

Executive Committee Minutes

March 29, 2007

3:00 – 5:00, Sue Jameson Room

Present: Elaine McDonald-Newman, Tim Wandling, Eduardo Ochoa, Carlos Ayala, Edith Mendez, Catherine Nelson, Elizabeth Stanny, Art Warmoth, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth

Absent: Mary Halavais, Doug Jordan, John Wingard, Ruben Armiñana

Guests: Steve Wilson

Approval of Agenda - Contracts and grants criteria added to item four. *Approved.*

Approval of Minutes of 3/1/07 – *Approved*

Chair's Report

The Chair said she was obsessed with the IDC resolution and would make that her report when the item came up on the agenda.

Provost's Report

A member asked about all the people being paid in A&F out of IDC and the \$5 million loan. What will happen to all those people and what about the loan? The Provost responded that the loan is still there being used as working capital. In terms of the people, A&F will have to downsize. It will take two or three years as there are grants that are that long and have partners to the grant, that we can't get out of.

A member asked if the Provost's office would look at all the work dictated by CSU and SSU demands, policies and procedures, give those activities a reasonable amount of time to be done and divide that by the number of faculty to do it. The Provost said they tend to focus on variables that they can control. He would need to be convinced that there would be some action that could be taken. He thought the conclusion would be that we are under-funded and under-staffed.

The member said he thought when he hears that an area is under funded and we need to give them money, then it must mean we are over funded. We need some ballast to say, we're under funded too, go get the money somewhere else.

The Provost asked what the member was referring to. The member said Development. The Provost said that Development was funded off the top. He has argued that if there is something of great value to the health of the university, that it should be funded off the top as a proportion of total budget. This means implicitly the allocation of existing resources is more or less appropriately allocated prior to that, so if one does something new, then the contributions should be proportional.

The member said then does that assume that administrative positions in Academic Affairs are adequately funded?

The Provost said no, we are under-funded across the board. There was no other part of the university that could afford it more than another.

A member said the bigger question was if everything is under funded, how do you prioritize taking something off the top, or determine relative under funding? The Provost said that even as under funded as we are, we simply can't afford not to fund Development, as it is an investment that will ultimately bring resources back to us. The member said was there no systematic way to do a cost/benefit analysis? She argued for the Provost's office to provide such information. What are the expected benefits of Development? What are the costs? The Provost said that's true. He said the budget that the university inherited since the end of the orange book era tended to under fund the campus compared to the norm and that has been primarily in Academic Affairs. He argued to the President that that was the source of the under funding, but now they have more flexibility to reallocate resources and couldn't they do a marginal cost/benefit analysis. In part, a response to that issue was A&F's analysis about how we were allocating our resources in comparison to peer institutions and as he remembered it showed we were not so far off, so an implicit reallocation has already taken place relative to what the campus had previously. It was also related to SFR and the conclusion was that we have higher costs in our faculty salary structure that leads to higher SFR. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he believed that our faculty salary cost per FTEF was higher than other institutions. All that means to him is that we have more professors at the higher levels as well as more senior lecturers.

A member said that she remembered that we are very under funded in terms of academic support, what is being done about that? L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he had a report about that.

A member asked if there was a projection about the time frame for the Academic Affairs investment in Development to come back to Academic Affairs as resources. The Provost said they have not made that calculation, but they could. The member thought that might be good to do.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth noted that Academic Affairs would not be putting in the total \$400,000 to Development, but 60% of that. The average rate of return they have been able to achieve from the Foundation is around 10.65%. Just the one gift that is coming to endow the Business School, should bring back to the School about \$200,000. He thought the President wanted to support Development because it is one of those components of the CSU budgeting system that was not included. When the CSU budgets were put together there was not a perceived need for extramural support through philanthropy. There's a mandate now that we raise 10%-20% of our general fund through Development. The trouble is that the money may not come where the faculty would like it, that is up to the donor. But his understanding was that the new staff in Development would focus on academic funding. The Provost said we don't have an annual fund, which we should have. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said the PBAC should have a good discussion about investing \$400,000 and having it spin off \$7- 8 million a year. He assumed there would be similar discussions on all the off-the-top proposals in the PBAC. All the issues are competing and they are

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:47 AM

Deleted: ,

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:47 AM

Deleted:

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 10:48 AM

Deleted:

weakening the growth formulas that make it more difficult to fund direct instruction in all areas.

A member reiterated his request for a cost/benefit analysis of faculty work to help make decisions at the Division level. He argued that policies needed to be looked at with a cost/benefit analysis to see what work faculty are able to do.

A member said she had heard a rumor that the Schools can't raise any money until the GMC money is raised. She asked if this was true or false.

The Provost said the campus has made a pledge not to announce any capital plans for buildings. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said there are some instances where that could still happen, for instance with the students and the University Center or if an individual gave as a gift a building. The member said her Dean was saying he couldn't go out and get any money.

A member remarked that he didn't think the cost/benefit analysis needed to go into policies, but could go along with them, generated from either A&F or Academic Affairs.

The Chair asked how this might come back to the committee. The Provost said that the Senate could pass a resolution directing the standing committees to do this and then the administrative folks on the committees could help the committees get the information they need.

Statewide Senator report

C. Nelson noted her written report in the last Senate agenda. She also reported that R. McNamara will be bringing the IDC issue to the Faculty Affairs committee of the Statewide Senate. The Provost remarked that there was a presentation about the importance of research at the Academic Council by the Deans of Research throughout the CSU. They mentioned an EO order that covered contracts and grants and the Provost brought up that they didn't mention an EO order he was familiar with from his campus, EO 753. That raised the profile of the EO order.

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

L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he had a request of the Executive Committee about where a couple of items should go for review. The first he passed out was a draft memorandum on guidelines for university employees on the use of state resources. He said there has been a lot of whistleblower activity in the CSU and people may not be aware of what they can and cannot do with their offices, desks, computers, cell phones, etc. He said employees could get themselves in trouble if they are unfamiliar with the requirements of the government code. He wrote these guidelines to help get people off the hook, if they get audited. He wanted reaction about the language and guidance from the academic perspective.

It was suggested that the memo go to the Academic Freedom subcommittee as well as FSAC.

The Chair asked what the problem was **that** the memo was trying to address. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said he thought it has to do with personal vendettas. Both employees involved **with** whistleblower accusations on this campus suffered minor and serious discipline. The Chair asked how “de minimus” was being translated into occasional. There was discussion about how this might impact faculty work. The Provost said there is a clash of cultures between the auditors and the academy. The more of a paper trail that can be created about those difference the better. There was more discussion.

The Chair asked the body if they wanted to send it to FSAC and AFS. No objections.

The second request had to do with a policy about cell phones that is based on IRS codes. The university will no longer have cell phones. If someone is determined to need a cell phone, they will give that employee a stipend and it will become a taxable event to the employee. **It was referred to FSAC.**

The Chair asked about the new food policy. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said they are meeting with the health department to work out a softening of the policy. The Chair was glad to hear they were working on it, as the students were very upset.

APC report – A. Warmoth

A. Warmoth said they are working on four things. They had a report on the Accessible Technology Initiative and their suggestion was to have a more nuanced phased approach to the implementation of the initiative that may prove more cost effective and help more students more effectively. They are also looking at a clone of the Global Studies program proposed for Singapore. They are trying to put it into context of what the development plans are **for** School of Extended Education in general. They are expecting any day now the feedback from the School of Social Sciences on the name change from Schools to Colleges. As soon as they get that they will have a recommendation for the Senate. Most interestingly, Katie Pierce along with the Provost presented 5-year budget projections. They have been stimulated to think about other scenarios instead of the growth trajectory the campus is on at this point. They will continue brainstorming to see if they can come up with other interesting ideas.

FSAC report – C. Ayala

C. Ayala reported that FSAC has been working very hard on the RTP policy. The committee decided at the last meeting that the additional level of review at the Provost level is not something they will be moving forward with at this time. They are busy trying to get something ready for the May 5th meeting of the Executive Committee. He explained the specific issues they are currently considering. It was suggested that **not** ranking at the department level for promotion be more specifically clarified as faculty are getting mixed messages. There was more general discussion about what FSAC is doing with the RTP policy.

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:01 AM

Deleted: of

Engineering Science Curriculum revision – M. Halavais

The Chair noted that the documents in this packet were the correct ones. M. Halavais was ill, so the **Chair asked if the body thought the item was ready to go forward to the Senate as a consent item. *Approved.***

By-Law Change – Standing Committees/Liaisons – T. Wandling

The Chair noted that S&F passed this last year. The major changes concern the liaisons between EPC and APC. Also, one of the recommendations of the Senate self-study was that all members of Senate committees be elected. Some members of APC were appointed. APC voted to change this too. The rest of the changes are reformatting of the paragraphs of this section to help clarify the section. **Moved to go forward to the Senate. Second.** The APC chair said they thought their list of who they might send liaisons to could be changed. There was discussion. It was decided that APC's changes could be brought up in the Senate. *Approved.*

By-Law Change – Duties of the Chair of the Faculty – T. Wandling

The Chair also noted that this was completed by S&F last year. The Senate self-study found that the duties of the Chairs kept multiplying over time and the by-laws didn't change much. In S&F, there was a lot of discussion about whether it was more important for the Past Chair to attend budget meetings or planning meetings. They had decided on planning meetings. She also noted the "social" duties of the Chair put together by M. Dreisbach as information. **It was approved to go forward to the Senate showing the original by-laws.**

IDC resolution – E. McDonald-Newman

The Chair introduced a resolution about the current IDC (indirect costs for grants) situation. She passed out copies, as it was just finalized that morning. The body took some time to read it.

The following is a summary of the discussion:

The Provost said the terms "demand" and "insist" were noted as not usual for the Senate. "Recommend" was suggested as more suitable. The Provost said he thought the resolution did not reflect the current state of affairs. The Chair asked for examples of how the resolution did not reflect the current state of affairs.

The CFO said he did not think the grant approval conditions were "imposed by the Division of Administration and Finance." They were put into place by the University. The Chair agreed to change it to University, but argued that the conditions had been "imposed." The CFO argued that there was no 20% threshold. The Chair noted the resolution says "previously cited rate of 20%." The CFO said the 20% IDC was not going to Administration and Finance, but a variety of places. He said they had not had the opportunity to discuss this. The Chair argued that the administration should have come to faculty first to learn what consequences

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:04 AM

Deleted: ,

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:06 AM

Deleted: the

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:06 AM

Deleted: of

imposing an IDC threshold would have. The CFO said emergency situations required emergency action. The Chair noted grants that have been let go because of this new situation. She thought was serious business for A&F and serious business for the faculty too. The CFO said it needed to be worked through in a collegial fashion.

A member said she felt in the dark about what was going on and thus was struggling to have sympathy. The CFO said he had not had a detailed discussion on this topic with anyone in faculty governance. The Chair said she thought faculty were being punished for things happening in CIHS and did not think our academic mission and our students should suffer for what happened in CIHS. Faculty grants are small peanuts compared to CIHS. The CFO said that he has seen that CIHS has splattered mud everywhere and for that he was sorry. He is putting in extra time to help shepherd grants through. But the activities of CIHS have gotten the attention of Federal Agencies and State Agencies and have cast a shadow on SSU. He has three investigations on-going at the moment. At any moment he expects the Inspector General of the United States Federal Government to appear. The Bureau of State Audits could appear at any moment as well. It all relates to CIHS, but it is reflecting on our whole grants and contracts area because the Vice President was involved.

A member questioned the sentence in the resolved clause referring to the 20% threshold notion. She thought it should be stricken and strengthened with language about statements made by the Provost that the formula being considered was based on federal rates and approached 20%. She also said that at recent meeting the Provost did verbally request FSAC and FSSP to meet with him to discuss the creation of the formula.

The Chair asked if either the Provost or the CFO had “bothered” to pick up the phone and contact her about this issue. This has been going on for a month. Being informed about something is very different than being consulted about something. The Provost referred to the memo that he has sent out about this and argued that the Chair was ignoring his efforts. The Chair said the memo does not discuss IDC. She said these administrative costs, as she understands the rule, are to be determined by L. Furukawa-Schlereth. L. Furukawa-Schlereth said, yes, that is the rule. The Chair continued saying that faculty grants are going to have this IDC component in them, because that memo says some grants are not going to be allowed to go out. Why should they not go out? Either they do not meet the academic mission of the university or do not benefit students. Which of our grants are those? The Provost said that the guidelines will apply to all grants, not just faculty grants and there may be grants that do not involve faculty that they will pass on in the future. The Chair asked for a memo to faculty that tells them that their grants will go through and that money will not be taken out of instruction to pay for those grants.

The CFO said if a grant meets all the criteria, it will go through, and if it doesn’t meet the IDC rate, it will get a university wide subsidy. The Chair asked what would come out of Academic Affairs. The CFO said that that discussion is a budget discussion and will be talked about in the PBAC. The Provost and CFO reiterated that all grants that meet the criteria would go through. The CFO said that he thought the rate will be around 20% IDC due to our cost structure.

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:07 AM

Deleted: y

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:08 AM

Deleted: at recent meeting. -

Edith Mendez 4/19/07 11:11 AM

Deleted: it

The Chair noted the amounts of IDC money that came back to Academic Affairs in previous years. The CFO said that money should continue by some rational model that will fund a department's oversight of grants and contracts. He didn't know what that would be yet. That's a new item that will have to be put into the cost structure. He agreed with the resolution except for the items he cited above.

A member argued that this is an important part of faculty work, RTP and the university's responsibility to the community. She said it is a very unhappy situation and that faculty are frustrated.

It was moved that the IDC resolution go forward to the Senate. Second. Discussion included concern about the complexity of the personnel issues and that Senate leadership on the PBAC need to understand the complexity of the issues so they can speak to faculty about what we're dealing with and that the concerns and feelings of faculty whose grants are being held up is taken seriously. It was suggested that the resolution needed some edits before going forward. The Chair said she was open to all feedback. The Provost recommended it not go forward as the resolved clauses had many incorrect statements. He said the rationale was helpful and could be used as they go forward in creating guidelines. A member said that if it does not go forward, he would like to see more consultation before another is submitted. Another member said the rationale clauses were very helpful, but he thought the resolved clauses containing words like "demand" and "insist" were not helpful in the re-structuring process. A member asked for substantial discussion instead of worrying about the words.

There was no quorum for a vote on this motion.

Senate Agenda – informally recommended

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Elaine McDonald-Newman

Correspondences

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes 3/8/07 – emailed

Engineering curriculum revision - attachment

☛ Ongoing report: Update on WASC

BUSINESS

1. Workload Resolution – Second Reading – T. Wandling (*revision may be emailed or passed out at meeting – was in 3/8 packet*) T.C. 3:20
2. Substitute Resolution for San Bernardino's on Access to Excellence – Second Reading – attachments T. C. 3:40
3. Consultation with faculty re: Accreditation of Business Dept discussion continued
4. Discussion of impaction and related admissions issues

5. Advising Policy revision –First Reading - D. Jordan – attachment 3/8 agenda T. C. 4:00
6. Cost Sharing Policy revision – First Reading – C. Ayala – attachment 3/8 agenda T.C. 4:15
7. Formal Dispute Resolution Procedures – First Reading – D. Jordan – attachments T. C. 4:30
8. By-Laws revision: Standing Committees and Liaisons – First Reading – T. Wandling
9. By-Laws revision: Duties of the Chairs – First Reading – T. Wandling

End of meeting

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmström