

Executive Committee Minutes
March 27, 2003
Sue Jameson Room
3:00-5:00

Present: Noel Byrne, Rick Luttmann, Steve Wilson, Ruben Armiñana, Robert Karlsrud, Robert Coleman-Senghor, Catherine Nelson, Elizabeth Stanny, Bernie Goldstein, Art Warmoth, Karen Thompson, Larry Furukawa-Schlereth, Robert McNamara

Guest: Stuart Jones, Director of Development

Meeting began 3:02

Approval of the Agenda – Amendments the agenda: Resolution on war in Iraq T.C. 3:45; Posthumous B. A. degree for David Immel; Draft of WASC report from APC. *Approved.*

Approval of Minutes - Minor amendments, *approved.*

Correspondence Received – None

REPORTS

Chair of the Faculty - (N. Byrne)

The only a report I have is I certainly welcome President Armiñana's decisions regarding the funding for instruction from the reserve funds.

President of the University - (R. Armiñana)

Nothing happened. (laughter) End of my report.

Provost/Vice President (B. Goldstein)

I want to ask a question that has to do with a series of panels throughout the campus to talk about current events. The question is - what is the role of an academic institution during a time of war such as we are having. It would seem to me it would be useful to have similar panel discussions, as we did with 9-11, in a way that allows students to have a really good teaching and learning experience. I thought we did a good job last time – the panel in the cafeteria had very good attendance. So I'm asking, what are your thoughts on that. One of the things about the previous time is that we had faculty organizing it and that's how it worked. I'm just throwing that out and am willing to work with whoever wants to do this to try to establish some kind of informal program that allows people who want to do this to get together in small groups and talk about the issues at hand.

N. Byrne - My understanding is, and this is an inference of mine, that Peter

Philips would certainly welcome working with you.

B. Goldstein - He's supposed to have a meeting next Tuesday, I think and I will be there. Anyone else who wants do this would be very good.

R. Luttmann - Tuesday at noon ?

B. Goldstein - Yes.

R. Coleman-Senghor - I think we needed a clarification on exactly what are the obligations of faculty. Their obligation is to teach their classes. Their obligation is to use their time and not student's time. I recall this from other times of struggle. Students come from long distances to attend classes. It is an important part to of their experience being on this campus. It is also an important part of their experience as learners and as citizens to understand that there is a time for debate. There are areas for debate and there is a difference between the commitment of individuals and a commitment of an institution. As a Senate we have confused the issue by not giving ourselves technical material about what exactly we are asking the faculty to do and I'd like this body to clarify that issue.

B. Goldstein - As you recall the last time we did this, we did not have classes canceled or suspended. Instead, it was voluntary and people did it on their own. It was very well attended. We had one session out by the Alumni Grove and as I said one in the student cafeteria that was well attended. And a very good discussion was going on. So for those who wish to be involved, we could do that and we will help.

N. Byrne - I just received the statement of the resolution and perhaps since we have the resolution on the agenda for 3:45pm that might be the most useful time to address what you are saying in some detail.

Statewide Senator - (S. McKillop)

S. McKillop - Nothing happened since you (N. Byrne) were down there. I'd be interested to hear about the Budget Summit meeting.

N. Byrne - Okay, I can add to the comments that I provided at the Senate and, of course, President Armiñana is welcome to add any comments as well. In brief, as you know this was a Budget Summit that was attended by all of the President's of the CSU institutions, most Senate Chairs, and I understand, all the campus AS presidents. The first half of the day was constituted by presentations about the budget including an early presentation by from Betty Yee, associated with the Governor's office and the legislature and others. Then we were asked just prior to lunch to meet to in groups, the composition of which had been pre-selected and I learned afterward that every group included members from diverse campuses rather than the figures associated with a particular campus. There were six groups, each group was comprised of three university presidents, three Senate chairs and the balance made up of

AS president's or other students representatives. We were asked to, from what we understood from the morning session and any other information we had, to generate a set of suggestions to Chancellor Reed so he could make a case before the legislature to deal with the budget problems of the CSU. Every group was required to generate five or six suggestions. We could do more than that, but we were asked to consolidate them which we then presented to the body in the afternoon. This was Web Cast, (<http://www.calstate.edu/budgetcentral/> - scroll down to Budget Summit) so anyone can view these proceedings mildly edited.

S. McKillop - Since this is the first time you had ever tried this combination of people, did you feel it was a good thing?

N. Byrne - I did. I thought it was excellent. The recommendations were formulated with an eye to the collective good rather than just at the level of parochial interests of sub-groups.

S. McKillop - Thank you, that was very good. That was my report. (laughter)

R. Coleman-Senghor - What were some of the interesting recommendations?

N. Byrne - A number of groups made this fairly notable recommendation - by the way I should preface by observing - it was not required that the recommendations be arrived at unanimously. In that sense, the discussion was boiled down to five or six recommendations. These, at least, received the tacit assent of the group as a whole. Several of the group's recommended a variant on a pay cut. The group of which I was apart was not so interested in a pay cut. Often the figure that was cited was 2%. And the pay cut referred to all university employees. By the way this was arrived at not to by communication among the groups and this was not universal among all groups - these were independently arrived at, but I would say it emerged in about half the groups. In the group of which I was a part this was termed a rebate rather than a cut because of the consequence to retirement and benefits if there was simply a cut. To my mind I was not only surprised at the recommendation, but that it emerged in several groups. It was duly reported by each group without editorial comment. There were recommendations for a tempering of the tuition increases from various groups.

R. Armiñana - There was concern about greater flexibility in the way that cuts came from the Governors budget. Better utilization of the physical plant, Saturday classes, things of that nature. As Noel said, we did not even have to have consensus in the recommendations. Some people were saying get away from a state funded summer session and go back to students paying for it. There were no crazy ideas. They were all thoughtful ideas.

R. Coleman-Senghor - What idea was the one most interesting and the most contentious?

R. Armiñana - We never had a discussion of that.

N. Byrne - There was no contention.

R. Armiñana- That never happened. Most of the discussion happened in the groups. Clearly the students have a great deal of concern about a substantial fee increase. There was a lot of conversation about a stable, predictable, long-term fee policy. If we had had that we would not have needed these things. It makes a lot of sense and everybody agreed, but the Legislature and the Governor have never voted for it. There was a lot of concern about 25% verses a long-term policy.

N. Byrne - There was one other thing that I think was notable - that is several of the groups did suggest any accommodations to the budgetary crisis that we face such as higher SFR, or what ever, that these have a sunset - once we have returned to a normal fiscal circumstance. . .

R. Armiñana - And you keep an accounting, so at some point you basically say to the State, you owe us X amount.

R. Coleman-Senghor - A rebate that generates a rebate.

R. Armiñana - The question was how are you going to pay it over time, in good times - because we should recover, over time, the present losses.

R. McNamara - On the rebate, how procedurally would that happen? We're talking about next year right? Collective bargaining has to come into it, doesn't it? Then we would go to the Governor and say this is what the Chancellor recommends?

R. Armiñana - The Governor in his budget message in January has recommended such a (unintelligible) strategy with the State employees. And has instructed the head of personnel to pursue that at this moment with absolutely no successes with, in this case, the bargaining unit at the state level. He would have to do an agreement with each bargaining unit. And probably have to go to some level of (unintelligible) education. It becomes more difficult even with non-represented employees which each one has it's own contract per se. There are some technical issues to do that. Perhaps one of the ways to start is a voluntary fund. Those things are difficult to do because you're covered by so many state and federal laws, individual contracts, etc. How you do it - it impacts your taxes, your retirement contributions, retirement payments.

R. McNamara - I ask because you said it was the number one most common thing that came out. Was it just to make everybody feel good - or we would hypothetical do that - but realistically knowing that would never happened because of the logistics. That's why I'm asking. Or is it something that we think may be a partial resolution.

R. Armiñana - I think there were overall good intentions. Sometimes good intentions cannot be actualized because technically it is very difficult to do.

And it takes so many steps All of them have to go in the right direction.

R. Coleman-Senghor - Was there any discussion at all about the impact of class size on learning?

N. Byrne – You raise a really important point. Among the ground rules - I actually criticized this in our group - was that the issue of quality was beyond the scope of our consideration with the rationality that quality is understood differently on different campuses. My objection might be somewhat obvious, that is, in the end if we have fewer resources but must educate more students it seems clearly that quality is at risk. Now my argument was that to the degree we are held to standards of outcomes assessment, those criteria that are embodied in those outcome assessments are operational definitions of quality. I believe that we can specify quality. All we have to do is look at these outcomes of assessments and they represent an empirical specification of quality. At least we have that as a standard of reference. So I believe quality should have entered into this discussion.

R. Coleman-Senghor - Even if they didn't have a discussion about quality, they did have a discussion about utilization. That's where that issue comes in. It seems to me you immediately enter that question of class size - what are you going to do, what are the limits just in terms of the physical plant? Whether or not you are going to have one teacher to teach 160 students - where are you going to house them, what hours you're going to teach them in? This is a question that should have been addressed because it immediately falls back into the question of utilization. It's a resource question as well as a quality question.

N. Byrne - It did arise in the group of which I was a part and I'm sure in others as well. Of course it was expressed in terms of the student - faculty ratio. That's why the notion of sunset provisions was raised.

R. Armiñana - You have two problems with that. One is the conditions of the planning assumptions I distributed the other day (unintelligible) the Governor's proposal. In the Governor's budget it is proposed to take a lot of things away. Therefore from a public policy issue if the Governor's budget, comes through it would mean enrollment has been covered. There is a bit of a dispute between the Governor's office and the Legislative Analyst office where the Governor says you have 2% already and have 5% more coming and the Legislative Analyst says we don't care about what you have in, you have to absorb it, even 5% maybe too optimistic. The Governor's Budget takes with one hand and gives with the other. Technically, enrollment has been covered.

R. Coleman-Senghor - Enrollment has politically been funded, but the question is where you put the bodies? And where you put the bodies in respect to the faculty that are teaching. That seems to me a risk management issue. For instance how many students can you have in a lab?

R. Armiñana- That's why the question of class sizes is a very limited option.

R. Coleman-Senghor - The reason I ask this question is that again Sonoma State is being placed at a disadvantage in terms of the history of funding for building. We've been behind the curve on that with respect to the growth space we're going to need. No? Not true?

R. Armiñana - Not true. We are way ahead compared to other campuses - with Salazar and the Schultz Center. You don't need to go farther than our sister campus in San Francisco. They will tell you that that is not so.

R. Coleman-Senghor - With respect to classroom space?

R. Armiñana- Yes, in terms of what we called FTE utilization. We are not behind.

S. Wilson - In response to Robert's (McNamara) question, there's a group on this campus that is trying to set up a foundation account for that and currently they're wrestling with some policy issues. They are working with Larry and Stuart.

R. McNamara - I knew that was happening on a volunteer basis but it was not realistic for the collective bargaining, etc. I'm talking about the across the board 2%. It would be nice for this other group to know so they could get that going, to give it enough time.

S. Wilson - The way they're dealing with that is by making it voluntary. Everybody gives their pay so there's no pay cut involved. They're not required to buy into it. Any individual can make a charitable contribution if they want. And like I say, they're wrestling with some of those problems.

A. Warmoth - I'd like to follow up on what you were saying about space utilization in relation the fact that I heard you say that technically enrollment is being funded and at the same time we're dealing with issues of limited space utilization. I like to know more about how those two factors interact in terms of what we're really facing in terms of enrollment management and curriculum management on this campus.

R. Armiñana - Very simply, in our discussions that we have had, Friday is a day where it is very likely to have more classes. Under normal circumstances people don't like to go to classes on Friday. On every campus in the CSU Friday afternoons are empty. Saturday is not a use day - somewhere back when dinosaurs roamed the earth there were Saturday classes. It might not be convenient - I have to tell you that I was one of those who found eight o' clock classes highly inconvenient to my body rhythm. I took one as a freshmen and swore never to take one again. It was a Sociology class and I got an A. But I swore to God never to do that again. But that doesn't mean that we can't have classes at 7 o'clock, 8 o'clock, Friday afternoon and Saturday and Sunday. That's some of the questions we talked about when we talked about

utilization. Longer days. There may be other ways such as summer use. There is a tension between need and personal preference. I had to take that class at eight. These kinds of things are doable when you are under difficult situations.

A. Warmoth - A follow-up question. I understand that the idea of utilization is basically coming from the system and the Legislature. In the context of insufficient utilization I'm wondering if it is appropriate, and in order to keep the average class size where it is now, to schedule classes on Fridays and Saturdays to see if anyone shows up.

R. Armiñana - Some people might not show up, but I have to tell you from the what the Legislature is planning, you if you don't take classes on Saturday and it takes you seven years to graduate, that's your choice.

A. Warmoth - What if we schedule these classes on Fridays and we don't meet to our enrollment target?

R. Armiñana - We lose money.

R. Coleman-Senghor - I'm glad were having this discussion. That's the direction I wanted to go in. I look around and see a lot of flat space. You can talk about having space but if you don't have enough space to put in a certain number of students. . . that's why I asked Bernie how many of the current spaces are presently utilized and can take over 30 students. I'd like to get some sense of utilization based on the model that requires us to have large classes. Because they can't have it both ways. You can't have faculty members going to a class of 25 because that's the only space that's available and then saying to him or her you should be in a class on Saturday of 120 when there's not even enough space on Saturday for 120. What is the bearing weight - what can this institution bear in terms of certain class sizes distributed 7 days a week?

R. Armiñana - There is the FTE of the campus.

R. Coleman-Senghor - That can be mapped to on 7 days a week?

R. Armiñana - No, they have a rule. So many people, so many spaces, so many days, so many hours. At this point with what we have we will exceed capacity in '07.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - '05 - '06.

R. Armiñana - 10,000 is the maximum capacity of the University. Over that we would have to build.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - Approximately 7900 for that FTEF without going to year round operations.

R. Coleman-Senghor - These abstract formulas, they seem to want to have it both ways. What are the constraints that we have? What can I do as a faculty, what can I encourage the faculty to do? Does that not, in fact, place us in a situation where we're saying let's go for larger classes? I'll come in on Fridays and, I've said that, and you know what? They can't find a place for me on Friday.

R. Armiñana - Let me tell you what the constraints are. It's not so much physical as cultural. People say "I like to teach in Stevenson 102, Tuesdays and Thursdays at 10am. I have been teaching in Stevenson and therefore anything else I'm upset about." There is a space, but it might not be convenient. That's one part of the constraints. And when you're not in a crisis you can accommodate that convenience as we have done over and over. We are not going to get to a new building for four to six years. We're going to remodel one but not get a new one. We can build buildings until we run out of space. That's the problem that Chico has. It's very serious. They have budget cuts and no growth money. Because they have hit, physically, their capacity. If we have layoffs, Chico is the place it is going to happen first.

N. Byrne - We have passed our time certain

Resolution On the War in Iraq

S. McKillop raised a concern about the recent passage of a resolution on the war in Iraq at the Senate. She argued that the Senate should not take such an action without consulting the faculty. The resolution came out of the blue and people were intimidated when it went to a second reading so quickly. A lot of people didn't vote which was unusual. They didn't know how to take a stand, so they didn't. The Senate should think about what is appropriate for the Senate to do. Even though it's legal, she argued it was not the right way to go.

Discussion resulted with some members arguing for various ways to change, discuss or deal with the issue S. McKillop raised. Other members argued against any action or agendaizing of the issue at the Senate.

Coleman-Senghor noted part of the problem is that the Senate passed something the force of which we are still puzzling about. R. Armiñana stated that the University cannot suspend classes and so the Senate has before it an action that it cannot do. This has been checked out legally.

It was determined by an examining the minutes of the Senate meeting in question that the amendment states that the suspension of classes is voluntary.

R. Coleman-Senghor stated that he was not bringing up the issue of faculty, but of students. The faculty can leave voluntarily but the students do not have that choice.

The body decided not to agendize any item for the Senate regarding these issues.

R. Karlsrud suggested that the Senate should ask for documentation when an item comes to it from another campus body through a Senator.

Stuart Jones, Director of Development

S. Jones expressed his appreciation to be at the Executive committee for the first time.

S. Jones - After talking to various faculty I came to the conclusion that our office needs to do a better job communicating you and the Faculty Senate about what we're doing. At the same time we need to be open to feedback and input about how we are doing. Before I get in to talking about how we can be helpful in the campaign you are launching, I wanted to let you know about some changes in our office and get your input. I know some of you have concerns. I welcome that. Just since we've got going two people are now dedicated to academic fundraising. We want to go down two paths – the Green Music Center and academic fundraising. Lance Plaza and Byron Boyce are almost exclusively doing academic fundraising. About five months ago we launched with Bernie and the Deans an academic fundraising priority list. Each of the Deans took to the Department and faculty members an opportunity to submit a proposal form. Those proposals have now been brought to the Dean's Council and then discussed and discussion is happening, even now, with the President's Cabinet to really refine what the academic priorities are. We don't set those priorities. The Development office responds to the academic priorities. I feel deeply about that. We simple weigh in on the fundability of those ideas. We changed our focus somewhat with the Green Music Center. We realized that the people that are going to make or break the Green Music Center are a relatively small group of people. Our focus is much more of a rifle than shotgun approach. We've seen the results of that. As you know we are within \$5 million of construction and fully anticipate that we'll start this summer. But we haven't done that at the cost of academic fundraising. I think it is important that you know that. I know you have some concerns about our budget which will be approximately \$628,000 next year. I would very much welcome your feedback on what your greatest concerns are about the Development Office funding and perhaps I can respond to some questions.

E. Stanny – How do you decide which donors you use for which purposes? Of the \$628,000 what is the return to Academic Affairs, in terms of what Academic Affairs contributes and the return in dollars raised?

S. Jones – I think it is important to match university needs with donor interests. That's how you maximize gifts. So it's very important we be close to our donors and share with them the variety of needs of the university, then try to match where they want to be involved. I think it is interesting to see the number of people who have come to the university through the doors of the

Green Music Center and then have given in other areas. I've seen the same thing through the years with Athletics, it may not be the most popular thing with the faculty, but it's just the front door to their experience with the university. I'll get back to you on your second question if you want a particular number as to what the return or cost/benefit is. I can tell you last year \$8.3 million was raised through the Development Office, the year before that was \$10 million, the year before that was \$16 million. So I think it is a good cost/benefit. I don't have the specifics on academics but am happy to come back and give you that kind of detail. One of the reasons I thought it would be well to come here is to discuss issues that you would like me to take to the full faculty Senate.

R. Luttmann – I think it would be very useful to invite Stuart to the Senate. I think we're all aware that there's been a lot of scuttlebutt about the Development office - essentially because of the budget crisis, a lot of rumor. It would be useful for Stuart to make a presentation at the Senate and answer questions like how much is budgeted, how much effort is spent on academic fundraising, position of the Green Music Center, etc. As well as questions from the Senators.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I would like to get some sense of the cost of maintaining the Center because what I got from Larry earlier on was the issue of how this Center was going to be supported. In the present drive for a fiscal plan for an endowment, I would need to know exactly where efforts are going to go because it's very clear that it's not only about putting up a building, it's about continuing program activities that will fill the building. If I'm correct, Larry, you talked at the Senate about the capacity for this building to support itself and have a return earned at a future date. I'm interested in where does the endowment fit in the funding of the operational size of the house, especially in terms of staff and a relationship between faculty and the programs. I am interested to know whether we have a Chair or if the decision has been made and you have been instructed to seek funding for other kinds of staff or personnel. I think that would give people a clear picture of how the expenditures of this plant, once it is built, will be taken care of.

S. Jones – I'm going to have Larry respond first and then I'll chip in. I know Larry's put together the business plan about the staffing, at least the state funded.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – I'm happy to do that. It really relates to three big areas in terms of funding the on-going operations. Two of them are easy to get your hands on and the third is a bit more difficult. The first one is the basics to maintain the infrastructure - the lawn, the air conditioning equipment, the custodians – because this building has approximately 100,000 square feet we estimate given the CSU formulas in this regard it will cost about \$640,000 a year to maintain that particular building. We're fortunate that this gift will be provided to the people of California and the State recognizes we have a responsibility to maintain that structure as they do the

Schultz Center at \$6.40 a square foot. That's a restricted fund. It will actually turn out to be more because the cost of maintaining buildings is a bit more than \$6.40 a square foot. The second one relates to the curricular offerings and is coming through the committee, that I assume is being created, that at some point as those curricular opportunities are defined both for co-curricular and curricular there will be funding for them again through state funding. That's a formal curriculum which would happen through the marginal cost formula. If that particular aspect of our curriculum was to grow and new faculty positions would be added, such as Theater Arts and Music, and follows the normal academic plan, those resources should come as well. Similarly in the co-curriculum sense, the Center for the Performing Arts which is, of course, the umbrella organization within the School of Arts and Humanities which will operate the Green Music Center curricular and co-curricular activities, has funding from the Instructional Related Activities program as well as the normal revenue of producing activities that it generates currently through ticket sales and things of that nature. The third part that gets to be a little more difficult to handle are the costs for programming aspects beyond the formal teaching part and the formal performing part that's not related to students. Those generally require arts underwriting. Generally speaking private underwriting or government underwriting such as the National Endowment for the Arts or corporations underwrite performances. And that's true in all arts organizations. And that's where Stu comes into play and that's where the endowment comes into play and that's a little trickier. Generally, the formula is an event not academically related will generate on a good day 60% and 40% will have to be obtained from private sources. So that's where the fund-raising organization comes in to make that whole.

S. Jones – And I'll just tell you this summer we will be forming an Advisory Board for the Green Music Center that will consist of – first some of the people who have made a significant contribution and those that are interested in helping in the future. That group I anticipate to, in time, raise upward of a million per year in an annual fund and that endowment will be on-going and build up over a number of years. As you may know we have 7.4 million dollars in charitable trusts, those are coming in and those will be put toward the endowment to help with programs. So I think that will be an on-going campaign, but nothing will be as vital as this Advisory Board that we're putting together this summer.

N. Byrne noted that Stuart is coming to the Senate and further discussion about this might be deferred until then.

E. Stanny - I think it would be useful to bring to the Senate how increases in, say a sports performance, and or the benefit of the music center increased things like alumni donations. I've read that too, that it is just phenomenal the increases you'll see when a sports team is doing really well and I wonder if there is any evidence for a music center. I think that would be a big sell for the faculty.

R. Coleman-Senghor – Getting back a bit to Larry's concern, my concern is

about the operational costs. As we have to address the question of underperforming endowments, what kind of strategy do we have for dealing with underperforming endowments? The other thing it would do well from your side is to show faculty what the numbers are like in terms of contacts you have made with potential donors and how some are actually chosen. I'd like to have a couple of examples. Especially if they're not anonymous – to say that we brought this person forward to talk to them about to the Music Center, but they chose to donate to support students or in identifying that they decided to divide. I think we'll need some examples of that so we will know that that it is not only a stance that you're taking but that it produced results.

S. Jones - I'm going to be more than happy to do that.

R. Luttmann suggested that Stuart be given the opportunity to give materials to Laurel if he chooses to do so to put in the packet. It's helpful to have that in advance.

It was decided to have Stuart Jones at the Senate on April 24th.

Report from Chair of Structure and Functions

C. Nelson - I am on the committee that is planning Freshmen Convocation for the Fall. It's going to be held on August 26, which is a Tuesday, the same day as orientation and advising between 11:30 and 1:00. I'd like to encourage all faculty to attend, and if you have regalia, to wear it. We are going to be inviting President Armiñana and if he is available and the then Provost, the President of the Associated Students, hopefully get the gospel choir going a little bit. And then we adjourn to a pizza or some other form of lunch which is not set yet. Second I'd also like to ask if we have any plans for the Faculty Convocation – have we talked about a date or anything?

It was determined to that the date for the convocation has been set. It is August 25, 2003.

Report from Vice President of Administration and Finance

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – I have two items I'd like to speak about. The first one is the Provost search committee has announced the names of our finalists. I have to say the largely faculty committee that I've had the privilege of working with over the past few months in narrowing down the pool from some 100 twenty people to five has been a remarkable experience for me. And I think we've worked in a very collegiate fashion and identified five people, I think the campus community can feel very proud of. They will be joining us for visits on the week of April 21st. I think the President is going to have a difficult choice. And they are all very impressive. Their resumes or vitae, as I've come to learn they're called in the academic world, are in my office, Bernie's office and On Reserve in the library. I encourage every one to the look at them. The reason I bring this up is that on the interview day, and this

is only relevant to the 24th, at 2:30 to 3:15 there is an open meeting for the faculty. In light of that the Senate might want to consider starting their Senate meeting later on that day.

N. Byrne – Absolutely.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth - The faculty meeting is 45 minutes as are all the meetings with the candidates. There is just not enough time for all people who want to meet with the candidates to do so. If we did, literally, the candidates would leave at three in the morning. We tried after considerable discussion in the committee to provided 45 - 50 minutes of meeting time and then literally ten minutes to go in the bathroom and walk to the next meeting. They go from the seven in the morning to ten at night and that's the agenda and I think there is an hour right before dinner when they can collect their thoughts. A very intense day. The good news is that right after the faculty meeting there is the open community forum, so if professor wish they can continue on and they will be joined by other members of the campus community. So really the faculty have about an hour and a half with the candidate when you think about it that way. That's the best we can do given the clock and human capacity. It's a very strenuous day. I guess that's part of the test.

R. Luttmann – Do you want to mention about the feedback?

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – Yes, at each meeting a member of the search committee will be present. We haven't quite figured out how we are going to obtain input from folks. We are not going to be accepting input by email due to confidentially reasons. We will probably have little index cards where people can write their commentaries for the committee. The committee wants to gather that information. We're going to meet on the first of April to flesh that out. My sense is that's how we'll do it. The budget, from a campus prospective we're now in a hiatus. Right now were in a holding pattern until the May revision. That's the next big issue. What were doing at the campus level it is that the attention have shifted very much into Academic Affairs because of the President's position to allocate the \$650,000.00 into direct access for students through courses for the 03-04 budget year. It is important to fully understand in a rather specific way, assuming the Governor's budget, how that affects course sections and part-time faculty employment. It is very very important for that to be clarified so that Bernie and I can advise the President as to where we stand to close the gap if there is one. We would like complete that, though I think I will be recommending to the Provost and the President that we postpone the President's Budget Advisory committee to allow Academic Affairs time to fully grasp that. It is a hard task. We're asking the academic units to totally shift thinking in light of the President's decision last week. We're really trying to have these academic decisions bubble up from the Deans and the Chairs. Ideally as you close down the month of April and go into to the May, we can make recommendations to the President on the 17th. So that's where we stand on the budget and then we'll deal with the revision and when the revision comes.

R. Coleman-Senghor – This question is directed to both you and President Armiñana, and I hear from you President Armiñana that you're seeking flexibility with respect to the budget from the Governor. My question is could not that flexibility be given in the departments? I'm thinking of a particular teacher, Kim Hester-Williams, who is an outstanding teacher and yet she is trying to meet the needs of students the Teacher Preparation program. She is going to be teaching a class of maybe about 60 students, one class about 80 and another 25 and handling of a large number of students. Isn't it possible that some of this money going directly to instruction, can't we just say, here you've got some money? Why can't that happen?

R. Armiñana - There are 214 sections that are in danger of being lost. The purpose is to have 214 sections covered. You have two issues - one is dealing with FERP and the second it is that people don't want to lose their jobs. I'm trying to do both and on that level of flexibility, we might meet the number one and not number two. I'm trying to meet both at the same time. I've told the Deans I'm not giving money for renovating a laboratory – this money is not for that to because you cannot do both.

R. Coleman-Senghor – I'm not asking that. I take your point . . .

R. Armiñana – We are trying to do two things at the same time.

R. Coleman-Senghor - I see if the point that is it can the lead to this fiscal issue which Larry has raised, if you lay off part-timers, you may have to hire them and you have the cost that is involved in that. If our effort is to cover the classes and at the same time serve the students, when a student has an instructor who is there to serve them in terms of teacher preparation that is a direct curricular issue. If we're looking at both these issues then I can understand that.

R. Armiñana - Absolutely.

A. Warmoth - I understand what you're saying about the fact that we want to preserve sections and we also want to deal with the issue of minimizing layoffs, but it seems to me there is a third element in this situation that we haven't yet addressed and that is the elements of enrollments targets.

R. Armiñana – It's not an issue.

A. Warmoth – If it's not an issue. . .

R. Armiñana – It's not an issue because it's a given. That has to happen.

A. Warmoth – Understanding that it seems to me that to one of the realities that we're in is that we are under that constraints of enrollments targets but that the same time this additional flexibility with regard to sections and the hiring of lectures it is being injected into the planning and scheduling process

fairly late in the game. The reality is that putting these sections back at this stage of the game has very different consequences than it would have had they if they had been there from the beginning. In that sense I wonder if there might be some value to having flexibility in decision-making at the school and department level within the parameters of the overall target?

R. Armiñana – I will amend my two moves to three moves. Meeting enrollment targets, providing the sections at the people who have (unintelligible) covered. The three, however, to go together, they are jointly tied together. We have done it every year I've been here and we will do it to again this year. I have no doubt these three things can be done. No good deed goes unpunished.

R. Coleman-Senghor – What's the good deed? You found money that was already there.

R. Armiñana – You'd prefer not to find it?

R. Coleman-Senghor – I would preferred to have an accounting system the would let me know . . .

R. Armiñana – We have it.

E. Stanny – If the May revise comes and there is a big cut, and students have already signed up for classes and there is a big cut in the classes, what happens?

It was determined that the fall would stay the same and classes could be cut in the Spring.

R. Karlsrud – For years as Dean we would set aside dollars to pay bills across the year. And very seldom would we get much of that back. All the Dean knew they set aside some dollars for that purpose. This is the one year where we don't have to pay them, we hope, thank you President Arminana, and then those dollars can be put into play. I know there is going to be a parking problem in the Fall but the School of Social Sciences has put in 26 to 27 sections. All the departments won't get their first choice, but based on the need to make target that's the best they will get in the Fall. In Spring we have more time to plan. Believe me it is better to have the dollars to put into play than not. With my Chairs I said, yes, I have growth money, but unless you put in a section that is going to represent growth and basically allow the school to make its target you're not going to get the money. I did it all the time. I assume every one of the Deans even today do that. I assume it's being done at the Provost level. It's the only way you can insure that those sections will help us meet target because no matter what anybody says about what the three priorities are that's number one. We'll be giving back millions of dollars if we don't meet target. We won't be worrying about whether we lay off lecturers.

R. McNamara – I appreciate your comments and the need for planning and the need for flexibility and I support that. I think that the faculty gave a pretty clear message that we were quite concerned about these layoffs and the impact this was going to have on our departments and on university as a whole. As well as the impact on individuals. I felt that when we put that message out there this was a number one priority and I support that this money is being targeted for that reason. But that does not mean that, of course, in the bigger picture the flexibility is not needed for good academic planning.

L. Furukawa-Schlereth – I have to say Bob (Coleman-Senghor) I'm a little distressed by your observation that the accounting system somehow did not reveal these resources or poor financial management let them come forward at a late date. I really think that's unfair. You need to understand that I went way out on limb at the end of the third quarter to say to the President at this stage of the game with 90 days still to go in this fiscal year that you should allocate almost three-quarters of a million dollars for direct instruction in a future fiscal period. I think that was an important recommendation to make in order to provide some of reassurance to part-time faculty and our students and that they would have the curriculum in place to make the Fall terms. But it's extraordinarily risky. I think the President has made that clear. Most financial officers would not even come forward with that recommendation until much much closer to June 30th. The financial accounting system is quite accurate. It's just that at this time it seemed to me a more strategic decision and I commend the President for taking great risks. We could end this year in deficit. It is entirely possible.

R. Coleman-Senghor - I want to temper my response by saying that I am very pleased to see that I will have my colleagues with me in the Fall. I also have to say that, President, and you can correct me on this, as I sit here and listen to the presentation of these issues – there are a number of us who have run businesses or handled businesses and understand of the how things like this work. We understand decisions have to be made in terms of risking dollars to make dollars. All that I'm saying is that it is not a question of having money brought forward to us at this time. I knew there was a reserve. An institution that doesn't have reserves, even in the toughest of times, can hardly claim to be in a position to manage itself. So the question becomes, one you as an executive officer, as a fiscal officer have to decide when and how to put those reserves in. And I fault you for deciding to do it now. My concern was what was the thinking behind it, the principle issue is not just putting more students in, obviously we will need help to make the FTE. So the issue is now can we balance our needs to meet the FTE with our need to provide employment for our colleagues. That to me a fine way of doing it. But personally I do not want to be viewed as a faculty member we don't appreciate that because I raised issues about the principles or reasons guiding your decision-making. I think that that is part of our deliberative process. Your presentation of this has not gone unappreciated but it was not appreciated because it was not understood. Now that I understand it, I appreciated it.

R. Armiñana – Let me tell you, you got the inference totally wrong. My inference was I know, at this moment, there are a bunch of AM's and departments who have a plan, no matter how faulty, because of lack of resources. They have it done and since Thursday they have to redo it. It's an additional level of work and an additional level of complications. That's what I was referring to – no good deed goes unpunished. Finding money makes you change your plans.

R. Coleman-Senghor – My apologies.

R. Armiñana – I hope I continue to disrupt their plans as more resources are found.

N. Byrne asked for the meeting to continue and to 5:07. There were no objections.

The first business item - Report Protocol at the Senate - was deferred the next meeting

Draft of WASC Report

R. Coleman-Senghor asked that the draft of the WASC report be sent to the Senate as an information item. E. Stanny remarked FSAC looked at the report and has a number of suggestions. N. Byrne stated that it appears we should not have this on the agenda for the third.

Request for input for the emeritus dinner program

L. Holmstrom asked for suggestions for the Emeritus Dinner program as she has to plan the logistics this summer. This item was deferred to the next agenda.

Posthumous degree for David Immel

N. Byrne introduced the letter from the Sociology Department regarding a posthumous degree for David Immel. He noted that this is being proposed in large part because of what it would mean to his family. He reviewed the procedures for posthumous degrees. C. Nelson suggested that because he does not meet the criteria for a B.A. Degree, the letter include the department's take on what ever information the Senate needs to consider a Certificate of Recognition. R. Coleman-Senghor suggested it be referred to the Standards committee for a recommendation. N. Byrne noted that the procedures do not required that and, in reference to Catherine's suggestion, the "or" provision does render the student eligible for a posthumous Bachelors degree. R. Coleman-Senghor argued that it was appropriate for the Executive Committee to refer. R. Karlsrud suggested that the Department of Sociology needs to address the criteria in the letter. S. Wilson pointed out a couple of things were missing from the letter. N. Byrne thanked people for

their suggestions and will refer the item back to Sociology. It was decided that if the changes were made it could go ahead to the Senate.

Senate agenda

1. Endorsement of Resolution from the Statewide Academic Senate: Student Fees in the CSU: Mitigating Their Effects - *2nd Reading* - R. Luttmann - attachment
2. Posthumous degree award for David V. Immel - attachment

Meeting adjourned 5:10

Respectfully submitted by Laurel Holmstrom