

## **Executive Committee Minutes**

October 9, 2003

Sue Jameson Room

3:00-5:00

**Present:** Catherine Nelson, Melanie Dreisbach, Noel Byrne, Elizabeth Stanny, Ruben Armiñana, Doug Jordan, Phil McGough, Rick Luttmann, Elaine McDonald, Robert Coleman-Senghor

**Absent:** Robert McNamara, Eduardo Ochoa, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

### **Approval of the Agenda – MSP**

### **Approval of Minutes - MSP**

Correspondence Received combined with Chair's report.

## **REPORTS**

### **Chair of the Faculty - (C. Nelson)**

C. Nelson reported that the Provost has indicated to her that he wants to use APC as the primary vehicle for faculty input into the Multiple Disciplinary teaching facility report process and she said she's sent an email to R. Coleman-Senghor and asked him to stay in touch. She has received a lot of memos concerning several initiatives going on system wide that she thinks our faculty need to respond to and participate in. She has sent these to the Chairs of APC and EPC. They involve CSU system wide efforts in the areas of enrollment management, facilitating transfers, degree completion and articulation, which is the establishment of core classes that can be transferred from community colleges to the CSU. There are four specific initiatives she has asked them to stay on top of. One is a recommendation for an ad hoc steering committee on student success which was appointed to coordinate efforts to create a campus team tailored to existing campus efforts and governance structures that enjoys among others the participation of department chairs to coordinate the campus planning and implementation of transfer and degree completion issues. C. Nelson stated she presumes that team should be set up under the Provost, but to her knowledge, that has not been done. Another is a campus plan due to David Spence's office, he's the CSU VP for Academic Affairs, regarding improving degree completion and that is due in his office by November 14<sup>th</sup>. There's an early December conference at the Radisson Hotel in LA about facilitating transfer and degree completion and there's also a conference at the end of January on Intersegmental Major Preparation for Articulated Curriculum which is this community courses transferring into the CSU. She went down to the All Chair's meeting last week. There wasn't anything brand new that she learned other than the system's emphasis on enrollment management as a way to deal with the budget crisis. Bob Cherny mentioned that the State Assembly's committee on higher education is holding a series of hearings on alternatives for funding higher education some of which sound pretty scary. There's one called "earn, learn and return" where education is completely funded by the state, but you get a bill on

your income tax to pay the state back. There's a voucher system similar to one being used in Colorado and he did not go into any detail on that one. The English Model, where funding is based on the number of students who graduate in the system, not those enrolled and that sounds scarier still. He also talked about how the legislature is interested in this articulation process and as a result of that the CSU is trying to develop a plan to avert more legislative (*unintelligible*). Part of that may be a common lower division core for all majors. This is one of the reasons she stated she thought our EPC and APC need to stay on top of this. There was some discussion with Marshall Cates, who's Chair of the Statewide Senate's K-12 committee about trying to identify transfer units for credential students, multiple subject right now. And identifying 60 units of transferable course work and then whether or not that would be ok for single subject credential students and then the next step would be is that model appropriate for all majors. That step has not happened yet, but there is preparation for it. That's what the January conference is about. A little bit more information about the conference at the end of September, Richard West, who is executive Vice Chancellor and CFO of the CSU talked about the Supplemental Budget Language, he said that the Supplemental Budget language is guidance, not obligatory. It is outcomes based, it is not governing transactions on campuses as CFA would like to argue, that's the Chancellor's office's perspective. He also talked about enrollment management being use to meet the budget crisis. And Ted Anagnoson who's Chair of CSU LA, said he was "glad the CSU was giving the legislature the message, no more money, no more access. But that this message does not include the point that more students, no more money exploits faculty." West also stated that messages have come from the legislature both to the Chancellor's office and CFA that greater agreement between the two would put the CSU in greater stead in the legislature's eyes and he argued that shared governance is based on collegiality, while working conditions issues are adversarial and they both tend to get mixed up in the political process. There is another conference going on which she will pass along to Paul Draper of the GE subcommittee, in March on General Education Assessment.

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

R. Armiñana reported that obviously transition documents are being prepared dealing with the new administration. We don't know yet who will be that. The Governor elect is going to be announcing some of his transition people as we speak. Our indication is that many of the people who will be engaged will be people who have experience in State governance because they will be the people who were in the previous administration of Pete Wilson. He thinks Governor Wilson himself will play a significant role. He said some of you may disagree, but he stated he thought Wilson is highly sympathetic to the CSU and understands it. He also sees some of the people we are involved with will have an impact on the new administration. Of immediate impact he thinks there were four Trustees that were nominated in the last two months by Governor Davis who were not confirmed by the Senate whose appointments will be rescinded. Therefore the new Governor will name new replacements. It's too soon to tell what's going to happen. We are still under the legislative mandate in terms of access and compensation not to increase next year. That could change under the new administration. We will see those things developing in the months to come. N. Byrne asked if he understood correctly that

the last four Trustee nominees might or will be rescinded. R. Armiñana responded he was sure, if history repeats itself, they will be rescinded. It has happened before. When Davis took office there were two or three Trustees nominated, but not confirmed and they were rescinded. It's a normal course of action, it's not unusual, unless the Governor decides to do otherwise. P. McGough asked about the Green Music Center. R. Armiñana responded we are one million dollars short. Clearly we are actively pursuing that million dollars and he is confident that between now and the end of the year that million will be committed. We will go and bid the project again by early March. We have made some changes which will save about 4.5 million dollars without touching the hall. Some of the changes are improvements. For example, there was a wall that everybody thought everybody else wanted and at the end nobody wanted, we thought it was required by the fire marshal, etc. Now the wall is removed and saves close to \$400,000 and improves the space. We will go to the Board of Trustees with the financial plan at the May meeting and hopefully start construction by late June, then it's a two year construction program. P. McGough offered his congratulations in this economic climate. To move forward is exciting. R. Armiñana said we have 38 of 39 million. R. Coleman-Senghor asked about the second phase having a bond and asked R. Armiñana if he said the passage of 53 would facilitate that? R. Armiñana said the passage of 53 would hinder that. There will be a bond measure for education on the March ballot, K through University. Out of that bond issue, the CSU will get about \$600,000,000 in two phases. On 53, if anything, he said he made the comment that if we keep committing the state's budget to specific purposes, we might as well figure a way to commit 100% of the budget so not to have a budget, a legislature, a governor, just submit a bill against your percentage of that and you know what you're going to get from now on. We are now at 85% of the budget mandated.

## **BUSINESS**

### **Renaming Schools to Colleges – P. McGough**

P. McGough said he was asked by David Walls to asked this committee if it would refer the Structure and Functions the question of changing the Schools names to Colleges. About four years ago David asked him to bring this up. He maintains that when you're a college your subdivision is schools and when you're a university your subdivision is colleges, so when Sonoma State College went to Sonoma State University it would have been consistent to rename the schools to colleges and he thinks we should do this. He asked me what happened four years ago and P. McGough stated he didn't remember. The only issue is to we want to send this to Structure and Functions for consideration. M. Dreisbach stated Structure and Functions could look into it, but that it was not a given that universities have colleges. She outlined what the committee might consider. E. Stanny stated she thought in theory he might be correct, but in practice he isn't because every university she can think of has schools and not colleges. N. Byrne said ditto. R. Armiñana stated his recollection of four years ago was that the same discussion didn't raise any excitement. No one thought it was important. He further offered there is no obstacle to changing from a financial point of view. R. Coleman-Senghor asked why this would go to Structure and Functions in light of the fact that where in the authority lies the change of a name of a School. He argued that the same issue

would be involved in changes in the structural change between parts of the institution. It might be a recommendation from Structure and Functions directed to the administration. He thought that the policy needed to be reviewed as the authority for such changes is not clear, although ultimately it would need to be signed off by the President. R. Armiñana stated some of that was visited with the School of Science and Technology name change. If you change the name to a given name, i.e. the Phil McGough School of Business, that requires Trustee approval and they have a policy for that and it has to be for a major contribution. The difference from going from School to College is more a technical change. M. Dreisbach noted that D. Walls had also contacted her about this recently and one thing he did say that made the most sense to me was that we have the Hutchins School and that would put the Hutchins School in a better relationship to the colleges. But that was the only positive she could see. She argued that School seemed very fitting due the small size of SSU. P. McGough said he will tell D. Walls that it fizzled. **R. Coleman-Senghor moved to refer the question of determining the policy regarding naming of schools or changing schools to colleges to Structure and Functions. E. McDonald second.** N. Byrne argued against the motion. He argued it seemed like make work. R. Coleman-Senghor responded that it may be more pressing than we think. With strategic planning discussion and possible restructuring, it may be better to anticipate policy than react. He understood the notion of make work, but it would clear the way, during this time of radical institutional change, to be positioned to have thought this through rather than rushing it through. P. McGough noted that when Extended Education became a school it went to EPC. **Vote on referring – motion died for lack of majority vote.**

#### **Emeritus Status for Kay Trimberger - attachment**

C. Nelson introduced the item. She noted emails in the packet between herself and Bill Houghton regarding this issue. Kay Trimberger notified Faculty Affairs that she is resigning from the Faculty Early Retirement Program and her last semester of teaching was Spring 2003 and she is requesting consideration for emeritus status. The normal cycle would be that she would be on the list for our consideration for Fall 2004. It is here for the body's consideration. R. Luttmann stated he did not see any compelling reason to make an exception and thought it would open up a can of worms. R. Coleman-Senghor stated he did not see why there would be any argument at all. She's been teaching for a number of years and is no longer teaching. If she's no longer teaching, she is in effect emeritus, is she not? C. Nelson responded that technically the Senate has to recommend the status to the administration. R. Coleman-Senghor asked has she been delinquent in announcing it to us? Then the question becomes do the other emeriti announce to us or do we go out and find the list. Do all mid-term retirees fall out of this? R. Armiñana stated Kay's intention was to teach under the FERP program in the Spring semesters. In the last few weeks she has decided she does not want to continue, so she has properly asked to be relieved of the FERP as she has the right to do. He stated he believed the FERP policy does say that the faculty member has to request emeritus status. That's the history of why she's doing now and not sooner. R. Coleman-Senghor asked if he thought she had done it in a timely manner. R. Armiñana responded yes, she has the right to do it anytime before she is back to her teaching assignment. He thinks there will be more of this in the FERP program where people will change their minds. The FERP policy

allows for that flexibility. N. Byrne was in agreement with the idea of why not. He asked R. Luttmann for clarification for his statement that it would open a can of worms. R. Luttmann responded that people could wind up leaving FERP anytime and does that mean we're supposed to pass a resolution to the Senate and on to the President, it could be happening every month. Traditionally, we've done this once year. People who have retired independently of FERP at the end of the Fall term, we haven't made them emeritus right away, we waited until the next year. He stated given that it is an honorary status anyway, once a year is sufficient. E. McDonald stated she was interested in what kind of numbers were being talked about. If it's once a month, that would seem to be a burden on the Senate, but if it's just special cases that seems timely. . . R. Armiñana stated it is never a stable number. The policy question seems to be do you do this once a year or twice a year. Because people usually pull out of FERP a semester ahead of when they are to serve. P. McGough stated he thought the average number of FERP years is three. He agreed with R. Luttmann that it's a policy thing. If we are going to do this, we should say we'll have a list twice a year. But he didn't recommend doing it on an ad hoc basis. R. Coleman-Senghor suggested that people announce by October 15<sup>th</sup> their request for emeritus status for a mid term list and that we change our policy in response to new conditions. **C. Nelson suggested to refer the item to FSAC and come back to the next meeting with a recommendation for a policy change on the emeritus status list to the Senate from an annual report to a semi-annual report. P. McGough suggested FSAC consult with Bill Houghton who creates the list. No objections were noted to referring.**

#### **Miller report ad hoc committee – M. Dreisbach**

M. Dreisbach reported on the follow up meeting with Richard Whitkus regarding the Miller report. They met on September 23<sup>rd</sup> and had a very congenial, productive meeting whereby we asked him what his concerns were and his concerns were that this report not just be ignored. That it had come before the Senate in the previous academic year and there had not been mention of it since at the Senate and he was afraid it was just going to die. Crystallizing what came out of it was we agreed we were trying to set and reinforce a tone of collegiality in the Senate and we thought just by bringing this report back to the Senate right now, it might not be the best decision, but we were looking for a way, and asking him for input as well, on a way to deal with this report and not walk away from it, but have the best forum for it. He agreed that perhaps another venue for it would be better. Then the issue of balloting came up and there was a recommendation that the Senate conduct business by secret ballot particularly when specific individuals or groups were involved, like lecturers. He did express the concern that even if one junior faculty member felt intimidated in any way at the Senate that we should do something about it. He talked about a safety zone so that people's opinions would not be held against them in anyway outside the Senate. What we came away from was letting him know that, yes, we were looking for a way to address the report and that we were also trying to reinforce collegiality in the Senate. We has also considered including junior/senior faculty relationships, faculty governance as a topic to be included in the faculty retreat. R. Luttmann stated he didn't think faculty governance is obligated to do anything about this report. He felt the report was inconclusive and didn't see any suggestions of action to be taken. This was the first time he had heard about using

written ballots and that is something we could do. It's a step that is specific and concrete. N. Byrne stated he thought it was useful to bring the subject of balloting before the Senate for discussion. He suggested a secret ballot be done when requested and voted on. E. McDonald asked to respond to R. Luttmann's comments. She thought the issue was complicated. There are a few individuals that through their force of character or their passion or emotion or whatever tend to try to dominate. She wasn't on the Senate when the report was done and didn't think bringing it back to the Senate at this time was the right thing to do, but talking about the culture of respect in faculty governance between newer vs. senior faculty is an important discussion to have. Not that any action needs to be taken to infringe on certain people's rights over other people's rights, but she thought we can't harm anything to talk more about a culture of respect and making sure it's there always. R. Coleman-Senghor stated that if people think the balloting issue should be brought up, it should be brought up. The secret ballot is about individual choices. Anyone who functions in the Senate is functioning as a representative and as such they do not solely speak for themselves, they speak for the people they represent and as such their vote is public. We need to let people know that when they are on the Senate they are not representing themselves. You are there representing what you think is your best judgment of a situation for your school, your department, for the university as a whole. The idea of a secret ballot is anathema to the democratic process of representation. He continued with his reaction to the substance of the Miller report. N. Byrne stated his main sympathies are with the point E. McDonald made. He also respected R. Coleman-Senghor's point. He noted that those at the lower end of a hierarchy are more likely to feel a little bit of reluctance to voice their views for reasons independent of those situated more highly. He thought this might merit discussion at a retreat, if not the whole topic, some time be set aside for this discussion. He also stated he saw a place for a secret ballot, if some representatives because of their social location, will make them less forthcoming in their representation of a constituency, then we should come up with ways to address that. It would be a structural remedy in some circumstances. He stated he would like to see it discussed at some a forum as a retreat. M. Dreisbach noted the Miller report went beyond the feeling of intimidation of some faculty, it did talk about the fatigue of items going on and on, excess of discussion of certain items. She did think it would be worthwhile to have some kind of forum and maybe that forum is actually in having orientation for new Senate members. She said that junior faculty have told her that when there is a vote, they see people looking around to see how people have voted and that makes them feel intimidated for how they voted. She thought there may be times when a secret ballot would be appropriate. However, having an orientation meeting and having senior faculty members develop a little bit more rapport to try to evaporate some of that feeling between junior and senior. E. Stanny stated she thought the secret ballot should be considered because in some ways people may be making decisions based on short term criteria rather than long term criteria. Perhaps a resolution comes up that affects them and they are not going to be on the Senate the next semester, there's certain emotional pressure that doesn't serve the institution or the people the Senator's are supposed to represent because they feel this pressure. She didn't think votes should be hidden from people we are supposed to represent, but she also thought there maybe a time for a written ballot that could be disclosed later. E. McDonald strongly agreed with R. Coleman-Senghor about not having secret balloting. She would like to hear examples from

Richard about what would be appropriate. What we are talking about here is the tenure process and that is the only place the hierarchy starts to make a difference. It could be that junior faculty might feel better if there was some way we could ensure that the political decisions you're making in the Senate room aren't going to be affecting what's happening in your School committee or the University RTP committee and Deans. All these people have a role in approving your process and perhaps this could happen at an orientation, but maybe it could be getting all the people together in the RTP approval process to say you can't judge people based on their decisions or there could be some grievance or back up process so if you feel you've been judged harshly you can appeal that. That's what junior faculty are concerned about. At some institutions she has heard that they don't encourage junior faculty to be part of governance, but she thought we do want to encourage junior faculty in governance and this is an issue to be addressed. R. Coleman-Senghor noted you cannot control bias, you can only accommodate yourself to it, even aggressive accommodation to it. To address N. Byrne's comments, the only people who would not fall under that category would be full professors. That cuts out a lot of the life of the university. We want to increase collegiality and appreciate the efforts of the Chairs recently to do that. The proper body to talk about this is Structure and Functions on the question of balloting. He suggested that this item be taken to the Senate. He asked that if someone votes in secrecy how are we assured that the vote they put forward is the way they are going to announce their vote to the body that they represent. R. Luttmann noted that even full Professor are not entirely safe especially in an environment where we have merit pay, teaching awards, etc. P. McGough stated that anyone can request a secret ballot at any item and it goes to a 50% vote. He stated he knows a full professor who claims he left the Senate because of, related to intimidation, a kind of monolithic sensibility. It may be a function of groups or parliamentary bodies, he was not sure. A secret ballot would help that but you've (R. Coleman-Senghor?) raised a major issue and he didn't know how to reconcile it. **C. Nelson proposed that the Chair of Structure & Functions research Robert's Rule regarding secret ballots. There was no objection.**

## **Return to Reports**

### **Statewide Senator - (P. McGough)**

P. McGough reported that the committees met last Friday and Richard West met with Fiscal and Government Affairs and an issue came up that he thought would be an issue for the campus in the Spring. The system has for the first time put in a disincentive for going over enrollment targets, that is the fees student's pay will go back to the system if a campus is over enrolled. He is concerned about how this is going to manifest itself on our campus and on some others. In his own department they've been told to schedule for 15% less FTES than this fall. This is going to mean that many classes are going to have enrollment limits that are not a function of the size of the class or of the kind of course it is. For example, he will be teaching the Legal Environment in Business in a room that holds 120 and the limit will be 80. He's talked to people and a lot faculty don't intend to honor these limits because they feel their real job is give students courses and in this Fall with many more FTES, we've had 60-70 students not being able to get core courses in business. He's concerned about implementation – are some faculty going to fill the room and

other's be seen as the police state faculty? R. Armiñana stated that you have to disassociate the Business School from the rest of the University on this issue. For a number of reasons, Business is more significantly over enrolled than the other Schools. Therefore there is more of an adjustment in Business than there would be somewhere else. What we are planning to do is in the Spring semester the number of new students will be limited to credentialing students and local fully transferable upper division from community colleges. It is believed that by doing that we will come as a university on target. Business has this particular issue, not the whole university. P. McGough stated then it is not as big an issue, but is an issue. R. Luttmann noted at the VPBAC the Provost mentioned the figure of 15%, but at the last VPBAC he said the Fall over enrollment was not as large as he thought and therefore the cut to the Spring would not be as severe. He was looking at more like 8%. R. Coleman-Senghor noted that the first figure came from PeopleSoft that included Extended Education students, so the figure was re-looked at. That might account for the difference. He continued that he thought P. McGough's point was interesting and he thought it was a question of how the Dean's are going to discipline this matter. On one hand the question is what's going to happen when what individual faculty do in the classroom counts against the university as a whole. So the question becomes how are you going to discipline that unit, and in this case the Chancellor has actually set a discipline for the larger unit, you go over, you lose those dollars, you still have those students. And he thought that principle should hold for the Schools. It points to how tricky enrollment management can be and how disciplined we as an institution will have to be and what we as faculty have to say to faculty about the question of discipline. This is a good place for the faculty and administration to meet for encouraging a disciplined response. But since we as faculty do not have a structure to reign in these folks, that structural device goes to the administration. We can encourage our faculty to respond to this crisis in this way and also support the administration in terms of its disciplining of this process. He encourage this issue to be brought to the Senate, discuss it there and have a clear position from this Executive body about how we should respond to this enrollment issue. D. Jordan stated it's fine to say, with the budget cuts, you have too many students, it's your problem, but he thought that one of the issues that should be discussed at the Senate is the impact on students. There are students that need these classes and if he as a professor says you can't come in simply because the Chancellor's office is going to penalize Sonoma State, that student may not be able to graduate. As an individual faculty member I'm torn between money issues for the CSU and servicing my constituencies which is the students that want graduate to get in my class with available seats. R. Coleman-Senghor responded that he thought discipline meant balancing out those two dimensions. There are students who need to be served. They are on a schedule that we promised them. It's also a question of managing. He gave examples of how the English department is working with these ideas. D. Jordan stated he thought that puts in extra burden on the individual professor and how is he going to make the decision that a certain student deserves to be in a class.

#### **Chair-Elect of the Senate - (M. Dreisbach)**

M. Dreisbach reported that Structure and Functions put forward to the Provost the names from the School of Business and Economics faculty members to sit on the



search committee for the new Dean. The three faculty members include Robert Eyler, Armand Gilinsky and Elizabeth Stanny and the department chair that was selected is Linda Nowak. Also the other search committee we are dealing with is for the position for the Director of Admissions and Recruitment. Structure and Functions had the responsibility of putting forward names and we have just been through that process. We were asked to put forward a faculty members name and in looking at the policy there is no mention of the number of faculty who would sit on that. S & F discussed this issue and strongly recommends that we put forward three faculty names and that the committee be large enough to have broad representation including three or at least two faculty members on it. This is an important position impacting all areas of the university. We had good interest in serving on the committee. Structure and Functions would like this body to recommend three faculty members to sit on that committee. She didn't know the size or composition of the committee yet. She said she planned to put forward a rationale to K. Crabbe's office. The question was divided. 1) Structure and Functions recommendation in response to K. Crabbe's request for a faculty member to serve on the search committee for Director of Admissions and Recruitment is Kim Hester-Williams and 2) that the committee involve two more faculty members recommended by Structure and Functions who are Duane Dove and Thomas Cooper. **R. Coleman-Senghor moved that the recommendation of Kim Hester-Williams be accepted as representative to the search committee. P. McGough second. Approved. R. Coleman-Senghor moved to accept the recommendation of the Structure and Functions committee to send two other names forward with rationale. N. Byrne second. P. McGough voiced a reservation and suggested that it would be a courtesy to discuss it first with K. Crabbe. He supported the motion. The motion was amended to discuss the recommendation first with K. Crabbe. Approved. ( The tape after this point was damaged. Everyone sounded like they were under water. I have provided what I could discern, but could not always identify the speaker.) R. Coleman-Senghor moved to accept the two other names put forward by Structure and Functions for the search committee for the Director of Admissions and Recruitment. Second. Approved.**

*(tape quality further degraded. The following is from the minimal notes I took at the meeting. lh)*

## **Reports continued**

APC reported

EPC reported

FSAC reported and asked to reconsider the lecturer compensation resolution. There was considerable discussion about this topic. **R. Coleman-Senghor moved that FSAC bring forward a fair resolution of the issues raised by the lecturer compensation resolution. N. Byrne second.**

The meeting was extended 10 minutes

**R. Coleman-Senghor called the question. Motion for FSAC to bring forward a fair resolution of the issues raised by the lecturer compensation resolution approved.**

## **Senate Agenda - approved**

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes

**Information Item:** Report from Catherine Nelson on All-Chairs Meeting, Thursday, October 2, 2003 at CSU Golden Shores, Long Beach

## **BUSINESS**

1. Resolution from the Lecturer's Council regarding Enterprises surplus – attachment –Second Reading - S. Wilson T.C. 3:20
2. Report "First Generation, Low Income undergraduate Students" presented by Richard Rodriguez and Elisa Velasquez T.C. 3:45
3. Report on Community Solidarity Fund – B. Moonwomon T.C. 4:05

## **ADJOURNMENT 5:10**

*Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom*