feel that the quality of the education we can deliver there is already is already substantially comprised by the increase in number of student we have to handle. 22 to 25.3, which is worst case scenario, would be a very significant increase. He referred to the proposal by the Chancellor that we no longer accept budget cuts to the extend that they influence quality, that we maintain quality and turn budget cuts into reduced student admissions. The fact that you've got a 5% reduction which will account for only \$1 million of the \$3.4 million in the budget, suggests that the reduction isn't enough. The feedback he's getting is that faculty feel very strongly that we should try to keep

the SFR from not increasing more than it has and to solve our problem by reducing our FTES in agreement with the Chancellor's policy. E. Ochoa responded that would be great if we had the money to do it. R. Luttmann said no, we've got a certain amount of money, what are we going to do with it. How many students are we going to try to teach with it is the real question. You run out of money you stop hiring faculty, there's no way around that. But he assumes he will find other ways to deal with the problem, get offline sources of money and so on. Having done all that the question is, then what? E. Ochoa said that one of the few things the Chancellor tells us and not asks us to do, is it gives us money and it gives us a target. We can do a lot of things, but we can't simply disregard a target and if they tell us a 5% cut, and you mentioned a 17% cut would be required to maintain the SFR with this budget. . R. Luttmann said if you have to take the entire \$3.4 million out of instruction that's what it would be. R. Armiñana said we are given a target and we live to that target. If we come short of that target, we lose the corresponding amount of money. If we were to reduce FTE by 17% the result would be the layoff of probationary faculty. We're always balancing competing interests. A higher SFR versus the layoff of probationary faculty. Even if we have the authority to do it, which we don't, that's the trade off. R. Luttmann stated he understood what R. Armiñana was saying, but how does a 5% reduction square with the Chancellor's recently stated philosophy that he's going to try to protect quality. R. Armiñana responded that it's called matters of degree, they are not absolutes. Some protection of quality – there are some people, especially in the Legislature including a member of the Trustees who believes strongly that you should take all the students, the 20,000 that we're saying we will not take, we should take them for the amount of budget we are given at a much higher increase than the one proposed in the SFR. Therefore, there are matters of degree. Does this preserve quality enough? Absolutely not and the Chancellor never meant that. He said *some* quality.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated that when there's a crisis very often when the institutional barriers go up, they need to be modified and loosened. He was crunching some numbers and figured out that if we had our personnel on the other side of the house, as you already do President Armiñana, teach one section, one section in their trained area or area of expertise, would keep the SFR somewhere in the range of 22 to 1 instead of 25 to 1. We have gone this way before, namely the personnel on the other side of the house have been involved in teaching. He suspects maybe we should go that way again. If we are in fact a kind of community, then this weight should not fall to one or one group of members of that community. R. Armiñana said we cannot force people to do that. He thought it should be available to every member who is capable and had the credentials to do that. We cannot force them. It is a very laudable thing to do. R. Coleman-Senghor said he was not naïve on that point, but at one time with a particular program you called upon, we called upon individuals to teach in classrooms in terms of the EMT program. These were people who were in effect administrative officers, who were technicians and they taught in EMT and still teach in EMT in many instances. He said he believed the Executive Officer within a particular range of reasonableness can require a great deal as you are requiring of this faculty that they consider a 25.3 load. R. Armiñana said it will have to be voluntary. What he has problems with is the silent belief that the burden of the budget reductions will fall only on one side of the house. The burdens of this budget reduction will fall on every single individual who works at

this institution. He doesn't think there is another side of the house, he thinks everybody is in the same house and it will be a poor house. If you are asking people in the community to do something either more or in addition and they are capable, willing and able to do it and the department would like them to do it, he thinks it is a wonderful thing and should be done. If the department of Chemistry has a major need and he would like to help, there is no way he can help the department of Chemistry, his knowledge and abilities and training in chemistry are very limited. It's a matter of meeting need, ability, etc. We cannot force it. The burden of these difficulties will fall on everybody. He has problems with "the other side of the house," he doesn't think there are that many sides to the house, it is a single house. That's what he has serious problems with.

S. Wilson stated he was very supportive of this idea because it can't be done in departments that are experiencing layoffs so it would involve solving layoff problems first. R. McNamara asked the President if he would consider putting a request out using his authority. He thinks it would have some weight. He thinks there are some talented people out there that could come forward, and then the departments can figure it out. We might be surprised who would come forward. He knows it is happening in his department and it is useful. R. Coleman-Senghor (addressing R. Armiñana) stated that it was his point that it is a whole house that addresses the needs of students and the livelihood of everyone who works here. He understands that. He's been in the business as long as R. Armiñana if not longer, so his sense is that he was not talking solely about a workload issue. He is never afraid of work. What he is talking about is that he has students that are not graduating, student running desperately around the halls figuring out how they are going to get a class. He understands that there is constraint here and we are talking both about the quality of the education and that's what he means by calling upon his colleagues from the other side of the house who have these capacities and abilities, not because they are working less, but because we need them to row the damn boat.

Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters policy referral – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach stated that the Structure and Functions subcommittee was looking at the role of Chair, Chair-Elect and now we're going to be looking at the role of Past Chair and revising the by-laws to bring what's in the printed word into agreement with reality. We revised so far the Chair-Elect and Chair's duties. Then we got to thinking we should look at other policies that are already written because part of the duties of the Chair-Elect is sitting on both the President's Budget Advisory committee (PBAC) and the Vice President's Budget Advisory Committee (VPBAC) and the Senate Budget committee. And the Chair was well sits on all these committees. But then when she was in the Senate office the other day, she and Laurel looked at the Faculty Consultation in Budgetary Matters policy which is recommended by the Academic Senate last issued in August of 1991. The membership of the PBAC and the VPBAC is different. It only includes the Chair on the PBAC and the Chair-Elect on the VPBAC and the Past Chair on neither committee. She wanted to bring it forward because she thought some committee should be looking at it and making a proposal for who should be sitting on which committee before Structure and Functions sends forward their revised duties. C. Nelson stated that she thought this policy was referred to the Senate Budget

committee last Spring and has not come back. We can ask what's happening. M. Dreisbach said Structure and Functions might have recommendations for the policy and C. Nelson asked her to send them to the Chair of the Senate Budget Committee, Andy Merrifield. R. Luttmann stated that he thought this was an important matter to deal with and was upset last year when he discovered there was such a discrepancy. There's no point in having written documents like that when we just ignore them. We really ought to do something soon. M. Dreisbach noted that the policy also contains positions that don't exist anymore, the Director of Fiscal Services, etc. C. Nelson said she would follow up with the Senate Budget Committee.

P. McGough asked why would the Senate Budget Committee decide what committees the Chair or Chair Elect should be on? C. Nelson responded that the Executive Committee referred the policy to the Senate Budget Committee last item for updating both in terms of consultation and in terms of membership. P. McGough noted that three or four years ago the Chief Academic Officer and the Chief Financial Officer were going to revisit the membership of the PBAC because there was a big discrepancy between what the document said and who actually was on it, but it seemed never to have happened. C. Nelson asked if the committee would like to see this pursued? **She said she would email the Chair of the Senate Budget committee, the Chief Academic Officer and the Chief Financial Officer.**

Senate assigned time – C. Nelson

C. Nelson introduced the item. She noted the Executive Committee makes a recommendation to the Senate on the distribution of the available reassignment time. She said that last year there was a temporary agreement with the Provost for a temporary reduction of 6 units and the Provost has indicated that he has a request to make of us in that regard. E. Ochoa said that this temporary request during the current year was predicated on the budget cuts that we faced this year. As you just heard from my report, we're facing another round of cuts in the coming year that is going to be twice as bad altogether. It's another 9.17% reduction in the university budget. Under these circumstances what he wanted to ask was not to reduce the assigned time by a larger amount, but to just extend this temporary reduction for another year given the even more dire budget situation that we're facing next year. C. Nelson noted that would maintain the current level of 48 assigned time units in to the '04-'05 academic year.

R. Luttmann stated that he felt very strongly that faculty governance needs to be looked at as a fixed cost. It's like having a President, whether you are small or large you have one. Faculty governance is something that is necessary for the functioning of an institution. He said he would resist very strongly the notion that faculty governance should share in some sort of across the board budget cut. The fact is that 6 units is enough to teach two sections, but that's a pretty small amount compared to the problem that we have. It's not going to solve the problem. It is going to make faculty governance weaker. His own view was unless we have someone who is willing to accept lower units for a job that we should ask for the original number of units that we had. He recalled to the body that the reduction this year came partially because R. Coleman was willing to donate 3 units and the other 3 units came from a

temporary vacancy in the Chair ship of Student Affairs. It was specifically agreed at the Senate that these were one time events. Unless someone is willing to come forward and volunteer, he thought the body should respectfully decline the request. R. McNamara said it seems to him that the amount is so small and for the significant message that's going to faculty as whole is not a good one particularly because there was so much discussion about the temporary. Of course, the budget has gotten worse and he didn't think anybody expected the budget was going to get better, but it was something that was agreed to do at that time. He was particularly concerned about the message it is going to give to newer faculty too and those that we're encouraging to get into faculty governance need this reassignment time. It does not encourage faculty to go into share governance. It is going to erode it. Little bang for the buck. It would create worse feelings and he would not support it. N. Byrne stated he agreed with R. Luttmann's contention that faculty governance should be a fixed cost. He sees much merit in the suggestion that people holding these positions could consider volunteering and it would parallel R. Armiñana's point about asking instead of requiring other people in the administration with appropriate expertise to teach. He stated he thought the same position holds with faculty governance that faculty shouldn't be required to serve without assigned time.

R. Coleman-Senghor wanted to give E. Ochoa the opportunity to speak about how we might govern without support. E. Ochoa said that if you look at other campuses in the CSU, some larger than ours, that operate with far less assigned time than we do, so clearly it can be done. R. Coleman-Senghor said he knows it can be done, but was more interested in how we might do it here on this campus. E. Ochoa responded that looking down the list of Chairs maybe some of these committees have lighter work loads than others, certainly Scholarship committee might have less work than EPC for example. There was a general comment among a number of the body that this was not the case. E. Ochoa said then maybe we need to look at how the Scholarship committee does it's work. Maybe some of that could be handled administratively perhaps, maybe there's some busy work that could be uploaded. The other thing fundamentally, is that he sees work on governance as part of the related duties. As a default, involvement in the governance of the institution should be part of the three units that full time faculty have. All things being equal giving more credit for involvement when assessing service by faculty at RTP time would be a way to direct more of those units towards this particular activity and thereby not requiring as much reassigning of time. R. Coleman-Senghor said that theoretically that is an interesting point to take, but factually what happens at this instance at our university's history, in certain departments we have very few senior faculty with the consequence that that senior faculty must serve on RTP committees, and must be engaged in the assessment and evaluation of part-timers. For instance, in the English department, he believed we have 30 part-timers and we have only 5 tenured faculty in that department. It is a requirement vis-à-vis the periodic review policy that only tenured faculty are to be engaged in the evaluation process. It is a requirement in terms of the RTP process that there has to be someone of a higher rank to review an individual who is coming up for promotion. Once you are on a committee you cannot serve at another level. Already two of our folks are tied up at other levels in terms of the RTP process. His point is that you (E. Ochoa) speaks about this as being part of their responsibility, they are carrying out that responsibility in many ways within the framework of just the department's

workload. That's where we are historically. We're in a change. Five years down the road this will radically change because we went through a hiring process where we had a hiring process where a group of people came in, but right now that is not the case. Then on the other hand we can't necessarily appeal to junior faculty to step into these roles of being chairs of many of these committees because they do not have that kind of historical background. When they do, they've been very courageous and they've been on the committee and active and the senior faculty have said we'll be there, we'll be on the committees in some way to assist you. The reality of it is that we're talking about a particular kind of personnel configuration and the work that people are doing – and this is not to even address the question of the increase of SFR for them in the classroom. E. Ochoa responded that two very straightforward approaches to this suggested themselves to him right away in terms of this constraint. One is that, there's a mechanism for tapping tenure faculty from outside a department from related fields if there are an insufficient numbers in the department. The other one is there is the question of whether in fact we have departments that are too small and whether some consolidation might not be advisable to try to make our departmental administrative operations more efficient. Long term those would be things to look at as well. R. Luttmann spoke to the 3 units E. Ochoa brought up that permanent faculty get. The fact is that members of the Senate who are not officers and members of committees that are not the Chair all serve in those capacities as part of that 3 units as well as all the other duties one has such as advising and going to department meetings and so on. The work involved in chairing these committees and the other duties that we are talking about are substantially beyond the equivalent of a 3 unit load. Nothing proves that more clearly than the problem we have getting people to be willing to serve in these positions. We have trouble as it is getting people to serve as Chairs of committees. That's a testimony that people are not being overpaid by the units we are giving. **R. Luttmann moved that we request the Provost to maintain our faculty governance units at 54. Second by E. McDonald and N. Byrne.**

N. Byrne stated his support for the motion. E. Ochoa shared with the committee how he would respond to the motion if it passes. He would take it under advisement and he would factor that in with all the other possible sources of cuts we are going to have to face in the Division and he would bring the lay of the land that he presented in the VPBAC, and he thought in that form it would become apparent what the tradeoffs are, concretely to going with or without a lower or higher amount of assigned time for governance. C. Nelson noted that the VPBAC does not meet for another three weeks and we need to get this information to the departments as quickly as possible because scheduling is starting now. Is it possible to do some kind of projection and get it to the Senate next week? E. Ochoa said it would be hard to respond to a request like this given how fluid the situation is. He doesn't know how difficult it will be for the schools to absorb some share of the cuts and depending on how much help they need in the Schools that will affect how much we have to cut in his office, the Library and ESAS. He doesn't really know how much flexibility he has. C. Nelson said if this motion passes and goes to the Senate with a recommendation for distribution for 54 units, are you then prepared to make the decision to cut and then inform us of that cut. Is that what you're telling us, you will cut this whether we like it or not? E. Ochoa responded he's was not saying that, but he won't be in a position to respond to the recommendation.

P. McGough said he would abstain on the motion and was disappointed in it. Given the struggles we may have next year and some very reasonable people hope that the bond will fail on the ballot and that the state will actually have to face the fact that it's not raising money to provide essential services and if the bond should fail we're just beginning to see the problems we'll have. It seems disappointing that there would be a disagreement over something like this, this early. R. McNamara thought that perhaps the body was complicating the issue with the motion. Our job here is to make a recommendation to the Senate for faculty governance as we do every year at this time. The Provost has made a request to us to consider. We don't really need a motion about that. We simply go forward with the faculty governance assigned time proposed from the Executive Committee for the 54 units if that's what we as a body decide goes forward. The Provost does what he wants with that. If we sent this forward with 54 units, we are telling the Provost, no we do not accept the recommendation. He was speaking against the motion. R. Coleman-Senghor spoke against the motion. Our business is to make a recommendation on the distribution of units that come to us as a faculty technically every year. We made a one year recommendation with respect to giving up 6 units. We are now going to make our decision based on 54 units and leave it to the VP to do as he so pleases, thereby not getting us in the business of voting up or down the question of whether we should take it or not take it. R. Luttmann said he made his motion on the assumption that Provost had presented us with a request and asked us to respond. There is another matter that we need to bring a recommendation to the Senate for how to dispose of whatever units we get. Therefore, **he offered an amendment to the motion that we add to it the clause that we recommend to the Senate the distribution of assigned time units for faculty governance based on the '02-'03 distribution.** There was some confusion among the members. R. Luttmann said the original motion was to respond to the Provost Ochoa's request by saying that we respectfully request that the allocation he gives to faculty governance be 54 units for next year. In deference to the concerns that have been expressed, he proposed another motion by adding a the clause that we recommend to the Senate - should we get the 54 units, it be distributed according to the table that we had last year. R. Coleman clarified that the original motion had not changed. R. Luttmann concurred. **Amendment seconded by E. McDonald.**

P. McGough stated he thought the original motion was a response to the Provost not to a request. R. Luttmann stated that he responded by requesting. R. McNamara supported the amendment and the item going forward. He felt it was complicated and a bit redundant, but for the sake of efficiency he wanted it to go forward. He did think it should be request, because the Provost has not been formal in his request, we're not responding to a written request. R. Coleman-Senghor stated that there was no written proposal before the body and one of the things we often do is when there is no written proposal, we don't act in terms of an action taken where we have a motion and we have action and recommendation for it. The other thing is we are not supposed to be debating these issues. The documents are not here. The motion and it's amendment are not in proper order with respect to that. E. Ochoa said he could live with the modified motion because he interprets it to mean that this body does not want to proactively make a smaller request than the customary one, but will make the usual request, the usual recommendation for distribution and cognizant of

the fact that future financial constraints may not make it possible for him to comply with the request, so that's fine.

Vote on amendment "we recommend to the Senate the distribution of assigned time units for faculty governance based on the '02-'03 distribution. "-- passed on voice vote

M. Dreisbach voiced her one real concern in reducing the units even in this time of crisis. She agrees with R. Luttmann that it should be looked at as a fixed cost and agreed with R. McNamara that we need to make these kinds of responsibilities doable for people. On the other hand she could see in sharing the weight of this crisis and would consider a reduction, but her fear is that it would become permanent and she thought that was a very real fear. She would be much against a permanent reduction in units, and thus she would have to be in favor of the motion on the floor. She said she knows the faculty that she's most familiar with in terms of workloads, people are stretched to the limit in terms of service commitments as well as other aspects of RTP and these are really extra duties to Chair committees. There's an exponentially greater commitment in chairing committees or serving as an officer in faculty governance. We really are stretched to the absolute limit. She had a faculty member in tears today in her office, feeling just stretched without doing any role in faculty governance and couldn't even conceive of doing it even for three units. For those reasons she wanted to voice her support for the motion. R. McNamara stated he thought we may be surprised by the generosity of our community. It is already being shown by the lecturer's fund. There are those volunteering to teach classes. He would like to put some faith in that. B. Lahme stated that as Chair of the Student Affairs committee she wanted to point out that last semester not much has happened. We have a plan for this semester, but last semester it was simply not possible. There were two of us, Nancy Cunningham and herself, together chairing the committee. Both of us with our normal load and additional responsibilities. Nancy is not at the university anymore. She went to Florida. So now we are one member short. We weren't able to put anything together with people taking their turn going to the Senate and the Executive committee, it was just not possible to have any plan and follow through with it. There are very important issues. We are starting on advising again as was requested by many people. We have worked on it, the Advising subcommittee has worked on it, we have a lot of information to share with the Provost when he comes to visit us. She's committed to doing something this year as Chair and perhaps next year. But without the assigned time it was not possible. N. Byrne thanked B. Lahme for her comments. He said it was not just a matter of working harder. There are finite number of minutes and hours and days in a week. There are limits. It's not just a matter of motivation, and willingness, or diligence or lack of laziness. He supported the motion. **M. Dreisbach called the question. There was no objection.**

Vote on the complete motion regarding recommendation for assigned time – passed on voice vote

Course Outline Policy and Draft Mission and Vision statement deferred to next meeting.

Appointment to University Documents committee – E. Stanny

E. Stanny stated that the University Documents committee needs one more member. This is a committee formed to review documents by RTP candidates who want to add after the deadline. She contacted Marty Ruddell and she agreed to serve and there's just one document. We have approved two other people at a previous meeting. **There was no objection to the appointment.**

R. Armiñana asked if E. Stanny would consider making the name of the committee a little clearer. He said until she explained it he was racking his brain. E. Stanny said it was in the RTP document. C. Nelson said perhaps FSAC could consider that.

From EPC: Biology MA to MS

E. McDonald stated that the Biology Department is proposing that their existing M.A. program be switched to an M.S. EPC understood it as a purely procedural matter. A little bit of this history – when they started the degree program they only had a B.A., so the M.A. seemed like a reasonable second step. Since then they have a B.S. and never got around to changing the M.A. to an M.S. until this point. Also since then their M.A. program has evolved into what sounds like a very rigorous program that on any other campus would be considered an M.S. The Graduate Studies committee approved it unanimously. EPC approved it unanimously and we even waived the first reading because it seemed so straight forward. She believes that Elaine Sundberg said that it was a change that did not go off campus for approval. It would be great for their students to have the M.S. instead of the M.A. **It was approved as a consent item for the Senate.**

Senate Agenda - approved

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes - 12/18/03 emailed

From EPC: Biology change of MA to MS.

Information Item: End-of-Year report for Graduate Studies subcommittee '02-'03;
Appointment of Marty Ruddell to University Documents Committee of URTP.

BUSINESS

1. From APC: Long Range Academic Plan – Second Reading – **Please bring your agenda from 12/4** for attachment – R. Coleman-Senghor T.C. 3:15
2. Senate assigned time for '04 -'05 – attachment T.C. 3:35

3. Resolutions regarding Lecturers: T. C. 4:00
 - a. From FSAC Resolution on Lecturer's on Senate Compensation – Second Reading - attachment – E. Stanny
 - b. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3.10 of By-Laws; Replacement of Lecturer Senators – First Reading – attachment – M. Dreisbach
 - c. From S&F: Amendment to Article III, Section 3 of By-Laws regarding election of Lecturer Senators - First Reading - attachment - M. Dreisbach
4. Resolution supporting Proposition 55 – First Reading – C. Nelson T. C. 4:30
5. Grants and Contracts Policy – First Reading – E. Stanny

Adjourned 5:00

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom