

Executive Committee Minutes

December 9, 2004

3:00 – 5:00 Sue Jameson Room

Present: Melanie Dreisbach, Jan Beaulyn, Brigitte Lahme, Elaine McDonald, Catherine Nelson, Tim Wandling, Sam Brannen, Ruben Armíñana, Eduardo Ochoa, John Wingard, Elizabeth Stanny, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Robert Coleman-Senghor

Absent: Susan McKillop

Guests: Dr. Tomas Morales, Eric McGuckin

The Chair welcomed everyone to the last Executive Committee meeting of the semester. The President introduced Dr. Tomas Morales, Acting Provost at Cal Poly Pomona who is visiting the campus.

Approval of Agenda – Approved.

Minutes of 11/18/04 – Approved.

Chair's Report

The Chair reported on the Spring Faculty Retreat. The invitation has gone out to all faculty, etc. There will be a panel in the morning. People seem interested in the topic. The panel will have one person from each School representing different stages of being here. The title is the Role of Faculty in the Institutional Mission more poetically known as The Three Legged Stool of Teaching, Scholarship and Service: Balanced or Lopsided? The panel members will look at that stool from the perspective of their experiences of being faculty here. The Provost will also be on the panel. There will be time for question and answer, group discussion of this topic. We will have small group breakouts. The retreat is Wednesday, January 26 at 8:30 in the Commons. For Spring Convocation the current thinking is we will have a Spring Convocation. This time it will be updates from people who usually speak with that lasting about 30 minutes in total. Then a discussion about Convocation, what should we be doing as a campus community and have an opportunity to reflect together about what direction we want to go in the future. She updated the body on her meeting in Long Beach with the other campus Senate Chairs. It was a very productive meeting. There was a report on the Academic Technology Advisory Council. The Provosts are looking for faculty input around Distance Education and Academic Technology. The Academic Technology Advisory Council wants to know our ideas about professional development in the area of technology, the use of distance learning and the integration of technology in to our curriculum and instruction. It appears that the CSU will ask for the authority to offer Applied Doctorates. This is somewhat in response to changes in certain fields, such as Audiology, where now it is necessary to have a Doctorate to be state certified. These are more clinical Doctorates rather than research Doctorates. At the meeting it was discussed that they should be offered and given funding, but it wasn't clear that funding would be available. The issue of academic freedom came up. In the recent Statewide Senate newsletter there are web connections to statements on academic

freedom and academic rights. Initially the discussion seemed to brush the issue aside, but several people brought up that if students are complaining, then it really does need to be looked at seriously. The Statewide Senate said they might develop models to guide committees on professional ethics on campuses, assembling a packet of resources materials for campus Senates to use. There was also a concern about using email on campuses for political advocacy- is that appropriate, do we have policies to cover that? Perhaps the idea of academic freedom among us seems amorphous, so we need more discussion. There was talk about enrollment of teacher ed being down across the system. For the Early Assessment Program apparently \$100,000 has been given to each campus to support the implementation of EAP. Many campuses have appointed a coordinator which was \$80,000 of that \$100,000. It was unclear how the money was being allocated on campuses for EAP. We were told we could contact Ted Anagnoson. There was talk about putting a letter together from campus Chairs that would be in the packet for new legislators, trying to education legislators about campus issues. There was a discussion about Strategic Planning. That is happening on a lot of campuses. There was a question about how lottery money was being used on campuses. A lot of concern about CMS.

Posthumous Certificate of Recognition for Jessica Liparini – E. McGuckin

E. McGuckin stated that Jessica passed away in a car accident on Labor Day. She was 31 units from graduation. She had a 3.33 GPA. She was not a stellar student, but she was extremely motivated, independent, mature, and conscientious. She had a minor in Business Administration and wanted to go to NYU for an MBA after graduation. We had a memorial service on campus which was extremely important to her family. We think a certificate of recognition would be very important to the family.

It was suggested that language be suggested by the department for the certificate.

MSP to put on Senate agenda.

Re-nomination of Faculty Trustee Kathy Kaiser – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach stated that Kathy Kaiser is our current Trustee. Chico has re-nominated her for a second term. Two other campuses have come forward in support. No one from our campus applied for the Trustee position. She wanted to introduce this resolution to re-nominate Trustee Kaiser. The language of this resolution is the same as the other campuses.

MSP to put on Senate agenda.

Course Outline Policy – E. McDonald

E. McDonald presented EPC's version of the course outline policy. She described the document. They made a lot of the controversial items into "strongly recommended" items. They split the items from the original policies into "must have" and "strongly recommended." The language about general education came from the GE subcommittee. For the list of university policies, we asked for the university to

create a single URL that faculty could reference. Adoption of this policy by the Senate would require somebody somewhere to create a single university URL where the specific policies were listed.

It was noted that the presentation of the policy was exemplary in terms of the committee being able to decide whether it was ready for the Senate. It was suggested that it be used as an example.

MSP to put forward to the Senate

What is the role of the Senate in administrative academic procedures? – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach noted in the packet the page from the Senate's constitution titled "Purpose." She reviewed the details of the Purpose. She wanted to have a discussion about this because of what transpired at the last Senate meeting around the Course Repeat Policy. She wanted a discussion for the body to become clear on this and be of one mind and one voice on what our role is. She did speak with K. Crabbe regarding the course repeat which is the particular issue, but there is a broader issue. If we have agreement on the broader issues, we may not have to deal with the particulars in this way. She noted that the course repeat policy appears in the paper catalog under regulations.

Points of Discussion:

Concern was expressed that changes to the course repeat policy had not come to EPC.

It was argued that the discussion was not appropriate for the Executive Committee, but that the Executive Committee should determine where to refer it.

It was argued that the Executive Committee can hear opinions of the faculty and it was noted that the issue was referred to the Executive Committee by the Senate.

The President argued that the Constitution did not include the word procedures. Most of the "policies" on campus are actually a mixture of policy and procedure.

It was noted that this is not the first time that academic policy has been changed without notification to faculty governance.

The question was raised about the course repeat policy - is this policy, regulation, or procedural matters? It says policy, but appears in the catalog as regulations. Admissions and Records is concerned that they be able to set deadlines. Do we want to be involved in setting deadlines?

Changes in these kinds of policies affect advising. If the faculty are not notified, how can they advise students properly. A change was made mid-semester. What are we supposed to go by?

The Chair suggested creating an ad-hoc committee to look into this issue and help us address it.

It was noted that we need to be able to assess procedures to see if they violate policy. It was argued that policies and procedures fall under the rubric of academic administrative matters in the Constitution.

The distinction between policy and procedure was seen as useful by one member. How to balance out the various needs between policy, procedures and how they affect instruction was suggested as a topic of discussion.

The Provost noted that inadvertently procedures can be created that make implementing the policy ineffective. It was suggested to try to anticipate potential externalities that do develop and contact those people that might be affected. He would support strongly encouraging K. Crabbe and anyone else in Academic Affairs that is developing procedures to get feedback from the appropriate body or group affected. He did not think it was helpful to cast these glitches in developing procedures as Constitutional crises or by trying to cast the net of policy to encompass procedures.

It was noted that the Senate approves the academic calendar, so does set deadlines. It was argued that an ad-hoc committee complicated the matter. When in doubt, people should consult with the appropriate body. We are trying to create a culture of consultation.

It was noted that when procedures are developed in government, there is an open comment period. It was suggested to have even broader consultation than the Standing committees.

The Provost suggested that the information could be communicated to the Dean's...

Several no's were heard around the table.

By the government model everything is posted on websites, it is totally open for people to comment. It does not filter through people.

It was noted that many policies have procedures built into them.

The President said the format of what we do is confusing. The policy statement should be short. Then the procedures can follow. In some areas, it is entirely appropriate for faculty to do the procedures. In other areas, the faculty probably doesn't want to do the procedures.

It was noted that there used to be a Director of Advising. Those units went away and never came back. It was suggested to reinstate that position so that it was clear who to communicate with and they could keep the faculty informed.

The Provost said he would ensure that people affected by Academic Affairs procedures would be asked for their perspectives. He argued this was all about the students.

Communicate and trust were discussed as important issues arising out of this discussion.

It was moved to refer to EPC to clarify the relationship between what counts as policy under our Constitution and what part does procedure have in the both the formulation of our policy and how are those procedures are linked to those policies and to bring back a position to the Senate. Second. Approved.

The Chair stated she would send a letter to K. Crabbe affirming the motion from the Senate last week.

Allocation of unused faculty governance units – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach stated she had a proposal for unused faculty governance units. We have 3 WTU's assigned for lecturer senators. Currently, only one of them has been used by a lecturer. It may be in the Spring that we will have two units unused allocated to us. She proposed that if the two units exist, those two units go the immediate Past Chair. The Past Chair used to have units, but a past chair gave them up. But that role has now been complicated and much has been added to the work of the Past Chair in terms of committee work.

Support was voiced for the proposal.

It was suggested that the issue of the role of the immediate Past Chair be addressed in the Senate's self study.

It was noted that this was just a stop gap measure and we should try to get these units for future past chairs even though this seemed like a fantasy.

Motion that immediate Past Chair be given the two units, if they exist, in the Spring. Second. Approved.

Designee for Enrollment Management Council for Chair – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach reviewed the membership of the Enrollment Management Council. The meetings are the second Thursday of each month from 8-9:50am. She asked if anyone was interested in being her designee.

It was argued that a member from APC should be on the Enrollment Management Council.

It was moved that the APC Chair or a member of APC be the Chair's designee. Second. (not voted)

It was suggested that the Executive Committee recommend that a representative of SAC, APC and also an SSP be on the Enrollment Management Committee.

The above suggestion was moved, seconded and passed.

President's Report

R. Armiñana stated that the person in charge of the Early Assessment Program here at SSU is Matt Benning in Pre-College Programs. They have an assigned number of high schools. There has been a lot of flurry about military recruiters on campus. The decision to make unenforceable the Solomon amendment was an issue of a panel by a two to one vote of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in Philadelphia. The decision only affects the states represented by the Third Court. Those are Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the Virgin Islands. The Department of Justice has informed that they will appeal. We have been advised that we cannot make any decisions in this regard. He spoke about the compact. There was a meeting today between the Chancellor and the Governor. As of last night, the compact will be what is included in the Governor's budget. The Governor's budget has a \$7 billion deficit. There is a lot of pressure. If there are no new taxes and no new borrowing, that means further cuts will come out of the part of the budget that is not committed and that is health and welfare. To be under the radar is the best thing possible. In terms of enrollment systemwide, we can be as high as 1000 FTES under enrolled. There is a question whether the system will lose the revenue associated with those FTES. The system is working on some long term enrollment targets based on the assumption that no new campuses will be built and no change in the delivery will severely impact enrollment. The existing campuses will absorb enrollment growth. The growth will be distributed differentially based on history, potentiality, demand, location, etc. In the early conversations, we are in for larger than 2.5%, probably 5+. If we push that out to 2015, we cannot do that with the present physical capacity. Physical capacity only increases with bonds. There will not be a bond next year. It is not cast in stone. But in terms of potentiality, we are scheduled for larger than 2.5%. That is going to become more defined and we are not going to have a great deal to say about it. We could argue for more, but not for less. It's going to shape the size and nature of the campus.

Senate Agenda

AGENDA

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Melanie Dreisbach

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

 Approval of the Agenda

 Approval of Minutes - 12/2/04 emailed

Special Report: GE Initiative Q & A – Paul Draper T.C. 3:15

BUSINESS

1. Resolution in Support of Boycotting Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Glencoe/McGraw-Hill Publishers – M. Goodman – Second Reading - attachment - T. C. 3:45
2. Course Outline Policy – E. McDonald – First Reading – attachment – T. C. 4:00
3. Posthumous Certificate of Recognition for Jessica Liparini – attachment – T. C. 4:15
4. Resolution re-nominating Kathy Kaiser for Faculty Trustee – First Reading – attachment – M. Dreisbach –
T. C. 4:25

Approved.

The Chair wished everyone a good rest and Happy Holidays.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom