

this month.

IV. Vice Chair's Report: Dick Montanari: Dick Montanari requested that APP chair Shaun-inn Wu share with the EC the Chancellor's Office letter referred to in the minutes of 2/6/02 regarding the Scholastic and Disqualification Policy.

As vice chair, Dick is automatically a member of the commencement committee. Commencement this year will take place at the Del Mar Fairgrounds, with each college having a separate ceremony. There will be no charge to attend, nor attempts to limit attendance. A call has gone out for students speakers and vocalists, which the committee will screen. It is expected that there will be a speaker and vocalists for each college ceremony. There is also discussion regarding inviting guest speakers, possibly Doug Flutie of the San Diego Chargers. If anyone knows of a possible speaker and especially if they have access to a speaker, please contact Dick. Sandy Parsons asked about parking. Dick indicated that his understanding was that there probably would be a charge for parking, but that it would likely be less than the six dollars normally charged. Sandy also expressed concern that the call for student speakers and vocalists be sent broadly.

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

VI. President's Report: Alexander Gonzalez Attending a systemwide executive committee meeting.

VII. Provost's Report: Robert Sheath Regarding the systemwide budget, a cut of \$29.5 million is anticipated and is expected to be a permanent cut. We don't know yet what our campus cut of that will be, but anticipate it will be around \$620K. Our fee revenue shortfall is projected to be around \$320K, for a total reduction of around \$940K.

Enrollment for spring was robust, and we have received a record number of applications for next fall. Despite increased enrollments, because we were down last fall, we do not expect much increase in revenue from the Chancellor's Office in 2002/03. Funding may support three new faculty positions campuswide.

Our growth projections appear to be back on track, which is important because new buildings are linked to that. It is possible the Humanities and Social Sciences building may be moved up to the next bond. The Business building is included in the special economic incentive package, which moves that project up 14 months.

He and the president plan to visit Chancellor Reed and Executive Vice Chancellor Spence to request a special revenue boost for the academic blueprint program. The funding would be used for expert consultants and campus visits.

Janet Powell asked for clarification regarding the role of the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee and how it relates to the new budget committee formed last fall. The Provost responded that the Budget Advisory Committee, which includes Bud Morris, is addressing how we might change our budgeting process. The committee has looked at various campuses in an effort to identify best practices, and is planning a site visit to Long Beach and possibly three other campuses. The committee will recommend changes to our budgeting methods. Janet questioned the lack of BLP involvement in this committee and in budgeting and long-range planning matters in general. The Provost responded that he would encourage the President and Stephen Garcia to go to BLP.

Several committee members expressed concerns regarding BLP's lack of involvement, and the Provost indicated that he would relay the committee's sentiments to the President. He also noted that the budget planning committee's charge is to look at all aspects of the university's budget, administrative as well as academic. Sandy Parsons noted that the administrative portion of the budget could have impact on academic programs as well.

Dick Montanari asked the Provost for clarification regarding the addition of three new faculty positions alluded to earlier, noting that he understood that the revenue came in one lump without specific line item allocation. The Provost responded that this was true, and that he expected that the equivalent of three faculty positions could be added, and concurred that this was a campus decision.

Janet McDaniel asked whether the Executive Committee had any interest in hearing from Enrollment Services Executive Director Richard Riehl regarding efforts to increase enrollment. The Provost noted some of the efforts being made in this regard including automation of many processes and the addition of a second shift, needed because of space limitations. Sharon Hamill noted that is important that we not only improve systems, but also train people in customer service and encourage a friendlier environment for students. The Provost stated that he had personally followed up on every complaint he has received and that he wished to follow-up on this matter, and encouraged the committee to apprise him of

these problems and he will follow-up. Several committee members commented that not all complaints are reported or rise to his level. He noted that a "mystery shopper" who was a student has been engaged to help bring problems to light.

Dick Montanari said that he would be particularly interested in hearing about efforts being made to attract students, noting that adding new programs is a long-term solution, and short-term efforts are needed now to increase our FTES. Sandy Parsons asked about advertising efforts. The Provost responded that there has not been aggressive advertising in the past and that External Affairs has a very small budget for this, but that he has asked the President to increase funding and President is agreeable. Bids have been sought from three firms to start an advertising campaign. Bonnie Biggs noted that External Affairs receives input from a faculty advisory committee.

The Provost recommended that the committee also invite the enrollment management group, which can speak to recruitment efforts. He also suggested hearing from Student Affairs and External Affairs.

VIII. Statewide Senate Report: Sandy Parsons No report.

IX. CFA Report: George Diehr At fact finding.

X. Committee Reports

APP: The committee did not meet yesterday in recognition of the Lunar New Year.

GEC: The committee reviewed 61 course recertification requests last fall and identified approximately 15 courses for which they had questions. They sent letters in December to the department chairs advising them of the status of their courses and notifying them of the need to respond during the appeals period of 2/1/02 – 2/20/02. GEC's feedback is then due at the end of February.

Regarding the Area C revision, the departments involved were asked to work together to come to a consensus and submit a proposal they can all live with. This effort has been going on since September with no consensus on a proposal in sight. The committee is now preparing to make its decision based on the information provided.

SAC: The Student Grade Grievance Appeals Policy was passed at last week's Senate, and the document has been finalized and forwarded to the Senate office.

The committee is now working on the details for the upcoming Student Research Competition, having received the funding for the competition from the Provost and Vice President Martinez. Community judges for the competition are being sought. She will work with the Senate office to devise guidelines for next year's competition, since we seem to be reinventing the wheel every year.

The committee has prepared the call for the lottery grants proposals and will be forwarding that to the Senate office this week for distribution.

The committee's next project will be the Student Records Retention Guidelines.

Sharon Hamill asked about the student grievance policy that originally contained the now separate grade grievance policy, and where that now stood. Jackie responded that the committee is gathering whatever various student grievance policies are in existence now, to determine whether there is any type of grievance not represented.

XI. Old Business

A. FAC RTP Revisions

The only part of the document the committee is still working on is the WPAF, and Janet McDaniel provided a draft of this section to the EC members. FAC is proposing a radically scaled-down file. The file would include a vita; three short statements (no more than three pages each) for teaching, research and creative activity, and service; five to seven items for each of these areas; and all personnel reviews. Rather than specifying a size of the file, the draft proposes limiting the submissions for each area, and allowing the faculty member to decide which five to seven items best represents each category. The draft includes a footnote which states that new faculty may not have five to seven items and some submit

fewer.

There ensued a lengthy discussion regarding various aspects of the WPAF, which FAC will consider before bringing a proposal back to EC.

B. NEAC Constitution & By-Laws Revisions

Kathy Norman indicated that the committee has completed most of its work on updating the Constitution to reflect current university offices and position titles, but is still cleaning up language regarding divisions within the College of Arts and Sciences. She anticipates bringing the document to the EC towards the end of February.

Kathy Norman said that Mary Elizabeth Stivers had been given a Constitution to look at for the president, and it was different from the one NEAC is working from, so there is concern that the document NEAC is working from is not the most recently approved. The discussion turned to the matter of whether or not presidential approval of the Constitution was required. Bud Morris stated his belief that the document indicates that it takes effect upon approval of the Senate.

Robert Sheath indicated that his office has been investigating the matter since it arose recently. They referred to the systemwide Constitution, which is silent on this topic. They also polled other CSUs and several responded that their presidents do approve their constitutions. Sandy Parsons indicated that changes to the systemwide Constitution are not subject to approval by the Chancellor nor the Board of Trustees. She suggested that the campus contacts may be mistaken about whether or not presidential approval is required.

Bud Morris asked that NEAC identify the document currently in place, complete its work on the revisions for the referendum, and as a courtesy the Senate will request that the president endorse the faculty-approved document since it includes references to administrative positions.

XII. New Business

A. NEAC Number of Senators

Kathy Norman directed the committee's attention to an attachment to the agenda which showed the current number of Senators, the language from the Constitution describing how the number of Senators shall be determined, and the calculations based on that language. Two colleges are currently underrepresented and the Student Services Professionals-Academic Related are overrepresented. NEAC recommends correcting this next fall, based on the headcount at that time. NEAC is also checking other CSU campuses' methods for determining membership.

The issue was also raised of replacing Senators on sabbatical. The College of Education currently has the faculty member on sabbatical who is a senator, and wishes to replace that Senate seat with another College of Education faculty member. It was determined that past practice has been to leave the seat open. Janet McDaniel suggested addressing the issue in the Bylaws. It was agreed that we should continue the practice of leaving the seat open. Dick Montanari suggested amending the Bylaws to provide for election of alternate senators.

C. NEAC Recommendations (taken out of order)

Academic Senate, Lecturer 01-03

Margret Crowdes

Faculty Affairs Comm., LIS 01-03

Ann Fiegen

Collegial Governance Task Force

Janet Powell, COE

Bonnie Biggs, LIS

Motion #3 M/S/P (Powell/Norman)

To forward the NEAC recommendations to the Senate

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

The next Executive Committee meeting will be held February 20, 12:00-2:00 in Commons 206

Marcia Woolf, Academic Senate Coordinator

APPROVED:

Sharon Hamill, Secretary 2001/02

Date