CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of
The ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as corrected

Minutes of the Meeting of April 22, 2003

Members Present: Dee Andrews, Cal Caplan, Alex Cassuto, Stevina Evuleoche, Karina Garbesi, Julia Norton, Norma Rees, Hank Reichman, Don Sawyer, Emily Stoper, Alison Warriner, Don Wort

Member Absent: none

Visitors: Carl Bellone, Susan Correia, Mark Karplus, Nancy Harrison, William Langan, Rita Liberti, Frank Martino, Sonjia Redmond, William Reuter

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S (Caplan/Sawyer) to approve.

Wort asked to add, under item 4, a replacement for Terry Jones on the Academic Senate for Spring.

Agenda was approved as modified.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 8, 2003

M/S (Andrews/Sawyer)

Reichman requested that mention of future tenure track allocations in the Department of Philosophy be added to the discussion of item 8. He will work with the Secretary to amend the minutes regarding that issue. Stoper mentioned that Sonjia Redmond’s name was misspelled and needed to be corrected.

Minutes were approved as modified.

3. Reports:

No reports were presented due to the abbreviate nature of the meeting

4. Appointments:

M/S/P (Warriner/Caplan) to appoint Tom Hird to replace Terry Jones on the Academic Senate for the Spring Quarter.

5. Continuing discussion of the Proposed Creation of the Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA).

Wort began the discussion with a brief introduction. The initial discussion of this topic had taken place at the XCOM meeting of April 8 when both the President and the Provost were unavailable. All members present at that time expressed their desire to have a thorough discussion with the President when she could next attend XCOM. He also mentioned that a
change in the bylaws of the Academic Senate requires overall faculty approval through a special ballot.

Reichman continued this discussion by stating that the Constitution allows the bylaws to be changed by a 50% vote of the faculty actually voting as long as a majority of the faculty votes. The current proposal would establish a new budget allocation committee and transfer the resource allocation function from CAPR to this new committee.

Rees was concerned about the function of the existing Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) which has six faculty representatives, five of which are elected (by the Senate). She was concerned that the work of the new committee would mirror the work of BAC. She suggested a number of alternatives including having BAC undertake the newly proposed functions outlined in the current document or eliminating BAC and giving its functions to COBRA.

Reichman responded that BAC is a committee designed to advise the President while COBRA would be an Academic Senate committee reporting to the Senate. He suggested it would be up to the President to decide if BAC was still useful once COBRA takes up its charge.

Rees reiterated the overlapping functions of the two committees. She felt it was counterproductive to provide materials to 2 committees. She also pointed out that COBRA, as currently constituted, does not include staff or student representatives. These constituencies are represented on BAC.

Garbesi suggested that the members of BAC be made a part of COBRA. Wort added that the campus should refer to the “best practices” from all the universities. Many campuses do have more than one budget committee. Reichman concurred and cited Long Beach State that has a Financial Affairs Council, a faculty committee similar to our proposed COBRA. It also has a Resource Planning Task Force, a broader committee (in terms of representation) to prepare the budget. The difficulty with BAC is that it meets just once per quarter rather than on a set rotation as is the case with other Academic Senate standing committees.

Rees asked if COBRA would restrict itself to faculty issues. Reichman answered that it would not restrict itself in that way, but would look at the entire budget. Faculty has not had an effective voice in budgetary issues and this may well be due, at least in part, to our own negligence. Campus budgetary committees on other campuses, particularly at LBS and San Diego State grew out of much more difficult situations than we currently face. COBRA would give the faculty a clearer voice.

Rees felt that the way that COBRA would function has not been made clear. She again mentioned the potential overlay of its functions with BAC. Langan supported the formation of the new committee and reported that all of the current members of BAC support the creation of this new committee. He felt that a dedicated budgetary committee of the faculty would produce faculty with much more knowledge of the budgetary process. Rees responded that the appropriate administrative office has provided all information requested by BAC. The fact that the faculty is disappointed with the functioning of BAC is not a reason to create an extra new committee. BAC could meet weekly. It could also be expanded to nine faculty representatives. They could be meeting as members of the Senate and members of BAC. Then she would have one body to advise. Langan reiterated that membership of BAC is not a faculty issue. Norton concurred with Reichman that the faculty has not done all it could in budgetary matters.

Creating COBRA and having COBRA members also be members of BAC is a good idea. Caplan added that the current BAC faculty members couldn’t provide the President with the advice that has been requested. COBRA would solidify and broaden faculty knowledge of budgets. COBRA would compliment BAC rather than overlap it. This would create a place for faculty to focus on budgetary issues and a means to inform the Academic Senate of these issues. The creation of a specific budgetary committee would be a way of providing the best expertise available by the faculty. This would enable the faculty to make more reasoned suggestions than what has happened in the past. COBRA would report to the Academic Senate while BAC is a
Presidential committee. Rees clarified that COBRA, as a Senate committee, may get better and more intensive information.

Reichman, echoing other comments, felt that COBRA is a way of creating greater commitment from the faculty and allowing it to provide more meaningful input. He added that BAC could be all or part of COBRA plus added members that the President included on BAC.

Rees indicated that the current chair of BAC is the Vice President, Administration and Business Affairs. Some details can be worked out later [to coordinate the two committees.] Rees favored a single university committee with COBRA as an element of that, also reporting to the Senate. She would like to see it in the document.

Caplan explained that the University’s Vice-Presidents are currently charged with developing their own budgets. The faculty needs to do the same. The Vice Presidents work year round on their budgets. Faculty would be doing this as well by meeting bi-weekly throughout the year. Having a Senate committee increases the responsibility of the faculty. Analysis and advice would be better thought out with a new committee. Rees wondered if there is enough faculty willing to devote this much time and effort to do this. She added that she does not feel she will be able to staff two committees. Wort felt that BAC could meet separately but the structure of BAC has not lent itself to providing meaningful analysis and advice. A committee of the Academic Senate would give more structure to the process.

At this point Stoper requested that we move on to another agenda issue since we seemed to be repeating our arguments. Reichman responded to the President’s question by explaining that the original proposal would have eliminated CAPR, but it was agreed to have CAPR continue its primary functions and see if there are enough faculty willing to become involved in a fifth Senate standing committee.

Since no vote or action by XCOM was required the next agenda item was considered.

6. 02-03 BAA 1 Incorporating the CSU Plan to Increase the Percentage of Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty in the California State University.

M/S (Evuleocha/Caplan) to forward to the Academic Senate.

Stoper began the discussion by asking what a plan would look like other than one that would simply increase the number of searches. Langan responded that the statewide Academic Senate encouraged local campuses to institute campus committees to achieve the objectives. Stoper asked if the plan would then be the number of searches necessary to achieve the stated objectives. Langan responded that the campus committee would also study the impact of any increase in tenure track positions on the existing group of lecturers. Rees suggested that COBRA, if constituted, would most probably be looking at the tenure track issue. Each year the Provost asks for ten additional tenure track positions as part of his budget request. She wondered what more this committee would do beyond what was already being done. She thought that this shouldn’t be made a subcommittee of COBRA, but one of its activities. Langan responded that since COBRA does not yet exist this proposed committee would be able to deliberate. Caplan, reaching back in time, recalled that the campus had a separate BAC of the Provost which discussed how to increase tenure track positions. This committee would perform a similar function. Rees felt that there was too much duplication and she would not approve of this committee.

Martino, also reaching back in time, recalled that he and Gonzales (AVP, Academic Resources) developed a model that showed the cost of replacing retired or separated faculty. He uses this model every year and said he would provide it to others. Increasing the ratio of tenure track and
tenured faculty to lecturers costs money. He reiterated his support for more tenure track faculty but this would come with a reduction in budget allocations to some other area.

*At Wort’s suggestion it was M/S (Caplan/Garbesi) to continue the discussion for ten minutes beyond the normal time of adjournment.*

Reichman agreed that this committee would have to deal with budgetary matters, but it should not be a third budget committee. It should work within the recommendations made by the tripartite statewide university commission. Everyone recognized that implementation of those recommendations would require extra allocations of funds by the legislature. If the funds were forthcoming each campus would need to determine how much it would cost. The system is unlikely to get any added funding in the next two years to implement the recommendations. But, by having a campus committee, it keeps the issue alive at the administrative and legislative level.

Langan asked that the penultimate sentence be reviewed; this states that campus committees would parallel the system-wide plan. If the system-wide plan was postponed by lack of funding so would the campus plan. If funding were to be passed by the legislature each campus would have a plan in place. Garbesi added that each campus needs to do a minimum amount to carry out the state mandate. Wort agreed with Reichman, Langan and Garbesi that we should have a plan in place.

Rees, at this point, informed XCOM that the projected campus costs of an eight-year implementation program are already available and that her office would be happy to provide this information to XCOM. She reiterated that the budget responsibilities should be folded into COBRA and that she could provide the numbers in ACR 73 context.

At this point Stoper urged a no vote on the motion based upon the available information to be provided by the President’s office to XCOM and FDEC. Evuleocha agreed. The motion to send this to the Senate failed.

*The remaining items on the agenda were postponed until the next meeting*

11. Adjournment

M/S/P (Cassuto/Stoper) to adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted,
Alex Cassuto, Secretary