

## **Executive Committee Minutes**

February 27, 2003

**Present:** Noel Byrne, Rick Luttmann, Bob Karlsrud, Catherine Nelson, Robert McNamara, Bernie Goldstein, Karen Thompson, Elizabeth Stanny, Steve Wilson, Art Warmoth, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Ruben Armiñana, Susan McKillop

**Guests:** Helmut Wautischer, Birch Moonwomon, Marilyn Dudley-Flores

Meeting began 3:05

**Approval of the Agenda** - items added: EMT, Shared Governance, Lecturer's Council document - *Approved*

**Approval of Minutes** - *Approved*

**Correspondence Received:** None

### **REPORTS**

**Chair of the Faculty - (N. Byrne)**

No report

**President of the University - (R. Armiñana)**

No report

**Provost/Vice President (B. Goldstein)**

No report

**Statewide Senator - (S. McKillop)**

S. McKillop - I would like to mention that in the CRC, Larry asked me to take a question to APC about the new dorms. He wants to know what character they should have, freshman or above? ESAS has been asked for enrollments. What APC does may come to the Senate. If you have ideas, let APC know. There will be 650 beds and our decision is due to the Trustees the end of March.

B. Goldstein -I asked Kathryn Crabbe to project enrollments two and three years ahead. Her data suggests that the proportion of freshman and upper division students will be about the same as it is now unless we change some way of operation such as more outreach to upper division students.

A. Warmoth – Among other things under discussion is shifting our recruitment area and to recruit for majors that have excess capacity. It would not be the same recruitment strategy as now.

N. Byrne – I'd like to report that at the CRC last Friday, that in response to questions about growth Larry said we would continue growth at 4-5% per year. He said that after 4 years at this growth rate, we will reach our institutional capacity.

A. Warmoth - Do you have a sense of what he meant by institutional capacity?

B. Goldstein - It means we have a limit of 10,000 students.

R. Luttmann – That number is based on our classroom space. Salazar classrooms theoretically increases our capacity. I'm not sure we can get to 10,000 with that. It's a formula that says that if you have so much instructional space, you can have so many students.

A. Warmoth – It makes a huge difference whether the 4% growth is going to be first time freshman or transfer students. We are much better equipped to serve transfer students.

N. Byrne - I believe there will be attention to this.

S. McKillop – There are only three or four weeks for a decision.

B. Goldstein – This will be on the VPBAC agenda.

N. Byrne – Jackie Kegley and David Spence sent something about faculty participation in enrollment management. This might be something that goes below the level of the Deans.

B. Goldstein - The Dean's make their decision in consultation with department chairs

#### **Chair-Elect of the Senate - (C. Nelson)**

C. Nelson - Structure and Functions confirmed Adam Hill to the Faculty/Staff Housing committee. B. Goldstein asked for two faculty for the Space committee. A recommendation is going to him from Structure and Functions. The last day for nominations to the Senate is tomorrow. We vote from March 5-12<sup>th</sup>. The winners will be announced at the Executive Committee on the 13<sup>th</sup>. Directions about how to vote electronically are in mailboxes. Please encourage people to vote.

#### **Vice President, Admin. & Finance - (L. Furukawa-Schlereth)**

No report.

#### **Chairs, Standing Committees - (Coleman-Senghor, Warmoth, Stanny, Thompson)**

#### **EPC**

A. Warmoth – APC passed a resolution to establish a joint APC/EPC task force on very large classes. The task force will make policy recommendations. It has a first

reading in EPC and I anticipate it will pass EPC next Thursday. I suggest we put it on the Senate agenda as an information item. It doesn't require Senate action.

S. Wilson – What is the relationship between that resolution and the APC document you referred me to?

A. Warmoth - That is about strategic planning in times of crisis. It is on the APC website. The only thing going forward is the creation of a task force. Everything else is up for discussion in EPC.

B. Goldstein – Hot off the press, I have a systemwide report on the faculty flow, which includes hiring and a wide variety of things. I'll make sure copies are available. I'd like to bring your attention to one page which lists success rates by campus for '98 - '01 hiring. Our rate is 94%. The average is 72%. In that period, we were the number one campus. Why? Location is one reason. Another is the way candidates are treated by our faculty. We have a good orientation and the faculty do a really great job of the treatment they give to candidates. We came out on top on this one.

## **APC**

R. Coleman-Senghor - APC is trying to confirm what are the issues exactly and where the problems are. We will be bringing a document forward in three weeks to the Executive Committee to go on to the Senate for actions. It will be a report to the Senate and we will ask for suggestions. Concerning the issue raised by Art about the question of recruiting. What are we recruiting for? Will general recruiting meet our needs at this time? We want to develop a growth management policy that reflects these kinds of issues - where to grow, how to grow and a collective agreement about where the institution is going. The first WASC draft has passed through the eyes of APC and will come to this body. If the final report does not reflect APC's views and concerns, we will file a separate report. We are struggling with the Long Range Academic Plan, but you will have it in your hands at the next meeting. New topics have arisen during this crisis that shows us areas where we have not thought about things thoroughly enough. We had our first look at the BS in engineering. When we bring it to EPC they will find we did a thorough job of looking at the program. Our concerns are not pedagogical nor the program itself. Our issue is whether it fits within a Liberal Arts context and is suitable. Is it the right time to bring in this program? That will be decided by other bodies. Initiatives and programs should have budgetary information included. We want to align program change with fiscal concerns. The proposal is coming from the School with plenty of support behind it.

## **FSAC**

E. Stanny - There's difficulty in FSAC to find people to serve. There's less flexibility in scheduling due to the need for large classrooms. The Academic Freedom committee referred the non-discrimination policy back to us. We reviewed it today.

## **SAC**

K. Thompson - There is a referendum in the STAR about the IRA increase for students which will be \$65 starting in the Fall. It was brought through the Fee Advisory committee. The voting on it will take place with the AS elections March 25-26. The fee includes athletics, performing arts, the library and children's school. The proportions for each area are in the STAR.

## **BUSINESS**

### **SHARED GOVERNANCE**

N. Byrne introduce the topic about the reassigned time associated with faculty governance. A meeting is set for Monday, March 3<sup>rd</sup> at 4:00 with B. Goldstein, N. Byrne, R. Luttmann, C. Nelson and A. Merrifield. He stated there is a necessity to resolve the issue by next week.

B. Goldstein expressed his desire to take time to debate and discuss the topic. N. Byrne pointed out the usefulness of discussing it in the Executive committee as all the standing committee chairs are present. B. Goldstein asked for input on the possibility of reducing the 54 units of assigned time. He stated that the largest non-instructional support of Academic Affairs is the 54 units for faculty governance. He noted it is painful to talk about reductions, but that faculty governance is not direct instruction. He asked for advice on how to reduce it.

R. Luttmann argued that the faculty need to be very careful how they respond to the budget crisis. He suggested that the faculty make sure the pain we experience with the budget cuts is visible outside the university or we will be suffering anonymously. If the faculty don't get credit for their efforts, it will make the CSU's political situation more difficult. The CSU is already under criticism from the community colleges and other state institutions - that we are being cut too little. If the faculty volunteer to work more for less, it is not visible. He argued that giving up any faculty governance assigned time is ceding authority to the administration and that having less units for governance meant working for free. He noted that the alternatives were not pleasant. For example, teaching more large classes might not feel good pedagogically, but it's more visible from the outside. If the SFR is raised, we can point to that as something we've experienced. But if we say yes, we will teach more students, we are also working for free.

C. Nelson asked B. Goldstein if a decision had been made to cut the units. B. Goldstein replied no. C. Nelson asked what percentage he might be considering. B. Goldstein responded that the Schools are being cut 5-6% and noted that those were direct instructional units. Since faculty governance is non-instructional, it could take a bigger hit, such as 10% or more. He stated he hadn't decided, but thinks that direct instruction should get the least reduction. C. Nelson reminded the body that the units for governance are set up on three-unit blocks which would be hard to divide up. S. Wilson confirmed that such a cut would take away 3-6 units. It was also clarified that the Monday meeting will take place in the Provost Conference room.

A. Warmoth strongly endorsed R. Luttmann's statement and expanded on it. He noted that in this situation the magnitude of the cuts, if responded to in a responsible way, would create more work for faculty governance, not less. He stated that if the faculty hoped to respond in ways that were visible and responsible, it will require vigorous exercise of faculty collective intelligence now and in the coming year. While hating to see cut backs, planning is needed for such an utterly ghastly situation. It needs to be done in such a way that it has a minor impact on majors. He argued for being creative in other areas such as the freshman year programs. He also argued that to cut back on assigned time would aggrieve the part-timers more, not less.

R. Karlsrud noted that the dollar amount of cuts being discussed is about \$75,000 which is not a lot of money. To take away whatever time faculty have to administrate important operations while at the same time looking at climbing SFR seems silly. Wiping it all out is not a politically sensible thing to do. A. Warmoth noted that it would be a blow to faculty morale and that governance will be asked to do a lot more in the future.

R. Coleman-Senghor agreed with R. Luttmann and stated that A. Warmoth made a salient point about workload. He reported that in his department they have already been asked to give up assigned time. If faculty governance units are reduced there will be no place the faculty can go to retreat from the classroom. He argued there is relatively little savings compared to enormous savings elsewhere.

R. McNamara stated he didn't think it was right to assume faculty governance doesn't have an impact on teaching. He asked how could someone take one of these positions, function as an effective chair and carry a larger teaching load? He argued there would be less faculty governance as he can't imagine anyone running for Chair-Elect and not having assigned time. It diminishes faculty governance for hardly any dollars. He asked B. Goldstein to reconsider. He noted cutting faculty governance was not much bang for the buck and the political impact would be severe.

S. McKillop stated that as a Statewide Senator she has known the Provost in many faculty governance positions and that she knows he is doing everything he can to save faculty governance.

K. Thompson noted diversity in governance is important in terms of junior and senior faculty. Reducing units for faculty governance might be more difficult for junior faculty and they would become more discouraged.

N. Byrne agreed with all points R. Luttmann had made and stated he felt the more significant matter was the whole principle of shared governance. The damage resulting from reductions in faculty governance assigned time was really to the principle of shared governance. He agreed with K. Thompson and noted that new faculty are very important to shared governance and their participation should be encouraged. They also face the heaviest workloads and are paid less. He reiterated the point that the savings are small compared to the damage in regard to shared governance matters.

R. Coleman-Senghor noted that when he asked APC to elect a new chair everyone ducked. He said it would be more beneficial for him not to chair APC next year and that his department will be fundamentally paying for his chairing of APC.

N. Byrne stated that the discussion had served its purpose and that anyone was welcome to come to the meeting.

B. Goldstein stated he hadn't made up his mind yet and that there are more things to consider. He found it compelling to engage new faculty in governance as that is what makes universities tick.

R. Coleman-Senghor argued that we need to look at how many "man" hours are put in on the other side of the house. What is the number of hours at cost per person to run the university? He noted that most faculty put in 50-60 hours each week.

S. Wilson asked if the amount of money makes a difference? If it doesn't, it's punitive. R. Karlsrud stated he trusted B. Goldstein to protect shared governance. But also noted that B. Goldstein is not going to be here. It would also be establishing a precedent, a bad precedent.

## **EDUCATIONAL MENTORING TEAMS**

N. Byrne noted that he is not an enemy of EMT and was part of it the first two years. However, due to recent troubled times, perhaps EMT could be put in abeyance for one or two years since the expense of \$200,000.00 has shifted to Academic Affairs. That would make a great contribution to lower division students for an array of reasons - the difficulty of getting GE courses, the size of GE courses and the impact of size on retention. He noted this was a dispassionate conclusion on his part and he had decided not to write resolution, but felt it requires discussion. It was clarified that the matter does not have a document to go to the Senate, but was just here at the Executive committee for discussion. N. Byrne also noted that the Budget committee had made recommendations regarding EMT which followed his comments closely. C. Nelson stated that the recommendation has not been formalized.

R. Luttmann noted he has never been involved with EMT directly, but knows it is controversial. Clearly we are spending money that could be spent on other things and we have to ask serious questions. Are we better off spending more on GE sections to have more flexibility and smaller classes than this program? The composition of entering students is also critical to the discussion. First time freshman are expensive. Can something be done to return back to a balance with upper division students? There is also the question about financing. He noted that EMT used to be paid out of Housing, but L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that would not stand an audit. Is that true for 100% of the financing? EMT has academics and a lot of other things too that would be appropriate to be paid out of housing. If 100% of the funding has been sent to Academic Affairs, why?

B. Goldstein responded that \$200,000.00 of the cost was transferred to Academic Affairs which he believes is the total. He noted that K. Crabbe is responding to the criticism of the program by developing a proposal that will keep the number of

sections constant, use consistent dollars, reduce the units from 6 to 4 and reduce the number of units of each section. She also wants to increase the rigor of the academic portion. In our GE conversations more integration and rigor have been discussed. He reported that the President is clear that the EMT program should be maintained as it is important to retention and graduation rates. B. Goldstein admitted there is some controversy about the affect of EMT on these areas.

S. Wilson expressed concern that if EMT is discontinued the \$200,000.00 will vanish and lecturer jobs will be lost. B. Goldstein answered that the money would be kept for instruction.

E. Stanny asked how much had retention or graduation increased since EMT or in other words, what is the return on the investment? B. Goldstein said the R. Bruce is putting together an assessment of this.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated that R. Bruce has not been able to configure the data for retention and graduation as there are so many variables. It is difficult to attribute any specifics to EMT. He argued for separating out administration leadership mishandling and the value of the program. Still there are a lot of questions that need to be answered. The program needs to be positioned so that we can evaluated it. Then we can do a cost/benefit analysis. Also there is no competing alternative to show what happens to students who do EMT, who do X or do nothing. Effectiveness of program is a failure of the faculty. We have failed collectively with advising in terms of the handoff problem. That's still here. How are we going to address that? The faculty need to understand that the faculty can say no and on the basis of academics go back in. He stated he has looked at 100 first year program all across the U.S. Only about 20% give two or three units for EMT-like courses, all of them give cr/nc. A lot are not taught by full-time faculty, but by SSP's or peer mentors. If you look you can find numerous models. But here the faculty are not currently controlling the curriculum of EMT.

A. Warmoth concurred that clear evaluation data is needed. He asked how much of the expense is paying academic faculty and how much Student Affairs faculty? B. Goldstein stated that he has asked for that data many times, but only knows Academic Affairs picks up \$200,000.00.

There was a discussion of the payment of SSPs and questions regarding EMT as a good use of their time. It was noted that the difference between the fantasy and reality of EMT is not clear. What are the absolute number of dollars, how many students are served and whether that is expensive or not was asked. It was noted that a true task force would include the GE subcommittee and it could make recommendations regarding integrating EMT and GE. B. Goldstein hoped that the money issues would not hold the faculty back in terms of the rigor of the program. He stated that learning from others about what is efficient is helpful and if EMT can be integrated with GE, all the better.

R. Luttmann noted that an SSP had told him that teaching EMT was part of his work day and argued that EMT sounds more expensive than \$200,000.00 if all is taken in to consideration. He also noted that EMT is voluntary and noted that it is hard to know whether the effects seen are due to EMT or self-selection.

M. Dudley-Flores stated that the EMT Steering committee believes that its \$200,000.00 generates \$1,000,000.00 for the university. A. Warmoth asked how this works. B. Goldstein answered that it is measured by FTES. If class sizes were increased even more FTES would be generated. A. Warmoth responded that the freshman year experience needs to operate with low SFR whether it is EMT or something else. It may be correct that freshman are more expensive, but they have social/emotional needs as well as academic needs. He argued that we need to adjust the ratio of lower division to upper division students where we have excess capacity.

R. Karlsrud stated he was always supportive of EMT and that faculty generally came away from it with a positive view. He noted it does cost more than \$200,000.00 as the Schools augment the cost. Currently, the History department is looking at 11-12 sections for the 200 series for freshmen and sophomores with 89-90 students per class. In large classes instructors can't talk to each student like EMT does. Even if all the dollars were dumped on the Schools the SFR would only go down to 60 per class. The students still need the skill building EMT brought them.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated he opposed any procedure to suspend EMT until EPC and faculty look at it. Both EMT and GE do not meet our needs as currently constructed. There is not enough integration. We've already lost our library research course. In some institutions orientation and academics are not separate, but joined by the idea of showing people the life of the mind. The faculty need to name academics as our duty. Currently EMT is not in the purview of faculty, so EPC cannot say this will not do.

C. Nelson suggested a time limit on this topic.

A. Warmoth stated that it is important the budget be restructured so that lecturers attributed to the EMT program are not seen as something make the Deans think they are losing money they didn't have. We need to fix the freshman year integration. The fix is not to toss EMT overboard. We have faculty governance mechanisms in place to deal with this.

N. Byrne stated that no one is suggesting throwing EMT overboard.

## **LECTURER'S COUNCIL CALL DOCUMENT**

H. Wautischer stated the document was being presented at the Executive Committee for symbolic support before it goes to the Senate. It is a call for solidarity and leadership. It is not exclusive to lecturer issues as such, but is a call for the inclusion of everyone in an institutional environment with academic leadership that is responsive to faculty and offers principles for authority. Leadership would not engage in dialog that opens the door for hierarchy to take over. Each and everyone in this room is concerned with the current situation. He argued that what is happening is simply messages coming down the hierarchy - Governor to Ruben, Larry to Bernie, Bernie to Deans, Deans to Chairs, faculty and lecturers. Where



should we turn to engage in dialogue? Once we allow the debate to be limited, it will set up an environment where we as faculty have no control at all.

N Byrne asked for clarification of the nature of the document. S. Wilson answered that the Executive committee could consider what committees to bring it too or if it is appropriate to bring to the Senate.

C. Nelson noted that the section of the document asking for maintaining course sections seems disingenuous. In Social Sciences we've flat out said 50 or so sections are cut. I don't want to stamp what I've participated in undermining. What are we going to do with this?

A. Warmoth said it is a call for vigorous debate. It could be referred to SBC, EPC or APC. His opinion was to send it to all three and invite lecturers to participate. Or we can refer it to S&F to pass out.

H. Wautischer stated we are open to debate and welcome information that would strengthen the document. One motivation is to protect our positions, but there is a larger picture. By going forward with course cuts not questioned we are already surrendering to a situation. If we have a responsibility as educators, we must question it. It is very different if I have 40 or 60 in my class.

B. Moonwomon drew attention to the sentence in the document "In order to assume the responsibility of faculty to be the principle authority of the academic institution." She argued that if someone else controls the purse strings, do we have to simply rollover and take it? She pointed out facts: lecturers are more than half of the faculty on campus. If half of the faculty are laid off, 83 tenure track position would be needed to absorb the teaching load. There are also intolerable teaching and working conditions. We are increasing class size under duress. Does anybody in the room work 40 hours a week? If you have to add 10 more, how will you do that? This is an alarm call.

R. Luttmann thanked the lecturers for bringing this to the body. **He moved to refer the Lecturer's call document to the Senate Budget Committee, the Academic Planning Committee and Educational Policies Committee and to include it in the Senate packet with an explanatory memo from the Chair.**

## **Second**

R. Coleman-Senghor stated he had nothing against people being informed and argued against sending it to the committees.

R. Karlsrud argued for sending it to SBC and noted that this crisis is very different from past budget problems. If we can't go forward, make the cuts and make target, it will be devastating. He also argued for moving forward with the administration in a collegial manner to see if we can live through this together.

R. Armiñana gave a footnote to what R. Karlsrud said. On issue of the reduction of searches CFA has initiated an Unfair Labor Practice which will aggrieve the lecturers further.

A. Warmoth agreed with R. Coleman-Senghor .

H. Wautischer stated that leaders require courage. He was sorry to disagree, but a class of 10 was not as good as a class of 50.

C. Nelson called the question.

**Vote on Motion to refer the Lecturer's call document to the Senate Budget Committee, the Academic Planning Committee and Educational Policies Committee and to include it in the Senate packet with an explanatory memo from the Chair - Yes = 10; no = 0; Abstentions = 2 - *Passed***

## **SENATE AGENDA**

### **BUSINESS**

1. Resolution: Constitutional Amendment regarding Lecturer Senator Term -2<sup>nd</sup> *reading* - C. Nelson - attachment - TC 3:45
2. Statement on Mission, Goals, and Objectives of General Education at SSU - 2<sup>nd</sup> *reading* - A. Warmoth - attachment TC 4:00

### **INFORMATION ITEMS**

1. Information Item from APC & EPC: Resolution on Very Large Enrollment Classes - R. Coleman-Senghor & Art Warmoth - attachment
2. Information Item: Lecturer's Call document with memo from Chair, N. Byrne - attachment

The following were deferred to the next Executive Committee meeting:

Appointment of Jean B. Chan and Leilani Nishime to Excellence in Teaching Award committee

Discussion of further acknowledgement of winners of Excellence in Teaching Award, i.e. special presentation at Senate meeting, or ?

Discussion of one winner of Excellence in Teaching Award speaking at Emeritus Dinner of following Fall.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

*respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*