The Senate Executive Committee was called to order @ 2:00 pm

Members present:
Officers: Deutschman (Chair), Ornatowski (Vice Chair), Bober-Michel (Secretary)
Administration: Enwemeka, Schellenberg
Committee Chairs: James-Ward, Conaty, Verity, Rhodes, Westin, Csomay, Donadey, Attiq, Balsdon
Senators at Large: Ely
CFA: Toombs
ASCSU: Wheeler
Parliamentarian: Eadie

1. Agenda (Bober-Michel)
   MSP Approve the Agenda of March 15, 2016.

2. Minutes (Bober-Michel)
   January and February deferred to April for approval.

3. Announcements (Deutschman)
   Deutschman explained that the Associated Students review (Cathie Atkins, Chair) will be extended to Fall 2016. The team felt it important to monitor and report on the transition from one leadership group to the next, and that process is just now getting underway.

   Schellenberg provided last-minute reminders about the WASC site visit and prepped attendees for the SEC portion of it. He reiterated the lines of inquiry, the focus on shared governance, etc.; he also encouraged our reviewing the WASC website.

   Deutschman led a brief discussion about replacing CAL Senators who resigned their positions this academic year, including McClish. According to Bober-Michel, who verified election results from the AY 2015/16 cycle, three of the four open seats could be replaced if those contacted agreed to serve.

4. Academic Affairs (Enwemeka)
Visit to Tijuana. The Provost recapped his visit to Tijuana – specifically, a class that Eric Frost is teaching in collaboration with faculty of the Autonomous University of Baja California (other campuses in Mexicali and Ensenada).

Georgia. Last year was, in the Provost’s words, a learning experience for us – especially in regard to the National Exam. Unfortunately, exam results aren’t known until late July, which delays and complicates the admissions process. So this year, we went with provisional acceptance (deadline, March 15), ahead of the test. To date, 60 prospective students have applied and paid a deposit on tuition and fees.

There are more than 1,000 prospective students in a database; common to them is an interest in STEM disciplines. We’re continually communicating with them.

We’re also seeing media interest—along with government efforts to publicize the program.

Renovations continue on the chemistry lab (nearly completed) and the HVAC system.

Nine Georgia faculty are visiting SDSU (Csomay is the liaison), with some administrators set to visit for training. In addition, nine Georgia students are coming to SDSU on a one-semester exchange program, and about a dozen SDSU students will go to Georgia.

Assigned time. The Provost reiterated that we spent about $29 million on assigned time in AY 2015/16, most of it ($21 million) easy to track/identify. Much of the outstanding $8 million represents coding errors.

The Provost sent out a message clarifying his earlier discussion on assigned time but the # of “push-back” emails he received show faculty (and staff) still have questions and misunderstandings. One staff member was very concerned that reductions in assigned time would mean increased workloads for coordinators and others—an assumption that is completely untrue.

The Provost asked us to think about the future – specifically, should a research university operate this way? We hire people to “do” three things: teach, conduct research, and perform service. So, let’s assign that time up-front; let’s be clear and honest from the start about what is and isn’t expected, rather than assigning time “traditionally” (12/12 units, 24 WTU) and then subtracting the actual work from some mythical “whole.” We should be thinking of workload in terms of percentages allocated to the three areas, and not “courses” per se.

The Provost displayed illustrative slides that Deutschman created for today—which largely depict the way assigned time plays out from one College to the next. The Provost is not bothered by the variability, but we need to better understand it in order to use assigned time more effectively. He also confirmed our assigned time practices do not have to mirror those at the other CSU campuses.
Bottom line: the Provost is not taking away assigned time and he’s not the one making assigned time decisions; that is primarily the responsibility of Chairs and Directors. He noted that the team conducting a program review for geography was stunned about how assigned time “works” here.

Csomay: Illustrated assigned time practices at universities in Europe, in particular how faculty are categorized as teaching or research. She asked: is that what we’re moving to?

Provost: Said that we’re already doing this (and exemplified his point via 6th year appointment files he’s been reviewing). He said his job is complicated by the lack of documentation; without the appointment letters, he doesn’t actually know the specifics of a hiring contract – what the faculty member was hired to do. The parameters of the work itself should be clear in the letter and elsewhere if the parameters change for some reason.

Conaty: Asked if a faculty member must “declare” his/her areas of focus or can there be variation over time.

Provost: Noted that some Colleges are designing metrics for assigned time, and those with metrics already are reviewing them for accuracy, reasonableness, etc. He hopes we’ll move to this model though there is no set timeline in place.

Ornatowski: Asked: are we moving to individual contracts w/ faculty? That is what many research universities do.

Provost: Said … in a way, but we’re already doing that to some extent. But the focus is only on teaching instead of on the three pillars. We should be defining all this up-front. He needs this “hiring” contract to do justice to the RTP reviews. The workload can change – the focus, etc.

Wheeler: Sees this as prospective v. retrospective; he appreciates the transparency of the approach.

Donadey: Said she still believes it’s about killing assigned time.

Attiq: Noted that the change would be SO much better for staff …

5. Officers’ Report (Ornatowski)
5.1 Referral Chart
   Noted that the academic misconduct policy was referred to AP&P.

6. Old Business

7. New Business: Action Items
7.1 Executive Session: Naming Opportunity (Herrick) – 2:45 time certain
   MSP Move to Executive Session
Herrick presented naming opportunities to SEC members, who discussed each one and voted on whether or not to support it.

**MSP** Move out of Executive Session

7.2 Committees and Elections (Rhodes)

7.3 Faculty Honors and Awards
Deutschman noted some issues with how the Committee is operating this academic year; we’re still waiting on the supporting documentation for the lecturer seeking emeritus status.

7.4 FEC Policy Proposal on Gifts (discussion)
Wheeler offered highlights of the proposal – and why he and others believe it is necessary to ensure faculty integrity isn’t compromised.

**Deutschman:** Argued that the report is vague—and not ready for Senate discussion and approval.

**Wheeler:** Explain that the key word is *inappropriately* … that’s the potential issue. What if a gift comes with strings?

**Ornatowski:** Noted that the proposal isn’t formatted as policy needs to be. It’s flowery, descriptive; the “policy” elements are merely implied, which means they’re unclear or ambiguous.

**Donadey:** Added that the document reads more like a rationale.

**Wheeler:** Said that he thought SEC would use the referral process – and have the appropriate committees review and comment.

**Schellenberg:** Feels that the document’s policy “intent” doesn’t match the actual language.

**Deutschman:** Thinks that the referral might be to both Constitution and Bylaws and AR&P.

**Ornatowski and Balsdon:** Explained why tight language is critical.

**Ely:** Wants more understanding of the process -- how this all will work.

**Ornatowski:** Advised Wheeler to look at Policy File language and mimic or model it. He should also meet with Constitution and Bylaws to review and then bring it back to SEC for referral (and that referral might also be to the SDSU Development Office). The rationale, he explained, can be presented as an addendum.
7.5 Sense of the Senate resolution regarding changes to the RTP process (Ornatowski)
Ornatowski provided a cogent backdrop to the discussion, focusing on Joanna
Brooks’ presentation to the Senate (March mtg) about changes to current RTP
process. It appears from that discussion the Senate is learning toward major reviews
at years 3 and 6, rather than 2, 4, and 6.

Brooks seeks direction – but our role is unclear; clearly, a sense of the (SEC and)
Senate could help here.

*Ornatowski read the resolution aloud.*

**Provost:** Feels this is a change in practice – not policy.

**Ornatowski:** If the Senate approves the resolution, then we’ve done our part. [It will
be an Action Item when it comes to the Senate]. If we vote it down, then we have
options to consider.

**Donadey:** Asked for a correction to the 2nd paragraph: appointment to reappointment
(RTP).

7.6 Student Learning Outcomes (Schellenberg)
Schellenberg noted that there’s nothing major here, but these policy updates are
appropriate. Changes focus on title(s), membership, terms, etc.

**Eadie:** Noted that this comes from an appointed committee—so if there are no major
policy changes, we can bring it to the Senate; otherwise the document goes to a
standing committee. Two sections seem to apply here: 3.0 – review from Faculty
Affairs … and 5.0 – Academic Affairs.

**Donadey:** Since membership grows to 15 from 13, it seems like new policy – see 3.0.

**Ornatowski:** Concurred, seeing the changes as major – especially with the new focus
on outcomes.

7.7 Staff Affairs (Retirements)
This sort of report will start coming to SEC quarterly.

8. New Business: Consent Calendar (Committee Reports/Information Items)
8.1 Library Report (Herman/Spearman) – 3:00 pm time certain
According to Herman, the report illustrates that the budgets of all units except the
library’s have risen significantly since 2003; the library budget is flat – which really
means decreases. Subscriptions are very expensive, and many tools are no longer
available (example: Lexis/Nexis). Interlibrary loan requests are way up – LinkedIn
and (other such resources) are no longer relevant.
Deutschman: How do we compare to other universities – including those that are “aspirational.” SDSU is not “like” many of the other CSU campuses.

Weston: SFSU and Fullerton budgets are stronger than ours – Northridge, too – but not as substantively.

Verity: What would the increased budget satisfy?

Herman: The loss of databases would be devastating … and interlibrary loan (as a solution) poses roadblocks for those writing books.

Verity: Can we partner with other campuses to support Lexis/Nexis?

Weston: It’s challenging to become part of another consortia.

Provost: Presented a graphic illustrating how a shift with base funding could help. Carryforward funds could be used as well.

The Provost agrees we could do a better job of funding the library – but there are ways to move funds around from base and carryforward to make this happen.

He encouraged Herman to get #s from AVP Prislin. The idea is to move some funds from carryforward to base … and then it becomes permanent. We must, however, do this prudently.

Wheeler: What about IRA funds? What does the library receive from this stream? How much does athletics receive?

Ely: Nothing goes to the library.

Toombs: The 5-year trajectory still looks flat.

Provost: Noted that the budget us up about $1 million, and added that we’re still recovering from the recession (though that doesn’t mean we don’t need to move forward).

Spearman: The library faces higher operating costs (30%) than many academic units (4%); it’s an expensive operation. Renovations are costly – computers need refreshing, etc.

Provost: Detailed how run-down the library looked when he arrived on campus; he demanded change. Even updates to the outside are in order.

Deutschman: Sees the library is a nerve center (and shared stories about how students interact with it).
**Donadey:** All the graphics help us see where the priorities are; I want to make sure this is going to the Senate.

**Schellenberg:** Feels it might be wise to get the #s reconciled prior to the Senate presentation.

**Provost:** Believes Herman should be able to connect with AVP Prislin.

**Eadie:** Let’s make this a time certain, off the consent calendar – best as an information item.

8.2 **ASCSU Report (Ornatowski)**
Ornatowski noted the RCA funding increase, but indicated that resolutions are slow to get posted to the site if at all.

8.3 **University Relations and Development**

9. **Other Information Items**

10. **Other Business**

11. **Adjournment**

The Senate Executive Committee adjourned at 3:30 pm.