Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 17, 2009

Members present: Jennifer Eagan, Susan Gubernat, Derek Kimball, Chris Lubwama, Jim Mitchell, Susan Opp, Asha Rao, Henry Reichman, Dianne Woods

Members absent: Denise Fleming, Mo Qayoumi

Guests: Dee Andrews, Carl Bellone, Cal Caplan, Linda Dalton, Fred Dorer, Mark Karplus, Michael Lee, Tom McCoy, Penny McCullagh, Sally Murphy, Glen Perry, Don Sawyer, Donna Wiley, Rhea Williamson, Gale Young

1. Approval of the agenda

Derek Kimball agreed to be the acting secretary in Fleming’s absence.

M/S/P (Lubwama/Eagan) to approve the agenda as amended by Opp.

09-10 CAPR 8 and 09-10 CIC 9 were added and the Task Force report discussion was given a time certain.

2. Approval of the minutes

No minutes to approve.

3. Reports

   A. Report of the Chair

   Opp reminds members and guests that there will be a meeting of the University Planning and Budget Committee (UPABC) after the ExCom meeting.

   B. Report of the President

   No report. President is at the BoT meeting.

   C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

   Report postponed. Will give full report at the Senate next week.

4. Appointments

None.

5. 2008-09 CAPR 42 revised, CRJA Program Review 08-09

M/S/P (Mitchell/Eagan) to place on Senate agenda.

   Reichman expresses concern about the annual monitoring, and will raise the point on the Senate floor.
6. 2009-10 CAPR 2, MS Kinesiology Modification  
   2009-10 CIC 2, Option Discontinuances for MS Kinesiology

M/S/P (Eagan /Mitchell) to place on Senate agenda.

   Discussion initiated by Reichman over the title of CAPR 2. Agreed that revision of MS was not in purview of Senate, only discontinuance of the options. Subject line would be changed in Senate document, Opp will explain on floor.

7. 2009-10 CAPR 4, Communication minors modifications;  
   2009-10 CIC 4, Discontinuances and New Minor in Communication

M/S/P (Eagan /Lubwama) to place on Senate agenda.

8. 2009-10 CAPR 5, MA Speech Communication title change;  
   2009-10 CIC 3, Title Change in M.A. in Speech Communication

M/S/P (Kimball /Gubernat) to place on Senate agenda.

9. 2009-10 CAPR 6, BS Business Administration Options Discontinuance;  
   2009-10 CIC 5, Discontinuances of Options in B.S. in Business Administration

M/S/P (Lubwama /Eagan) to place on Senate agenda.

10. 2009-10 CIC 6, Policy on Self-Support Courses and Programs

M/S/P (Eagan /Lubwama) to place on Senate agenda.

   Reichman notes that the term “stateside” is insufficiently formal, suggests changing to “state support.” Mitchell asks if state-supported cohorts are affected? Eagan replies that only new courses/programs will be affected.

11. 2009-10 CIC 7, New Course Add Period Policy

M/S (Rao /Eagan) to place on Senate agenda.

M/S/P (Mitchell /Gubernat) to refer back to CIC for further consideration.

   - Discussion of meaning of “administrative approval.” Unclear if this means faculty member, Department, College, etc. Eagan notes that department feedback suggested this flexible policy, as there was concern over getting courses filled. Concern expressed by Dalton that an absolutely clear (explicit) policy is needed regarding procedures and approvals, otherwise bureaucracy may be overwhelmed. Her suggestion is to require faculty and department signatures for withdrawal. Caplan and Kimball offer that “appropriate” department approval would be most similar to present procedure.
   - Gubernat expresses that 11 days is too long a period for adding courses, 20% of class will be missed. Opp suggests this is purpose of Department approval.
   - Reichman suggests that if filling courses is a problem then the wrong courses are being offered. This policy seems to create more work for department administrators in a time of decreased resources. He prefers 6-7 instructional days and no admin approval.
   - Eagan responds that the policy attempts to address add/drop issues with massive drops at last minute that leave no opportunity for adds.
   - Rao suggests shortening the drop time and lengthen the add time; expresses belief that these issues require more consideration.
   - Murphy notes that limit on withdrawals in combination with this policy really affects students. There is a 28 unit max for “W”s.
12. **2009-10 CIC 8**, CIC Subcommittee membership for 09-10

M/S/P (Mitchell /Lubwama) to approve appointments.

It was noted that Mitchell Craig is tentative.

13. **2009-10 CIC 9**, New Maximum Units for Enrollment Policy

M/S/P (Rao /Reichman) to place on Senate agenda.

- It is effective Fall, 2010. “Enrollment Policy” is catalog language.
- No data on whether high unit enrollment students typically drop classes, but it is noted that many other campuses are doing this.
- 12 units is full-time for Financial Aid and insurance, also for foreign students.

14. **2009-10 cFAC 1**, Suspension of new RTP requirement for Departmental Professional Guidelines

M/S/P (Rao /Gubernat) to place on Senate agenda.

15. **2009-10 CAPR 8**, Public Administration MA 5-Year Review

- Information item: upon further consideration, the Public Administration program faculty requested the opportunity to submit a revised self-study, five-year plan and program response to the Outside Reviewer’s Report, and CAPR would re-review the program in 2009-10 and submit a new report to the Senate.

16. Discussion of the Report from the Task Force on Academic Reorganization and possible ExCom recommendations based on that report. (09-10 BEC 5 draft)

- Opp gives overview of the Task Force report.
- Gubernat notes that the audience for the report is the President (also cabinet and Deans). Suggests that recommendations should be stated immediately, as opposed to beginning with guiding principles. Recommendations should be prioritized. Wordy, but likes the punch language of the chart
- Lubwama notes statewide policy should be considered: do actions require CSU system or local campus decision or approval? In particular reduction of T-12 assignments.
- Lubwama believes document should be narrowed down and dollar amount of savings should be provided for the suggested actions such as moving courses to self support. Opp notes that ExCom, Task Force has no way to know dollar amount of savings, no information on these issues.
- Rush-Woods recommends bulleted bold titles on each suggestion – focus on how to make bulleted points operational. Eagan agrees on appropriate structure for the intended audience and moving guiding principles to end of document. Rao expresses desire to keep guiding principles at top – important when “transformational changes” are being considered.
- Reichman concurs that all recommendations should be in bulleted format. Guiding principles could be first recommendation.
- Reichman feels that the recommendation on GE is too vague and too complicated: different courses for majors/GE (CSCI model) vs. majors and GE classes one and the same (CLASS model).
- Reichman notes that it is very hard to assess dollar targets and savings. Need these to be as clear as possible. Must involve faculty at all levels in discussions (example: get faculty to work out how to appropriately downsize departments), and involve faculty at every stage of implementation.
- Kimball emphasizes that SFR efficiency is equally important as dollar savings – must meet enrollment target or face ever-increasing budget shortfalls in future years, a downward spiral.
In some sense it would be better to place first priority on meeting enrollment target, which will not be easy given budget reduction, and second priority on satisfying budget constraints.

- Kimball notes that GE is critically important for students but very complex, considering budget and enrollment challenges solving the GE issues is both time-sensitive and needs to be done right. Opp notes that we need to move from a “growth model” of GE class offerings where supply to some extent could outstrip demand to a “scarcity model” where minimum GE course offerings are protected.

- Eagan suggests that there should be two major GE recommendations: (1) Provost-level decision about GE funding allocation, more power to GE coordinator, and (2) coordinate GE with CIC and other existing faculty governance structures. Eagan notes that different colleges don’t participate in GE equally, there is disparate interest.

- Reichman suggests that GE recommendation should be phrased in terms of developing more coordinated allocation of resources to GE, with details to be worked out. Focus on avoiding both waste and inadequate resources for GE, and degree completion for students.

- Rao notes that this was not a Task Force recommendation, and in fact we don’t have enough information for a specific recommendation. Opp explains that the point is less prescriptive and more about desired outcomes.

- Provost Dorer states that this may not be able to be solved this year, but it is definitely something to look at long-term. Need to take time to do it right. Opp notes that the problem is already here now – we are still in “growth mode” with respect to GE offerings, and there are no protections for GE course offerings when the cuts to classes occur.

- Murphy explains that there are already lines of students that can’t register for GE classes, some of which have been closed to majors only. Need to think through cross-college obligations for university as a whole.

- Provost Dorer agrees that there is urgency, and that in fact the administration is allocating $300k specifically to shore up GE offerings.

- Rush-Woods argues that language about “high-cost” programs needs to be removed. Not well-defined and potentially dangerous.

- Reichman reminds that we need to recognize when GE program is revised that there are many courses that do double-duty as major courses and GE courses.

- Eagan advocates a profile approach to programs – develop an evaluation that is not “one-size-fits-all.” Size and cost are not only measures of strength and value to the university. Perhaps we need to outline an approach to departments similar to the RTP for individual faculty members.

- Opp reminds ExCom that we should focus discussion on action items. Guiding principles and concerns should be separated from the action items.

- Gubernat suggests that the last bullet point on avoiding cuts to Academic Affairs (AA) should be moved to the top. Discussion about whether this is action item or guiding principle.

- Rush-Woods notes that it is crucial that we are all sharing and looking at the same data. We need to make sure that the institutional data we are looking at is clean and as up-to-date as possible. Opp states that Fall 2008 data is up-to-date and available. Provost Dorer explains that colleges have been costing the programs working with departments.

- Rush-Woods wonders what the real date for making these decisions is… is Dec. 15th the final date or is it Feb. 15th? Provost Dorer explains that CSU system-wide date originally was Dec. 15th but this was moved to Feb. 15th to allow flexibility. But catalog copies need time to prepare and need to adhere to timelines in the CBA for potential layoffs. Decided to move ahead with Dec. 15th deadline to be able to respond more effectively to emerging issues.

- Opp questions connection between potential layoffs and program elimination, which requires Senate action. Provost Dorer responds that no program elimination will happen without going through appropriate faculty governance structure and procedures, these layoffs may or may not happen based on enrollment limits. Time-consuming, need to give HR sufficient time.

- Eagan responds that Layoff Committee (UCL) must meet. Strange that we could be discussing layoffs before we have a budget. Provost Dorer replies that this is an issue governed by CBA. Reichman reminds that the UCL is for avoiding layoffs.
Discussion over dates and timelines for plans, layoff notices, budgets. Chief of Staff Sawyer explains that there will definitely be a continuing conversation after Dec. 15th. The CO has made it very difficult for campuses – the President charged the cabinet with getting the budget done by Dec. 15th regardless of CO directives. This gives us a better start than in the previous year.

Opp suggests that ExCom forwards this as a recommendation to the President and an information item for the Senate. Gubernat agrees that this should be an ExCom recommendation. Kimball argues that this should definitely be put up to the Senate for a vote, a regular BEC that can be fully debated on the Senate floor. Opp raises the question of whether or not we want the full Senate “word-smithing” the document on the floor. All of the Task Force information is already available. Lubwama suggests that this should just be recommendation from ExCom to administration for actionable items. Rush-Woods emphasizes importance of consultation with full Senate, need to have robust discussion on Senate floor, but agrees with Lubwama that recommendation from ExCom would be best approach. Kimball argues that we should not short-circuit Senate debate in any way on such an important item – these are exactly the kind of issues that the faculty of the university have entrusted the senators to address. The process of a full Senate debate may not be the most efficient but it is essential for the full Senate to carry out its duty and have an opportunity to edit, vigorously debate, and vote on a regular BEC with ExCom’s recommendations.

M/S/P (Reichman/Mitchell), [6 yea, 2 nay, 0 abstentions] to have the Chair recast the ExCom recommendations, circulate and edit via e-mail, then present as a memo from ExCom to the President and place on the Senate agenda as a discussion item.

- Reichman proposes as a compromise to introduce ExCom’s recommendations based on the Task Force report as a discussion item and then adjourn the Senate to a committee of the whole in which the document in its entirety is presented. Debate as a committee of the whole can be less formal and without the ability to edit or “word-smith” the document. Emerging from the discussion as a committee of the whole, if a senator feels so moved they can introduce amendments or motions to endorse or approve. Better than an information item but not as problematic as a BEC motion.

- Rao argues that unless we consult with Senate we are leaders without followers. Kimball argues against motion – the best way to have the Senate perform its duties on such an important matter is to introduce a BEC and go through normal procedures. If there are amendments or edits or word-smithing on the floor, so be it. We can argue for or against amendments and the Senate as a whole must be trusted to vote wisely, this is the charge entrusted to the Senate by the faculty. Mitchell replies that there has already been ample debate and opportunity for feedback with the town hall meetings.

17. Adjournment

M/S/P (Lubwama/Mitchell) to adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted,

Derek Kimball, Acting Secretary