

## MINUTES

**Executive Committee Meeting  
Academic Senate  
Wednesday, November 28, 2001  
Commons 206  
12 noon**

---

**Present:**        **Bud Morris, Chair**                      **Sharon Hamill, Secty./GEC**        **Shaun-inn Wu, APP**  
                          **Janet McDaniel, FAC**                      **Bonnie Biggs, LACAC**                      **Kathy Norman, NEAC**  
                          **Jackie Borin, SAC**

**Ex-Officio:**        **George Diehr, CFA; Alexander Gonzalez, President; Robert Sheath, Provost**

**Guest:**            **Beth Dobkin, ACE Fellow**

**Staff:**            **Marcia Woolf, AS Coordinator**

**Absent:**           **Dick Montanari, Vice Chair; Sandy Parsons, ASCSU; Janet Powell, BLP**

**I.        Approval of Agenda**

**REMOVE:**        LACAC committee report (deferred to next EC meeting)

**Motion #1**            M/S/P  
To approve the agenda as amended

**II.       Approval of Minutes 11/14/01**

**CHANGE:**        FAC committee report, paragraph 1, sentence 5:  
“...to consider the merit of including a ~~sunset~~ provision...”

**Motion #2**            M/S/P  
To approve the minutes as amended

**III.      Chair’s Report, Bud Morris:**

**A.       Academic Roundtable:** No meeting to report.

**B.       Referrals:** None.

**C.       Announcements:** The CSU Academic Conference starts today and runs through Friday in Mission Bay. There will be a presentation by the CSUSM team tomorrow on diversity on our campus. The team consists of Bob Yamashita, Garry Rolison, and Sharon Elise. Our campus has been grouped with the Chico campus, and there will be two other panels presenting throughout the day. This evening, Dr. Ronald Takaki will give the keynote address on multiculturalism. On Friday morning, there will be a discussion hosted by DeeDee Alpert regarding the report on the CSU at the beginning of the 21st century and how it accommodates diversity concerns within the CSU.

Plans are underway for the spring Academic Assembly, tentatively scheduled for January 31st. One item on the agenda will be a report by Bettina Huber on the second annual report on the National Survey of Student Engagement. This survey measures how deeply engaged students are in their learning, and Cal State San Marcos has fared well in this regard. Another possible agenda item is an update on the Niche Committee's work.

Bud Morris introduced guest Beth Dobkin, the American Council on Education Fellow, and committee members introduced themselves.

**IV. Vice Chair's Report, Dick Montanari:** Attending preconference meetings at the ASCSU Academic Conference.

**V. Secretary's Report, Sharon Hamill:** No report.

**VI. President's Report, Alexander Gonzalez:** The president plans to attend the Academic Conference on Thursday which is being held at the Bahia for the third year in a row. Local trustees Ralph Pesqueira and Murray Galinson also plan to attend.

Janet McDaniel has been working with External Affairs to get funding for the middle school program, and we have just received another donation: \$25,000 from the Price Charities. These funds may be used for assigned time for faculty. He expects they will reach their goal fairly quickly.

There was another meeting of the Trust Board this morning, and strong community support is evident. The Provost presented the academic blueprint plan to the Board and it was well received.

The budget continues to be problematic and still too volatile to report on definitively. A town hall meeting will be scheduled in early spring to update the campus on the budget situation once more information is known. The campus is currently facing a deficit of \$482,000 as a result of lower enrollment this fall (this represents reduced income from student fees). This amount must be deallocated from the current year's budget. In addition, the Chancellor's office has requested that campuses reduce their current year budget by one percent, and the Governor has just requested an additional \$10 million cut systemwide. As a result, the campus is currently facing a budget reduction of approximately \$700,000 in addition to the \$482,000 student fee revenue shortfall. Negotiations continue with the Chancellor's office to alleviate additional possible general fund budget cuts as a result of our lowered fall enrollment. The campus has also been asked to look at 1 to 10 percent budget cut scenarios for next academic year. A 10 percent reduction represents approximately \$5 million.

**VII. Provost's Report, Bob Sheath:** Efforts continue to develop a campus emergency response plan. The Provost met with David Barsky, Mary Elizabeth Stivers and Tom Schultheis and his lieutenant to further develop a plan. Barsky and Schultheis will draft a plan to ensure that Academic Affairs staff can be recognized by off-campus emergency response personnel in the event of an emergency.

Regarding enrollment efforts, SDSU recently provided information on 600 students, including their names, addresses, phone numbers, and intended majors. Nearly 40 percent of those 600 students chose a major not offered by Cal State San Marcos. (Historically, 45 percent of transfer students choose a major we don't offer.) Telephone interviews are planned for these students as well as for community college students to learn why they do or do not choose Cal State San Marcos.

Regarding the academic blueprint, five focus groups have been conducted so far among faculty and students and the information gathered has proved interesting. The Trust Board was very interested in the process at this morning's meeting and has requested a follow-up presentation of two hours to learn more about it.

The Provost has met with a dozen or so academic units and continues to conduct these meetings to gather feedback. He will meet with CAP on Friday to discuss their efforts on CAMP and how that gets into the overall blueprint effort.

Bud Morris asked how the provost anticipated cuts would be made in Academic Affairs. Bob Sheath responded that there were different types of cuts anticipated and that each must be treated differently. Any reduction necessary due to reduced fee revenues would be effected by a deallocation. The cuts necessitated by the Governor's requests (1 percent plus \$10 million) would be effected on an across-the-board pro rata basis. The president noted that he was working hard to have the anticipated general fund reduction (due to low enrollment) taken off the books, arguing that this is the first time this has happened and that we were impacted by SDSU's taking on 1700 additional students this fall.

The president noted that careful consideration is being given to how much we should grow next year, since higher than anticipated growth could have a negative budget impact. Current plans are to grow a conservative amount, approximately 1.5 percent. Historically, a bad economy results in higher enrollments. This, coupled with our efforts with SDSU, could increase our enrollment higher than projected and limit our available resources, since our budget is based on projections. At the same time, the bad economy means less funding per FTE, so a delicate balance must be struck.

The president also noted that the bond issue looks hopeful, and that increased faculty office space and classrooms will alleviate many problems we are currently facing. Typically, there is greater voter turn-out for a gubernatorial election which

should bode well for the bond issue. Also, urban voters are more likely to vote, and these tend to be more liberal and to have children, which increases the likelihood they would vote for the bond.

**VIII. Statewide Senate Report, Sandy Parsons:** Attending preconference meetings at the ASCSU Academic Conference.

**IX. CFA Report, George Diehr:** Several hundred people attended the recent union event at the Board of Trustees meeting. The CFA made several requests in the form of a petition.

Yesterday was the last mediation session between CFA and the CSU. It is expected that the parties will declare an impasse and move to the fact-finding phase, which is the final phase of bargaining. Fact-finding meetings would then begin after January. The CFA reduced its position on the compensation issue to a 2% GSI, SSIs for eligible faculty, and health care for lecturers on a 40-50 hour timebase, along with a small increase in the department chair stipend and the conversion of counselors to a faculty schedule over a three-year period. This is essentially what had been offered earlier by the CSU and was later withdrawn. Fact-finding could conclude by the end of February or mid-March. A settlement, while not likely, could happen at any time. There are big gaps in the parties' positions on workload and recruitment.

Regarding tenure track hiring, the CFA contends that the system needs to recruit approximately 2000 tenure track faculty to meet projected growth and replace retiring faculty members. It is anticipated that 2000 recruitments would result in 1400 to 1500 new faculty hires. The CSU's last position was 1100 recruitments, which the CFA contends would result in only enough new hires to replace retiring faculty members, with no new growth positions.

**X. Committee Reports:**

**BLP:** Absent.

**FAC:** Janet McDaniel reported that the committee is expecting the president to return the recently submitted Market Equity Salary Policy, which we have learned contained some contradictory language regarding the role of department chairs.

The call for proposals for next year's professional development grants is ready to go out. The due date for the professional development grants is February 6.

The new seed grant procedure is currently awaiting presidential approval. The seed grant proposals may be turned in any time and is an ongoing, monthly program.

The committee worked with Mary Elizabeth Stivers on a statement regarding the nature of a faculty member's work, which was requested by Human Resources for workers' compensation purposes.

The committee is working with the Faculty Center to come up with new language regarding how to address the issue of teaching effectiveness for the RTP document.

**NEAC:** The Committee has gone through the Constitution and has found a number of changes are necessary. They plan to recommend breaking up the document for the referendum vote and will be bringing a recommendation to EC shortly.

**XI. New Business**

A. NEAC Recommendations: Academic Policy & Planning Committee  
Glen Brodowsky, COBA 01-03

Nominating Committee for President's Award for Teaching  
Vicki Fabry, at-large 01-02

**Motion #3** M/S/P (McDaniel/Biggs)  
To approve the NEAC recommendations

B. FAC Faculty Awards Policy FAC is proposing that the Harry E. Brakebill Outstanding Professor Award and Wang Family Award processes be combined into one policy. This new policy would take effect next

year. In the meantime, the committee is proposing that it take on the task of identifying and recommending a faculty member for this year's Wang Family Award. The EC discussed the draft policy presented and made the following recommendations:

- At section I. C., change items 5, 6, and 7 to a statement indicating up to three items may be provided in each category.
- At section I. E., change first sentence to read "... to allow a substantial award..." and eliminate second and third sentences.
- At section II., change second sentence to read "... with each honoree receiving a cash award."
- At section II. A., change first sentence to read "... who have completed a peer review process within the last two years are eligible...."

There was discussion regarding ways in which the Harry E. Brakebill award recipient could be compensated for the additional efforts they put forth after receiving the award. FAC suggested that, in addition to the cash award, a reserved parking space, travel funds, or a course release could be provided. The president noted that travel funds could be problematic due to IRS regulations. He indicated that, in years past, the reception held to honor the recipient often cost more than the amount of the cash award given to the recipient. He indicated that he would prefer to reduce the size of the reception and increase the amount of the award to the faculty member, allowing them to use it in any way they choose. He also noted that the oil portraits represent a significant expense that could be redirected to the faculty member, and agreed that a photo gallery could still be provided to honor the recipients. Finally, while all agreed that the size of the dossier was a problem for the nominees and the selection committee, it was decided that letters of support should still be included but that their number might be limited.

The president noted that the Wang Family Award was originally proposed for five years for a total of \$1 million, but that it may continue at some level of funding. The provost will provide FAC with a list of prior Wang awardees who, he noted, in most cases had made significant contributions to the system.

FAC will revise the document based on these recommendations and bring to the Senate in February for a first reading.

The EC agreed to refer to FAC assumption of the duties of the nomination process for the Wang Family Award for 2001/2002, including notification of potential candidates, call for nominees, selection, and recommendation to the president.

C. Reaffirming the 2, 500 Word University Writing Requirement Bud Morris raised the issue of the campus' commitment to the writing requirement and indicated that he had been hearing that some faculty are not enforcing the requirement, and that there is concern about the workload involved and the lack of acknowledgment of the increased workload. He noted that alumni and students appreciate the requirement and that most faculty support the requirement. He asked for suggestions on ways to address the workload issue and reinvigorate support for the requirement.

Sharon Hamill indicated that, while it was rare, the GEC occasionally sees courses without the writing component. Shauninn Wu indicated the same was true of APP.

Janet McDaniel noted that graduate assistants are hired at other institutions to assist with reading and grading.

Bud Morris noted that there is no way currently to account for this effort using the APDB codes. He recalled that at one time there was a way to report this on the FAD, but that is no longer the case. George Diehr recalled that at one time they reported one additional unit per course for this effort. Bob Sheath said that he thought the Chancellor's office did not accept the reporting of the additional unit and that that is why it is no longer on the FAD report.

Janet McDaniel suggested that the discussions should start with whether or not we want the requirement, and then move to addressing compensation. She suggested we should first learn to what extent people are not doing this. She noted that making a student write is not the same as assessing their writing and instructing students on how to improve their writing. Kathy Norman agreed that an effort should be made to learn how it's working and what the current research says about writing requirements. George Diehr argued that a writing requirement is valuable in any event.

Bud Morris noted that a faculty member told him he was being asked to teach four courses with 45 students in each course and said that if this happens, he will go to Scantrons. Sharon Hamill agreed that workload is a critical issue. Other faculty members she has spoken with also find it extremely difficult to find the time to read and grade papers. She noted that one can't address the requirement without addressing workload, and that she has heard faculty members talking about teaching

elsewhere. She added that some courses have very specific writing requirements, such as meeting APA style standards, and that assessment of the requirement's effectiveness on a broad scale might be difficult.

Kathy Norman suggested we find a way to get input from the faculty which will provide evidence of whether it's being done and the amount of workload involved.

Bob Sheath suggested that perhaps an APDB code could be identified for reporting purposes.

George Diehr said that a class of 30 to 35 students with nine hours of contact and the writing requirement is reasonable; but 12 hours is not reasonable. He added that 30 to 35 students is the norm systemwide.

Janet McDaniel suggested that a subcommittee be formed which would report to APP and include a representative from from FAC and GEC for the purpose of looking into this issue.

Shaun-inn Wu noted that the problem is not whether we value the requirement, but rather the workload issue. The workload is not being counted. He noted that faculty will continue to support the requirement that the workload issue must be addressed, either by acknowledging faculty effort or hiring graduate assistants. The effort must be funded in one way or another.

Bob Sheath indicated that this is a systemwide issue and that we should hear from someone at the systemwide level regarding how to deal with this topic. He suggested that a workload forum include a systemwide representative, such as Sam Strafaci. George Diehr noted that there is a disconnect between what is reported and what actually happens at the campus level. He noted that the Legislature does not look at WTUs, but rather at FTEs.

D. Consideration of a Workload Forum George Diehr indicated that he would like to see a workload forum conducted at Cal State San Marcos. He suggested that three components of the forum might be (1) contract interpretation with representation from both the CSU and CFA, (2) practices and policies at other campuses, and (3) a presentation by Richard Serpe on the data collected for his recent survey, which may be published in mid-December. The matter will be revisited at the next EC meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

The next Executive Committee meeting will be held December 5, 12:00-1:00 in Commons 206

Marcia Woolf, Academic Senate Coordinator

APPROVED:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Hamill, Secretary 01-02

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date