

Senate Executive Committee Minutes
October 22, 2015
3:00 – 5:00, Academic Affairs Conference Room

Abstract

Provost Report. Agenda approved. Minutes of 10/8/15 – Approved. Chair Report. Statewide Senator Report. Vice Chair Report. Vice President of Administration and Finance Report. Draft policy / resolution on the Use of Release Time. Classroom renovations task force – long term implications. WASC update. Resolution regarding SSU Campus Based Equity Program, Second Round approved for the Senate agenda. Rohnert Park Mayor visit – topics and questions. Classroom Renovation committee report. EPC Report. FSAC Report. SAC Report. Associated Students Report. CFA Report. Senate agenda approved.

Present: Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Ed Beebout, Ron Lopez, Laura Watt, Sam Brannen, Deborah Roberts, Richard J. Senghas, Andrew Rogerson, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Carmen Works

Absent: Tom Targett, Ruben Armíñana, Michaela Grobbel (on family leave)

Guest: Kate Chavez

Provost Report – A. Rogerson

A. Rogerson reported that the transfer enrollments were not as high as they hoped it would be. They thought it may be due to the lack of housing, but were not sure. Also, many of the transfers wanted impacted majors. He said if they did not meet target, they would lose money. The Provost thought if the campus annualized at 100% target that would be about a million dollars in lost tuition. The Provost noted this was a nationwide problem. He said they wanted to get to 103% of target. A member asked if under division students could be admitted. The Provost said that he thought admissions would be open to that. It was clarified that the housing issue was in Rohnert Park, not on campus.

Approval of Agenda – item added Resolution on Campus Based Equity. Approved.

Approval of Minutes of 10/8/15 – Approved.

Provost Report – continued

A member asked what the faculty could do to help with the enrollment. The Provost said he had hoped that Chairs would open up seats, but understood if Departments couldn't. They were trying to interest students in under enrolled majors. He noted that if they do not make the target, it would mean that not as many lecturers could be hired. He said they needed to get students by the beginning of November. He thought it was better to wait until the November deadline passed to really worry.

The student rep noted that it was unfair that students were seen as making money for the campus.

Chair Report – R. Senghas

R. Senghas reported that 18 campuses had passed resolutions on Open Presidential Searches. He said he would be circulating to the Council of Senate Chairs a letter requesting adding more campus members to the Presidential Advisory Search committees, particularly if the searches remain confidential. It was difficult for one student and three faculty members to represent the diversity of perspectives on campus.

Statewide Senator Report – D. Roberts

D. Roberts said Statewide had not met recently. The Chair asked if she had been receiving any input from Senators or faculty members. D. Roberts said in the three years she has been a Statewide Senator, she had not heard from anyone.

Vice Chair Report – C. Works

C. Works reported that S&F received requests for a faculty member to serve on the search committee for the Student Advocate and the Associated Students Elections Commissioner search. They discussed APC and the classroom upgrade committee. They continued to work on the Faculty Representation on Search Committees policy.

Vice President of Administration and Finance Report – L. Furukawa-Schlereth

L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded to two resolutions passed by the Associated Students. One concerned the delayed renovation to Cabernet village which inconvenienced students. He said that he was open to providing some compensation for the inconvenience as called for in the resolution. The second was regarding the buttons for disabled people use to open bathroom doors in the Student Center that were not operating properly. He said that he thought that would be remedied soon. He noted issues that were emerging that he wasn't sure where to bring up due to APC being on hiatus. One issue was housing. He discussed whether increasing the student population would require more housing and how the current housing was distributed among the classes. He did not think the policy issues on this topic were in his purview. He was going to do a financial analysis to see if new housing was feasible. He would wait for guidance on this as building housing tended to be controversial. The second issue was about the change to how academic related buildings would now be built in the CSU. Previously, general obligation bonds had been used for this. Since those were no longer available, it is necessary for the CSU to issue its own debt and this would see general fund money being used to pay debt, which is very new. The CSU seems to be saying that a campus would need to come up with 10% of the cost of the building or renovation. He noted that Stevenson Hall was due for renovation which would cost approximately \$54 million, so 10% would be \$5.4 million to the campus. The campus would have to save that up over a couple of years, if that was the priority. He then talked about a new Professional Schools building, that would be approximately \$34 million. He said he thought that these

issues needed to be approached from an academic perspective. He thought that APC would have discussed this and these issues did need to be discussed somewhere. M. Lopez-Phillips noted that with increased enrollment, the need for more support services was also required. A member noted that Rohnert Park housing was very expensive and asked that, if new campus housing was built, it be targeted to low income students. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said that students these days would not like that suggestion. Most students want apartment style living. He also noted that new student housing debt would compete with renovation debt. Another option would be to take on a public-private partnership. A member suggested a trailer park situation or a tiny house situation. Another member suggested a co-op situation which was much better than the dorms or frat houses. The student member noted that students do come to SSU for the dorms and small classes. M. Lopez-Phillips discussed student family housing which created a very mixed type of community with different price points. The Chair thought this topic could be discussed in ACT. A member suggested taking best practices from other universities. L. Furukawa-Schlereth asked to be included in the discussion with ACT. He reminded the members that the campus bought 90 acres of land for faculty-staff housing, but that was not implemented due to the housing crash. He thought it could be developed with a public-private partnership. The Chair asked for a finance report at the Senate, so Senators could understand the trade offs of these kinds of decisions. L. Furukawa-Schlereth agreed to discuss potential dates.

Draft policy/resolution on the Use of Release Time – R. Senghas

R. Senghas said this draft policy was addressing a long standing issue about release time for governance and was just a starting point. He asked the Provost what he had learned from the Deans on this topic. The Provost said the 90% of the time, Deans did give money back to the departments to mount the course for which a faculty member received release time. In the few cases where that did not happen, more money was given to the departments; so the Deans felt it was a non-issue. The Chair asked for input from the Ex Com members. A member suggested framing the issue in a resolution. A member asked if other release time would also be included in a resolution or policy. The Chair thought it was just about faculty governance release time. A member supported FSAC developing a policy for release time as she thought that while the current Deans had this practice, future Deans may not. She suggested that CFA be part of that discussion. She stated this as a motion: **That FSAC create policy on campus reassignment time for faculty. Second.** A member suggested that a policy would not need censure language in it. A member suggested to include equity language in the policy and that departments have the first say in what courses would be mounted with release time. The Provost said that the more restraints that were put on the Deans, the less they would be able to serve the entire student body. **Motion approved.**

Classroom renovations task force – long term implications

The Chair noted that when this topic came up at the Senate there was an outpouring of comment. He was concerned that there was no formal communication between the classroom renovations task force and faculty governance. He noted that PDC was interested in issues regarding classroom space for new pedagogies or

technologies. A member suggested putting the task force on the agenda as a regular report in lieu of APC. D. Roberts gave an update about the task force and its work. A member, who was participating on PDS clarified that that PDS was asking how permanent the task force was and wanted to see the committee become more permanent and talk about how to plan for the future of classroom technology. They also wanted to see the Director of the Faculty Center to be on that committee. The Chair talked about changing the charge of APC to make it more relevant and then perhaps being able to re-constitute it in the Spring election. A member suggested that a facilities person be on an APC type committee.

WASC update

R. Senghas reported that ACT had gone over the criteria for Standard 2. He wanted the Ex Com to review the same section and return the next week to discuss it. Faculty Governance had been identified for specific criteria. He discussed how the review would be done. He asked members to identify how well they thought the campus was doing on the criteria and what priority it was for attention. He said the recommendations from the last WASC review should also be kept in mind. He said the committees could give their views and then those would be collated with others. A member noted that School members of the WASC Steering Committee were already talking to councils of Department Chairs to gather such information. The Chair said it would be interesting to see if the responses are different coming from the perspective of faculty governance. He said this first process was relatively simple – just determine for each criteria if the campus is doing fine, needs some work, is in trouble or it doesn't apply, and then decide what priority it should be given. A member noted that the criteria was somewhat problematic to answer. The Chair suggested using the WASC handbook for help. The Chair said the WASC consultant was not worried about the campus. He let the members know there would only be one visit instead of two. The rating was clarified to be 1, 2, 3 or 0 with one meaning doing well and three meaning needs work. The priority rating was A, B or C with A meaning a high priority. A member asked if there was an electronic repository of program reviews. There was not. The member requested that this be provided.

Resolution regarding SSU Campus Based Equity Program, Second Round – S Brannen

S. Brannen introduced the item and noted a few small changes. He noted that the recent report at the Senate by Dr. Howard Bunsis regarding SSU finances revealed that SSU faculty were almost at the bottom of salaries for TT faculty in the CSU. The resolution called for bringing all faculty up to the CSU average. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he did not have a problem with the resolution, but did have trouble with facts as presented in the rationale. He could not find the unrestricted reserve amount or the excess cash flow referred to in the rationale. He said Dr. Howard Bunsis had a flawed analysis of the percentage of budget for faculty salaries. He thought Dr. Bunsis did not understand the unique financial situation of SSU. S. Brannen said he would remove the entire first sentence of the rationale. There was more discussion about the facts stated in the rationale. A member asked for the most recent data on faculty salaries. S. Brannen noted that in 2014 the amount needed to

bring the faculty to the average was \$2 million and the equity program in 2014 was only \$250,000, so it was unlikely that faculty salaries were brought to the average. The Provost noted that new faculty were being brought in at the average and other faculty had received increases due to promotion well in excess of the average. He thought the campus was in a much better situation. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said if the resolution was asking for \$2 million, he wanted to know where to find that money. **The resolution was approved for the Senate agenda.**

Rohnert Park Mayor visit – topics and questions

The Chair asked if there were any particular topics or questions for the Mayor. The housing issue was raised. Questions about how the city and students could work together to fix the issues in M section could be raised.

Classroom Renovation committee report – D. Roberts

D. Roberts reported that they were working on the remodel of Zinfandel. She noted that in the classrooms, the computers would either be MAC or PC, not both. She admonished faculty to check out their classrooms. She said faculty could use their own laptops or check them out from IT on a first come, first serve basis. Having one platform in the classrooms will take away the 20 minute boot time. A member asked why the campus was getting rid of VHS players. He noted that there were items recorded on video that have not been put on DVD. A member noted that the Faculty Center will convert items. D. Roberts said the campus cannot get parts to fix VHS players anymore.

EPC Report – L. Watt

L. Watt reported that EPC still had light curriculum work. She said they were compiling a list of all the course changes seen on the MCCCFs and wanted to make that available.

FSAC Report – E. Beebout

E. Beebout reported FSAC was working hard on the RTP revision. They would have a second reading on the proposed changes at their next meeting.

SAC Report – R. Lopez

R. Lopez reported there had been high levels of stress on the campus lately which spoke to the need for more counselors and the Student Advocate. The Dreamers Center was moving ahead. A member said she had heard that there were 14 calls for ambulances for students with alcohol related issues and she wondered what could be done. The Chair thought they could check in with Matthew Lopez-Phillips.

CFA Report – C. Works

C. Works reported that voting continued for the strike authorization until next Wednesday. At 4:00 on Wednesday, they would have a “happy hour” at Lobos.

Associated Students Report – K. Chavez

K. Chavez said they were in a lull due to midterms.

The Chair noted that the Sustainability Day went very well. He hoped the liaison issue between the SEC and the Ex Com would be sorted out soon.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Faculty – Richard J. Senghas

Approval of Agenda

Approval of Minutes - emailed

Consent Items:

Information Items:

Special Visit: Mayor Amy Ahanotu of Rohnert Park TC 3:30

Special Report: Arts Engagement – S. Horstein TC 4:00

BUSINESS

1. Resolution regarding SSU Campus Based Equity Program, Second Round – First Reading – S. Brannen – attached
2. Elect At-Large member to Ex Com (semester replacement)

Approved.

Minutes prepared by L. Holmstrom-Keyes