

Executive Committee Minutes

12/11/03

Sue Jameson Room 3:00-5:00

Present: Phil McGough, Catherine Nelson, Eduardo Ochoa, Noel Byrne, Elizabeth Stanny, Robert McNamara, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Elaine McDonald, Karen Grady, Ruben Armiñana, Rick Luttmann, Melanie Dreisbach, R. Coleman-Senghor

Approval of Agenda – Two items were proposed added to the agenda – From EPC: Spanish Proposal and From FSAC: Appointing a University Documents Committee. *No objection*

Approval of minutes – minutes were emailed. *Approved.*

President Armiñana Report

R. Armiñana reported that the State Assembly was called back at noon to put together a finalized agreement on the bond measure for March and a spending cap. He didn't know what happened. He asked if anybody knew. There seems to have been movement yesterday toward a March bond. Clearly that's important. In terms of the mid-year reductions, the Governor has called for \$2 billion in mid-year reductions. The Legislature will not take those mid-year reductions until the later part of January because they will wait for the budget proposal from the Governor on January 10th which will give us a little more indication of where we are and where we're going. Remember the State has about a \$12 billion deficit still to be made up next year regardless of what happens to the bond issue.

P. McGough noted that the Press Democrat said today there was some willingness to vote on those mid-year reductions this week. Did the President read that? R. Armiñana said he had not read the paper. Other people agreed with P. McGough. R. Armiñana said good for them, we are going to get it anyway, therefore it doesn't matter. Given our calendar, we have to deal with this matter by the beginning of January because it will be retroactive to January 1 anyway. To us that vote is really pro forma. Our budget cut of the \$2 billion local will be \$461,600 which represents a 1% enrollment cut on our FTE target. Our '03-'04 FTE target was 6960. After reducing 70 FTE's our new target will 6890 for this year and becomes the target for next year. Without putting the January budget into the mix. That will have a lot of impact. Remember at this moment, this year and next year's target are the same. For our new target of 6890, we lose \$461,600. This represents \$23 million dollars for the system, roughly half of the Governor's proposal, about \$11 million of the 23 is unallocated and the other \$12 million is in outreach/EOP programs. The system has expressed in firm terms that we do not want to take the money from EOP and outreach, we would rather it be all unallocated. Because the Chancellor gets bad messages from lots of people, he wanted to read what the Chancellor said about EOP as quoted in yesterday's LA Times, "At any and all costs we have to save these programs," Cal State Chancellor Charles Reed said. It can't be more categorical than that. But it does test our commitment to EOP, to low income, it comes at a cost. It comes at a cost of 70 FTEs and it comes at a cost of the faculty who teach those 70 FTEs, etc. This is a zero sum game. He thinks it is a proper thing to do, but it doesn't

come without a cost. That's where we are. Therefore we do have to put in to place \$461,600 in further reduction. We will not be penalized if we are above our target. That's a change from previous rules of the game. Rules of the game in this business change and by tomorrow he might give different rules of the game. We will know more about the '04-'05 budget based on the Governor's January 10th budget. It will take two or three days. At that time we will know what our proposed budget is. There will be a difference between that and what we got this year. There might be a revenue expectation at that time. That revenue expectation means fees. They might not call it fees, Governor Davis called it revenue. It will tell us a level of enrollment. Based upon on that we will begin planning for Fall of '04. He passed out a handout regarding enrollment numbers for the last 10 years and the level of state funding versus student fees. This year our per student support revenue was \$10,344, \$7441 from a state fund and \$2900 from the students. We are back now where we were in 1999, better than 1999, but worse than 2001. Our high point was '01-'02. This is for your information.

R. Luttmann asked about targeted reductions. He asked E. Ochoa about it the other day and he said that even if the Legislature says a reduction is targeted, if it's a program we feel we want to support, we can transfer money to it. We've essentially done that with ESAS. It sounds to him that it means that the concept of a targeted reduction is meaningless. R. Armiñana responded no, those were programs the Governor at the last minute, in this past budget, allowed it to be unallocated. It can be categorical. At this moment it stands that the \$2 billion reduction, half of it is categorical. It has to be approved by the Legislature, but they have the power to make it categorical. We always try to make it unallocated so we can shift back and forth. There have been times when other people have argued for categorical cuts. He thought unless there's a strong philosophical purpose, the Department of Finance should not care as long as you meet the budget. Other people who have more philosophical interests might want it to be categorical. R. Luttmann said at this campus have been very concerned about inadequate diversity and so this is extremely important to us. He gathers that the system as a whole doesn't have quite the same problem. R. Armiñana said he would say unanimously that the Chancellor and all the Presidents believe outreach programs are highly important and would rather accept these cuts as unallocated and not categorical against EOP and outreach. E. Ochoa said it does make a difference if we were able to somehow offset internally some of the categorical cuts to EOP that were contemplated earlier, the fact that they are now unallocated cuts does make a difference because before when a portion of the cuts designation to be EOP cuts that meant that the FTE reduction that went along with the remaining cut was small. It was 40 FTE, now we're at 70 FTE. The marginal impact of making the formally EOP designated cuts undesignated is basically our FTE target was driven down by 30 more FTE. R. Luttmann asked about how the \$461,000 will be dealt with on our campus. There are various possible formulas – there is the marginal cost formula which would target 80% of growth money to Academic Affairs and 80% of growth money we don't get to Academic Affairs. There is also the number of about 67% which is the approximate percent Academic Affairs has of the university's budget. We had a discussion about this of some length at the VPBAC the other day in conjunction with the Supplemental Report Language which expresses the Legislature's intent to protect instruction as much as possible. He asked R. Armiñana to comment on how

he planned to deal with the \$461,000 cut on campus. R. Armiñana said we always start with the marginal cost formula, and then we try to ameliorate that. But that's how the money comes, and that's how the money goes. R. Luttmann said then 80% of that cut will have to come out of Academic Affairs? R. Armiñana said at the first planning stage, that's how you start planning. R. Luttmann said that didn't sound like protecting instruction. R. Armiñana said that is your opinion. R. Luttmann said it is. E. Ochoa said they have already done a lot of planning on the assumption that it was going to be \$300,000 for the campus, so now we got this \$160,000 surprise and 80% of that is about \$129,000, so that would be the incremental additional hit that comes with the latest figures. He will make every effort he can to shield the Schools to whatever extent he can from this new incremental hit because we had a plan already in place. L. Furukawa – Schlereth noted there are many other components in Academic Affairs beyond instruction, in fact the entire program of student services rests within Academic Affairs and had very little or no direct instructional support. All those things come together to reflect that 80% not just instruction. He imagines that Academic Affairs will appropriate all their cuts to the various programs within Academic Affairs, not just instruction, but support, institutional support and student service. R. Armiñana said it also means that the \$23 million, and these are permanent cuts, this is not a one-year cut, becomes 46 next year and if you add to that 46 the 56 in mandatory cost, it is already at a minimum without looking at the January budget or any further deterioration, we start with \$102 million less than we began with this year. The big difference from previous years to next year is that there will be no growth money. That growth money every year did ameliorate those cuts. The way the law is is that there will be no increase in '04 – '05 either in growth and / or compensation.

P. McGough had a question and used an illustration for it. A student told him that one of her teachers, a lecturer told her that its quite likely that many classes already scheduled to be taught by lecturers will be cancelled in the spring because of budget cuts. He asked what sorts of changes are we looking at in the spring because we have to cut this \$461,000. Will sections be cancelled? E. Ochoa responded that we did come out with a reduced schedule that had some shadowed classes, and as you may know we ran into a crunch on Friday, the last day of the first round of registration, when the freshman got around to trying add they got into problems. Not all, about half got reasonable schedules, but half did not. So we know we have to expand a little bit the offerings. There are a couple of big schools, Science and Arts & Humanities, will be able to accommodate that by shifting the pattern of supply. They will be canceling some low enrollment upper division classes and substituting some lower division classes, so they will be able to absorb some with that, but they will also open up more sections. Part of what was driving the restricted offerings was the need to compensate for over enrollment in the fall to try to achieve target. Now the figure is 6890 and we were at 6920. We have an understanding to some extent as long as we stay below 7000 FTS, and that has given us a little more room to grow a little bit. So those two schools will do that. Business and Social Science will actually grow because it was clear after we analyzed the pattern of enrollment and the class offerings and where the capacity was they were filled up all across the board, so they need to just open up sections, so they will be able to do that. They got most of the additional headroom in the enrollment target went to both of those schools. And the other two big ones are going to re-configure their offerings. That's

how we're handling it. The problem now is the \$129,000. P. McGough asked if any of the \$129,000 will come from salaries of people already assigned to classes. E. Ochoa said he hopes not. R. Armiñana said in many ways large parts of the CSU make decisions based upon a Southern California commuter campus model which is not the reality for many of us mostly in the Northern part of the state. For most of our students housing, either university housing or nearby housing, is probably their largest investment in their education because they don't come from the area. They have invested roughly \$8-10,000 a year on housing / living expenses versus \$2600 on tuition. You may have a situation as a parent or as an individual, you have made that investment of \$8-10,000 and you'll only be able to get 6 units. That is a very poor investment. If we had had the ability to provide, at a cost, more classes, \$200 - \$300 more per year, he'd rather pay \$300 more a year to protect a \$10,000 investment. It makes very little sense to have a fairly low tuition and a very high cost of living and not be able to protect it. That's the difference from a commuter campus where students live at home and thus housing is not a major expenses, so getting 6 units is an inconvenience and another year of schooling. That's manageable. Many times the system makes decision based on that commuter model versus the residential model. He said he was getting calls from parents saying they want to pay more. They say tell me what I have to pay so you can guarantee my child 12-15 units. He has to say he cannot do that. We could at one time, and the body may remember that he did propose that at one time and it was nicely overturned for all sorts of reasons. That's a real issue. We are creating a very bad investment. He has decided based on this that the construction of second phase of Beaujolais will be delayed at least one more year because the enrollment situation is very unstable. For the system it presents a serious problem with the bond payment as almost all of this has been predicated on expectations of either 3% growth in enrollment or at least a steady state. We are facing an actual decrease in enrollment.

E. Stanny asked for clarification on the \$23 million for the system which translated into the \$461,000 and then there was a figure of \$102 million, she was unclear about the conversion for SSU for that figure. R. Armiñana said to multiply by 2.3% would give roughly what SSU figures would be. E. Stanny asked if the 80% still holds for Academic Affairs. R. Armiñana said we get money through a marginal cost figure and Academic Affairs with all its components is roughly 82% of all the money. The money comes in, Academic Affairs gets 82%, the money goes out Academic Affairs loses 82%. Some people will argue it's 82% coming in and less than 82% going out, but for planning purposes we stick with one number for balance and control.

E. McDonald stated her concern as EPC chair is that these curriculum decisions, to drop lower enrolled major classes, and add freshman sections, is really being driven by the fact that we have this large residential freshman population on campus, that she thinks we didn't used to and that these decisions are not being based on the mission of our university or vision statement that we're creating or thinking about. The decision to drop the lower enrolled major classes in favor of offering freshman classes - it guts the major. She projects forward and asks are we ok as a university that has these really weak majors, but we have this huge program in 100 and 200 level classes. If we really are ok with that that should be something that comes into our mission statement. She understands this is a difficult situation to have all these freshman having zero units for the spring, but the only way we're going to wake up

California and say you have to raise taxes or put less into the prison budget or whatever it is, is to say sorry you can't take a class here next semester, it's not our fault, go call your Legislator. She doesn't see cutting the major classes and asking faculty to work for free and do independent study or we reduce the validity of our majors, she doesn't see how that is actually serving our students. E. Ochoa responded that in the short run, we're doing something here that is standard operating procedure in managing schedules throughout the CSU or any university, which is going through at least two rounds of registration because you never get the right mix in terms of what people actually need to take. The adjusting that is going on in Science and in Arts & Humanities is not a matter of wholesale cancellation of massive numbers of upper division classes. It's marginal adjustments. It's canceling the weakest classes and adding a few more here. This is a constant give and take. When he was department chair he was always arguing for more upper division electives in the major. E. McDonald said it doesn't seem like the normal give and take. E. Ochoa said the feedback he got from the Dean's was that between the additional FTEs that we allowed the target to rise by and these adjustments, we'll be able to take care of the freshmen. In the long run, he would argue that what we're doing here is that this campus has been shifting to a model where more and more of our students spend their entire undergraduate experience with us. And that is the ideal scenario for a university because that's when you can actually manage and control the entire educational experience and make it coherent, organic and a whole. If we are having to shift the balance now between upper division and lower division, it's not matter of giving primacy to lower division, it's a matter of balancing it to a more even state that goes with a traditional student population. If this campus, in the distant past was a transfer school, we had a artificially high ratio of upper division classes to lower division classes. Now we're trying to adjust to a situation where we can have a balanced, sustainable offering of classes. That may mean that we have to focus a little bit more in terms of the numbers of majors or number of options within the majors or the broad sweep of electives in the majors, but not a gutting of the programs, just a more balanced program.

R. Coleman-Senghor said he agreed with E. Ochoa that it is a re-balancing act. But the point is we have academic planning and we have administrative decision about how to go about achieving more immediate goals for providing classes for freshman. The problem is he would like some information to show him how we lack that balance. He'd like to be able to share the argument E. Ochoa is making, that we're out of line. He would like to look specifically in terms of majors. He's looking at a department that this year could offer for its majors 7 or 8 core courses for a major of 240 majors. We have a graduate program and we have a commitment that it works according to our commitment. When we are talking about cuts, what does it mean to the people on the other side, that we made a promise to those people who are undergraduates and are expecting a certain kind of curriculum to allow them to get out of the university at a certain time. If you look at the English department's curriculum today and look at its numbers and ask the question whether or not students taking courses will get out in time to matter, the conclusion would have to be they're not going to be able to do that. Part of that has to do with where we are locating our resources.

Chair's Report – C. Nelson

C. Nelson reported that we have confirmation from Kathy Kaiser, Faculty Trustee and Bob Cherny, Chair of the Statewide Senate that they will be able to join us for a visit on Thursday, March 4th. She and Laurel are currently engaged in planning what to do while they are here. Bob Cherny says there's always a tour of interesting sites. We are hoping to do a lunch with the entire Executive Committee, so please put that on your calendars Thursday March 4th from 12-1:30. We are more than willing to except ideas for forums to get these people in to speak to people. Certainly they will be at the Senate for part of the meeting. If you have any ideas what they should see, forums for them, additional forums to talk to faculty, let her know. The faculty retreat is on Thursday, January 22. It's going to be from 9-3. We are planning a general discussion first off in the morning, then a panel discussion, then break out groups in the afternoon. The invitation will be going out to faculty tomorrow morning via email. We're also inviting the top level of administrators across campus to join us for reasons that involve some of the breakout groups and protocol. In the announcement to the faculty, we will be inviting members of the faculty to help facilitate some of the afternoon discussions and sit on the morning panel as well. She will also send out specific email to faculty we would like to see involved. We also received a letter from San Diego State University in response to the resolution we passed about the fires. It says, "On behalf of the San Diego State University Senate, I would like to thank you and your Senate for their kind wishes and words. It's at these times that one realizes how we must all unite and help each other. Sincerely, Patrick Papin, Chair SDSU Academic Senate." Also, the results of a 2002 department chair's survey system wide have been made available on a campus by campus basis. Sonoma State's was sent to her. They are on the Senate website and an email has gone out about that to department chairs and to the Senate-Talk.

From S&F: By-Law amendment regarding duties of S&F – attachment – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach stated that in the past month or two we have amended the by-laws in terms of Grade Appeal Policy because the Grade Appeal Policy gave the Structure and Functions committee the responsibility for forming the Grade Appeal Panel and for selecting a Chair and the by-laws gave those duties to the Chair of Structure and Functions. So we amended the by-laws regarding duties of the Chair-Elect to bring them in line with the blue paper policy. What we did not do at that time was add those duties under Structure and Functions in the by-laws. Steve Winter was kind enough to bring forward a recommendations which Structure and Functions considered and amended and added also the new procedures for when there is an allegation of improper procedures on the part of the Grade Appeal. It's pretty straightforward. **R. Luttmann proposed that this be a consent calendar item. No objection.**

From S&F: Recommendation for revision of Grade Appeal Policy – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach stated that in doing work in Structure and Functions on Grade Appeal, we took a close look at the revision to the Grade Appeal Policy which is now up on the web. Her committee members were questioning the timelines that had been

written into the revision, that they were agreed upon between SAC and FSAC, but Structure and Functions did not have an opportunity to review this and so it we asked how are we going to do all that, review the allegations and make a finding within 10 academic days. Quite frankly the committee wanted 30 calendar days and we talked extensively and came to an agreement of 20 academic days. We're just trying to have it be reasonable. P. McGough asked what an academic day is. M. Dreisbach said that was the terminology in the Grade Appeal Policy, but she thinks that's a good question. E. Stanny noted that it was in the contract. R. Coleman-Senghor suggested a glossary for the by-laws. C. Nelson suggested that Structure and Functions come up with a list of definitions. P. McGough suggested M. Dreisbach consult the contract before it comes up in the Senate. M. Dreisbach said they did not change the wording "academic days", that is throughout the Grade Appeal Policy. **No objection to this item being on the Senate's consent calendar.**

Selection of Excellence in Teaching Award committee – attachment – M. Dreisbach

The body decided to ask LeiLani Nishime and Bill Barnier to serve this year. M. Dreisbach will request.

From EPC: Spanish Proposal conversion to 4 units – E. McDonald

E. McDonald passed out a handout. She stated that the Spanish Program in Modern Languages is converting all their classes to 4 unit classes. They are following the French program and had intended to do it at the same time, but for reasons such as people on sabbatical and involved with other things they couldn't work it out at the same time. They were worried when they first looked at converting to 4 units that it might diminish the breadth and scope of the Spanish major and minor, but in fact they found through this process it is more directed study by the students, they are able to advise their students more effectively. They have at this point some bottle necks where too many students are trying to get into too few courses at the same time and there are other classes that are under-enrolled. This is going to spread out their students more effectively over the whole program. They've required a capstone seminar which before wasn't consistently taken by all of their students. This new proposal holds to the standards by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for the Spanish Single Subject Waiver. It sounded like they were excited about it and EPC approved it unanimously. R. Coleman-Senghor stated that what is not spoken about in the rationale is that effectively there are fewer preps for faculty and that is an important change. It changes the workload profile of the faculty and that there should be an honest statement about that. In APC and EPC it was asked, what will be the impact of going to 4 units on the university as a whole. We did ask the Dean of Arts & Humanities to provide us with a rationale for this change and to speak to what he thought the impact would be of this change. The incremental changes might be something to look at. He's bringing it up to this body to see if that is something we would like to see addressed before this goes up for approval or not. E. McDonald said that it did come up again in EPC and Elizabeth Martinez had talked to her Dean and it's not a School wide initiative that each program ultimately is going to turn into 4 unit programs. It really is individual departments feeling that it is appropriate for

their department. She believed that EPC will ask the Dean to figure out some kind of policy statement for the School. R. McNamara asked how the new program spreads the students out more. E. McDonald said she guessed that they will have a better way to plan for their classes. In their previous program they had classes that a lot of classes fed into so it created bottlenecks. Now they won't have that. It's a more cohesive path for the students to follow. M. Dreisbach noted confusion in the description regarding the total units for the major and how that is derived. **R. Coleman-Senghor proposed the item for the consent calendar.** R. McNamara suggested language to clarify the confusion in the description. **No objection to the item being on the consent calendar.**

From FSAC: University Documents committee – E. Stanny

E. Stanny stated that the RTP policy states that every Spring the Executive Committee shall appoint a University Documents committee that will review any new material that a candidate wants to put into their file. So this committee is usually just formed if there is a case where someone wants to do that and there is an instance now. Members who serve on this committee are previous members of the URTP committee. She contacted three previous members Greg Crow, Bill Barnier and Jim Christmann. Bill Barnier and Jim Christmann are willing to serve. She has not heard from Greg Crow. **No objection to appointing Bill Barnier and Jim Christmann at this point.** E. Stanny will continue to contact Greg Crow.

Provost report – E. Ochoa

E. Ochoa reported on the budget situation so people will have a ballpark idea of the magnitude of what we're facing. The Governor is still working on the deal for the \$15 billion bond measure, if that's approved by the Legislature and goes on the March ballot and the voters pass it, we still are facing a \$12 billion deficit for '04-'05. The CSU portion of that deficit would be \$540 million. To that you would have add the \$102 million that the President alluded to that we carry over from this year. So that's a \$642 million cut. That would represent 35% of the CSU budget. Even if the fees go up, this may be where Richard West was getting his figure of \$400 million as the cut facing the system even after a fee offset. Nobody really knows. Things could get worse or get a little better if the Legislature decides we get cut less than our share, which is not very likely or they may have to raise some taxes after all. He can't think of any other scenarios that would make it better. So that's the kind of thing we may face and the expectation is that if those magnitude of cuts come that they will be primarily aimed at shrinking, in other words reducing FTE proportionally.

N. Byrne asked for clarification on the numbers. E. Ochoa said these are rule of thumb things. \$12 billion deficit, \$540 million is the CSU share if we allocated it according to current shares. \$46 million of a mid-year cut this year that's annualized to next year, \$56 million of increased costs, so those three items add up to \$642 million. R. McNamara asked if the system works on a deficit. The answer was no. L. Schlereth said the campuses just eat the shortfall. Largely the faculty ate that

workload, that you all have been working more than you should have in terms of numbers of faculty members.

P. McGough said he fell off his chair today reading E. Ochoa's memo to the students. It was wonderful until you said this is a one time situation and in 2004-2005 none of these problems will arise. He was concerned about what was being told students. E. Ochoa responded we are telling them if they are here, we won't have this mismatch between what they need and what we offer. P. McGough said so that's the secret, most of them won't be here. E. Ochoa said they will throttle back on the students we admit. To meet these new targets we will have to implement measures that go with our impacted status that we already have. We'll be using the eligibility standard, be raising that to the point that we can restrict enrollment to the numbers we can actually serve. In order to prepare for that, as the applications come in, most of them are electronic and the eligibility index is part of the database, so we will be able to sort them in descending order and spend the month of January processing applications and making sure everything checks out. And then we will start issuing admissions notices by going down the list. The timing will depend on how much information we have. Clearly, we will try to do it in such way that we don't wait too long and lose too many students to other schools, but we wait long enough to know that we haven't over admitted relative to what we will be able to serve. And that is what will avoid the problems next year.

E. Stanny said she wanted to understand the figures. \$400 million, that's the total CSU cut after the fee increases, so that might translate to the university at \$8 million and Academic Affairs as \$6.4 million, but she thought the Business and Economics School budget is only \$5 million, was she wrong about that? So that's like wiping out our School, plus some. R. Coleman-Senghor said that it's obvious that no one is going to work for free and students will be here. He's not as troubled about what's going to happen because the institution will be here. So the questions for him are what are the principles we are going to be operating on. If in fact we are tying money to students, which we do, what is E. Ochoa's sense if of the money we're going to have and the number of students we're going to be asked to serve. E. Ochoa said notwithstanding the impacted status and the need to shrink next year, we still will continue to admit all CSU eligible first time freshman students from the local area and we're going to, unless something unforeseeable changes, also apply only the baseline CSU eligibility index to EOP students, even if they are not from the local area. E. Ochoa said a back of the envelope calculation . . . L. Furukawa-Schlereth said it's about 700 students FTE, which would be about 1000 heads at this campus would be his instinct. R. Coleman-Senghor said if these folks don't leave. . . E. Ochoa said they will leave. They will graduate or transfer. There's no problem there.

E. McDonald she asked about ranking the students that will be admitted. When we have these higher standards, she thought at some point we were told we weren't allowed to have a higher standard? E. Ochoa said that was before we were given impacted status. E. McDonald asked what do we look at, GPA, SAT scores? E.

Ochoa said both. The CSU eligibility standard is a formula that combines both. M. Dreisbach asked when we got impacted status. E. Ochoa said he thought we were impacted for first time freshman when he arrived, but weren't acting on it. P. McGough said at Statewide he heard we were declared impacted for freshman this Fall. M. Dreisbach asked if we have an electronic admissions selection committee? E. Ochoa said they're in the database, so instead of processing them as they come in, which was the old non-impacted approach, we can now sort them by eligibility index. It's basically just a straightforward administrative procedure.

Statewide Senator report - P. McGough

P. McGough reported that last Thursday and Friday there was a conference put on by the Chancellor's office and the Statewide Senate on Facilitating Transfer and Degree Completion. He was there as a Statewide Senator. We had a distinguished contingent from Sonoma State. Elaine Sundberg gave a wonderful presentation on our model 4 year plans. The big issue for the academic side of the house at the Chancellor's office is reducing the number of units per degree. Spence, who is the Vice-Chancellor, thinks it is the most important initiative in his career. P. McGough thought it affects us much less as we're much better than average. He said some of the Statewide Senators are trying to get a move that admissions letters would have a statements of contingency. You would be admitted subject to the Legislature providing the funds. They claim the UC has started to do this already. Someone asked about reducing the number of units per degree (*not clear who on tape*). P. McGough said that the average student graduates with 20, 30, 40 more units than she or he needs. It's much higher for transfer students. Since there's increasing enrollment pressure and decreasing enrollment funding, this is a way to solve some significant part of that problem. The whole point of the conference was to share strategies that might get student to graduate with fewer units. His own experience having college age kids is that we have a culture in the community colleges where kids go there to find themselves. And there's no way they're going to reduce the number of units they eventually take, because they're using the units to explore. E. McDonald noted the articulation issues involved. R. Coleman-Senghor noted that in a survey of the unit numbers of the majors they came in between 36 – 42. Taking the upper range of 42 and adding the 9 units of upper division GE that gives you 51. Most student are coming over with 70 units from the JC. E. Ochoa said by taking the 70 plus the 51 you are talking about how many units are required for our programs. But the key issue here is how many units in addition to that are students taking. R. Coleman-Senghor said he understood that. He wants to see what the average unit load is for our students coming from the JC. E. Ochoa said this is a problem that goes beyond the CSU, it's a broader problem including the community colleges and Vice Chancellor Spence wants us to work with the community colleges to minimize that was well. P. McGough noted that Vice Chancellor Spence has spent an enormous amount of time and energy to get the community colleges, for instance, to do an Associate Degree to streamline the transfer process. The community colleges have been very uncooperative according to Spence. But a lot of the work they are

doing is connected to this issue. The problem is that many of these students don't know what their major will be until they've been going there for four years.

Chair-Elect report – M. Dreisbach

M. Dreisbach reported that the call for nominations for university wide elections has gone out. We did it early this year so people could give some thought to it. We've already received a couple of nominations. We will be having the spring election in early February. The other issue is that Structure and Functions had considered the role of the Secretary in the Senate and R. Coleman-Senghor's proposal that we eliminate the office of Secretary and after much discussion we decided to retain the role as is. R. Coleman-Senghor asked what the duties of the office are. M. Dreisbach said the duties are enumerated and most of those duties are being done by Laurel. They make sense for the person in Laurel's position to do. One member of the committee reviewed 40 campus websites all across the country to see what their duties are for the office and she finally came away saying most all the campuses have a Secretaries with a list of duties they are not doing, so let's leave it like this. We didn't want to lose the position, the voice on the Executive committee as well as the Senate and the committee was not of a mind to eliminate the office and add another at-large Senator. R. McNamara asked what the duties are and what duties Laurel is doing. M. Dreisbach said the duties are overseeing an archive of the minutes of the Senate, overseeing the archives of resolutions of the Senate and monitoring absences of Senators from Senate meetings.

Vice President Schlereth report

No report

R. Coleman-Senghor asked L. Furukawa-Schlereth about the disposition of the Multi-Disciplinary building. L. Furukawa-Schlereth responded that it's been submitted.

APC report – R. Coleman-Senghor

R. Coleman-Senghor reported that APC has been looking at the Long Range Planning document and incorporating some of the comments that were made. It is also taking a look at the WASC report and making comments. Once they see another version of the WASC report, they will meet online for their comments on it. They also received today a very exciting project coming from the School of Science and Technology which has to do with the acquisition of a piece of land in Northern California and the visionary aspects of this from the School are exciting. They plan to open up an equivalent to our preserve here, perhaps in the future a retreat for faculty and an observatory. The committee continues to work in its task groups. They will be making a recommendation to this body about GE. They will be making comments on the Strategic Planning process.

EPC report – E. McDonald

E. McDonald reported that there are programs coming through and they have been holding an extensive series of discussions about GE in our committee. She wanted to give a heads up to the committee that they will be creating a resolution that will say something to effect of we don't know what the ultimate product of GE will be, we need lots and lots of faculty input still for that, but we do want to have some resolution to bring to the Senate that endorses a particular path to GE, these are the timelines, these are the issues we face. She commented on the Conference. She attend sessions on the freshman year experience all day Friday. There were some fairly inspirational programs, particularly at Hayward State and San Jose State. We discussed briefly having these people visit our campus ad do a more in-depth look at their freshman year experience packages that they have integrated into their general education first year experience package which also might be a way to go with our GE reform. R. Coleman-Senghor noted that the resolution will be asking the Senate to accept the principle of reform.

FSAC report – E. Stanny

E. Stanny reported FSAC just passed a proposed course outline information policy that we will bring here next semester.

SAC report – K. Grady

K. Grady reported that they continue to work on the issue of advising that was brought forward by the Associated Students last spring. They are gathering data and trying to strategize. They will continue that discussion into next semester.

R. Coleman-Senghor asked E. Ochoa what the current status was regarding the allocation for faculty governance. E. Ochoa said what people may have heard was the upshot of the discussion on the VPBAC in which he presented all the line items we proposed to reduce in order to meet the Provost office share of the mid-year reductions. We need to come up with \$305,000 to do our share which is a considerably higher percentage basis than the Schools. Among those line items were the three units that the Senate has graciously agreed to. The comment made was that these were permanent cuts. We were using this to address a permanent reduction in our baseline. How we were doing this year though, need not be permanent. Next year we might come up with something else. There was discussion back and forth and there was some confusion initially that whatever we were doing here to address permanent dollar reductions was itself a permanent line item decision and that 's not the case. All these line items can change from year to year.

Senate Agenda

C. Nelson asked the body for guidance on the Agenda as it was overloaded. The end result approved:

Report of the Chair of the Senate - Catherine Nelson

Correspondences:

Consent Items:

Approval of the Agenda

Approval of Minutes - 12/4/03 emailed

From S&F: Duties of S&F in the by-laws

From S&F: Amendment to Grade Appeal Policy

From EPC: Spanish Program 4 unit conversion

Special Report on the financial status of the Green Music Center. (Curriculum report next meeting) T. C. 3:15

BUSINESS

1. Long Range Academic Plan and its relation to Strategic Plan. T.C. 3:55
2. Resolution regarding Grade Posting by PeopleSoft Software – First Reading – attachment – R. Whitkus T. C. 4:25

Meeting adjourned

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom