

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

VI. **President's Report: Alexander Gonzalez** Attending the annual Legislature Day in Sacramento.

VII. **Provost's Report: Robert Sheath** Regarding items discussed last week, concerns regarding BLP's lack of involvement have been forwarded to the President with a request that a plan be developed to meet these concerns. The Provost will meet with BLP tomorrow to discuss the academic blueprint. In addition, the Provost has offered to arrange for Richard Riehl and his staff to attend and EC meeting as requested by Janet McDaniel.

The Cabinet will propose that the campus once again revert to a 4/10 schedule for the summer. Units unable to revert to the schedule will be accommodated. This schedule makes possible significant energy savings.

VIII. **Statewide Senate Report: Sandy Parsons** An e-mail memorandum from Jacqueline Kegley regarding the status of the recent fact-finding has been forwarded to all faculty and to all Senators.

A systemwide academic technology strategic planning conference is being planned for mid April in San Jose. Attending for our campus will be Robert Sheath, Sandy Parsons, Bud Morris, Vicki Golich, Graham Oberem, Bonnie Biggs, Ben Cherry, Joan Hanor, Sue Thompson, Norm Nicholson, Chuck Allen, and Teresa Macklin.

Dick Montanari reported that the Faculty Flow Committee of the statewide Senate asked that a campus volunteer to conduct a survey of current and previous CSU faculty regarding issues impacting their decision to come to the CSU, why they stayed, why they left, etc. He offered to do this at our campus.

IX. **CFA Report: George Diehr** Not in attendance.

X. **Committee Reports**

BLP: Janet Powell thanked the Provost for conveying BLP's concerns to the President and noted that the committee looks forward to working with Academic Affairs and the President's office.

LACAC: The committee's first meeting of the new year will be held tomorrow. Current projects include working with the Copy Center regarding the fair use guidelines, and they are encouraged by Dora Knoblock's willingness to address this issue. Sandy Parsons is concerned that the Copy Center now makes only one delivery per day which presents a burden to faculty, and asked the committee to look into this.

NEAC: The committee is working on the Constitution and revising current policies regarding faculty on leave, which contradict language in the Constitution.

XI. **Old Business**

B. NEAC Number of Senators (taken out of order)

After last week's meeting, some EC members suggested that NEAC address this issue by counting faculty each spring, and NEAC will propose this in the revised language of the bylaws.

A. NEAC Constitution & By-Laws Revisions

Kathy Norman noted that the committee has been revising the language of the Constitution to reflect the current administrative structure of the University, and current position titles. They have also incorporated items from the last two failed referendums, as well as language provided by committee chairs to revise language regarding their committee's charge. The committee noted that many of the position title changes were due to upgrades in titles.

Robert Sheath expressed his concern that the document is not ready to be voted on. He noted that there are errors contained in the document and that it proposes major changes which have not been discussed. He added that this is a shared governance document, and that the new Collegial Governance Task Force might wish to offer some input regarding revisions to the document. He encouraged NEAC to seek broader input on the document and not try to rush it through the

Senate.

Norman noted that David Barsky had reviewed the document and the committee had incorporated the suggestions. She also noted that this year's NEAC was directed only to address "housekeeping" issues in the document such as title changes, and that other more substantive changes had come from prior years. The last referendum failed due an insufficient number of votes by the eligible faculty.

Dick Montanari commented that this is not a shared governance document but a Senate document that represents the faculty. It presents the faculty's opinion of who in the administration should be involved in certain activities, but leaves it to the administration to participate or not.

Bud Morris described the history of The Constitution and By-Laws of the University Faculty and the Academic Senate, noting its origin in 1990 by the founding faculty, and its adoption in 1991 by the first Senate. Later revisions occurred in 1993, 1994, 1995 and 1996. In 1996 there is record of the President thanking the Senate for their courtesy in providing him with the revised document, advising of his concerns about certain aspects, but respecting the wishes of the Senate and noting their action. Further revisions occurred in 1997, 1998 and 2000. In each case, in accordance with Article 8.4, the constitutional amendments became effective upon receiving a favorable vote of at least two-thirds of the eligible faculty. Presidential approval of the document has not been sought. Bud further noted that we need not attempt to revise the entire document at once, but just those amendments that may be addressed reasonably in the time available this spring. As with other matters, the EC – after consultation and discussion – will decide which amendments to propose, and when they are ready for presentation to the faculty. The EC welcomes input from the provost and the president.

Sandy Parsons noted that it might be a good idea to take a look at the systemwide constitution and our local one.

Morris expressed concern about timing, and noted that if the Collegial Governance Task Force wishes to make recommendations, the EC will consider them; however, it is unlikely they will act soon enough to impact this spring's referendum. He noted that even a successful attempt to bring the document up to date would be beneficial.

Sheath argued that the referendum should address substantive changes regarding the committees' charges, and that time should be taken to study the document and arrive at language that all parties could agree upon.

Janet Powell agreed that the document needed a bigger overhaul than we have given it in the past couple of years. She added that she would like to hear the administration's input, and suggested sending proposed revisions to the President for comment. This may help to improve working relationships. She also agreed that the document should not require presidential approval.

Norman thought NEAC could easily break it up into separate amendments, as has been done in the past, each one addressing a different article. She will meet with Morris and Marcia Woolf to structure the various amendments to facilitate their review.

Sheath agreed that scheduling the amendments was a good idea, and said he and the president would provide comments in writing. He is concerned by their having adequate time for reviewing and commenting, and noted the president travels frequently. Montanari suggested he bring AA staff to EC meetings since it would be helpful to understand the rationale behind their concerns. The Provost agreed.

Morris asked the committee chairs to notify Norman of any changes necessary for their committees.

XII. New Business

A. University Blueprint Committee

The proposed committee will serve as an advisory committee to the provost's office and the EC, and work with BLP to move the blueprint forward as quickly as possible. The model for structuring the committee is similar to that used for the YRO committee which works with APP. Proposed members include the Chair of the Senate and Provost as co-chairs, the Chair or member of BLP, faculty from each of the college curriculum committees (3), the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Associate VP for Academic Affairs-Academic Programs, and one member of the focus group committee. No

representation is proposed for IITS, Library, students, Student Affairs, nor External Affairs.

Bonnie Biggs indicated that, while the Library is concerned about resources for new programs – for example, Nursing, which is known to make great demands on library resources – it also concedes that its staff is too limited to make serving on every committee feasible. The Library is comfortable with representation by the Senate Chair and by BLP.

Janet Powell suggested that BLP could serve the purpose and is anxious to be involved. She suggested this route rather than creation of a new committee. She added that BLP could serve this role if provided the kinds of resources the new committee would have. Kathy Norman also noted that the committee may be underutilized. Shaun-inn Wu noted that over the years the role of BLP has been diminished.

Robert Sheath responded that Senate committees cannot be resourced at that level, that broader expertise is necessary, and that this committee will meet more frequently and aggressively than BLP could do. He added that BLP will be processing the proposals which will come rapidly from the new committee. The two committees would work closely together.

Sheath stated that he envisions BLP will fulfill its charge by thoroughly reviewing every aspect of new proposals forwarded by this committee, and by asking hard questions regarding resources.

Sandy Parsons asked how the new programs will impact current resources. Sheath responded that it takes a minimum of two years to bring up a new program, and that increasing enrollments will provide funding for the new programs, including additional faculty lines. Special funding may be forthcoming from the Chancellor's Office for this effort. He noted that next year will provide an opportunity for the colleges to catch up on their hiring. Between 2004 and 2012, he expects a 4% increase per year in faculty positions.

Wu suggested the provost continue to involve BLP in the process. Sheath responded that he expects the new committee would meet with BLP on a regular basis, and added that he had asked Stephen Garcia to meet with them also.

The EC agreed to endorse formation of the new committee.

B. NEAC Recommendations

Service Learning Advisory Committee

Miriam Schustack, COAS 01-03

Gary Oddou, COBA 01-02

Professional Leave Committee

Gary Oddou, COBA 01-02

Citation Appeal Board, At large 02-03

Sheldon Zhang

University Space Committee

Ofer Meilich, COBA

University Global Affairs Committee

Janet McDaniel, COE 01-03

General Education Committee

Susie Lan Cassel, COAS Hum/FA 00-02

Found. Aux. Svcs. Advisory Committee

Vivienne Bennett, 01-03

Sheldon Zhang, 01-03

Motion #3 M/S/P

To forward the NEAC recommendations to the Senate

C. Faculty Center

Bonnie Biggs introduced guests Vicki Fabry, Gina Grimshaw, and Graham Oberem. All four serve or have served on the Faculty Center Advisory Council. Bonnie directed the EC's attention to the handouts she delivered to the members yesterday. The FCAC is requesting establishment of a more formal link to the Senate by becoming a standing committee of the Senate with a Chair that would sit on the EC. Currently, there is no means for developing new programs; the council comes up with ideas, but there is no vehicle for bringing them to the Senate. The council is also concerned about the need for FC involvement in assessment. The FC also has a recognized role in faculty development on campus, especially in light of a move toward research in the RTP process.

Oberem stated that the Faculty Center does not currently function at an optimal level, and is an important resource for faculty development and new faculty orientation. A direct link to the Senate would help to define the Center's role and the activities undertaken. It would also provide the faculty more ownership of the Center.

Grimshaw indicated concern for the loss of status of the Center, evidenced by the recent reduction of the Director's appointment from 12 month to 10 month, despite a growing campus. The Center needs the faculty's support to grow. There was no New Faculty Institute last summer, a function that provides new faculty with a positive introduction to the campus, collegial support, and teaching guidance.

Fabry noted that the Center currently operates in a vacuum, and a direct link to the Senate would help the Center to develop its programs and provide an opportunity for the Senate to influence its activities. For faculty development to become a higher priority and more effective, this direct link to the Senate is necessary. In addition, the mostly junior faculty we recruit need the support of the Center. As new programs are brought on line, and with the need for assessment and the increasing class sizes, the Center can play a vital role in meeting these challenges. Students have expressed their appreciation for the faculty-student interaction, and the Center has been instrumental in developing this.

Robert Sheath suggested that the direct line to the EC be considered with the other constitutional changes. PAC is another committee that is not included, but could be. Regarding the administration's commitment to faculty development, he noted that he had created the sponsored research office to assist faculty in their research efforts, and provided new funds for seed grants. A policy regarding assigned time for research is also under consideration.

Bud Morris suggested that the Faculty Director might more appropriately report to the new AVP for Sponsored Research.

Sheath, in response to concerns expressed regarding a seven year old request for a grant writer in the Center, said that Pat Worden had researched the issue and determined that what was needed was not one grant writer, but a cadre of grant writers specializing in each of several disciplines.

There was much confusion regarding the issue of the summer institute. Sheath indicated that the appointee was on sabbatical, and there are differences of opinion about the delivery of services. Fabry stated that it was clear last summer that the director would not conduct the Institute, and that it was expected that Mary Elizabeth Stivers would. Sheath responded that this was proposed as an alternative but it did not happen. Funds have been committed to conduct the Institute in 2002 and beyond.

With regard to assessment, Sheath noted that this is a huge issue encompassing more than just the classroom, which is the Faculty Center's area of expertise. WASC expects an overall program assessment, and Sheath plans to propose a University wide committee on assessment to include the Faculty Center Director. He noted that an interim report is due to WASC next year, and we need to be conducting assessment at the program level for that report.

With regard to changing the Faculty Center Director's reporting line directly to the provost, Sheath responded that there are eight or more centers, and not all directors can report to him. His schedule and workload would not allow this. Changing the reporting line is something that should be discussed.

Sheath also noted that support for the Faculty Center was evidenced by increased funding levels, noting its budget is up about 30% over the last three years.

Biggs questioned the rationale for reducing the directors contract and at the same time taking on more faculty and moving to a year-round calendar. Sheath responded that Stivers had analyzed the duties of the position and determined that a 12 month position was not supported. He indicated the matter could be readdressed.

Fabry asserted that the Faculty Center has done more to improve teaching and the abilities of faculty than any other unit within University, and has brought faculty together across disciplines through the peer coaching program and classroom assessment. The payoff is evident in survey results which show our faculty to be innovative in their teaching. The Faculty Center has a proven track record, but is not being utilized well now.

Morris indicated that the discussion would be continued at the next EC meeting.

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

The next Executive Committee meeting will be held February 27, 12:00-2:00 in Commons 206

Marcia Woolf, Academic Senate Coordinator

APPROVED: _____
Sharon Hamill, Secretary 01-02

_____ Date