Executive Committee Agenda for January 21-22 and 26-27, 2004

Wed., Jan. 21, 8:30 - 10 a.m., ex com meets with standing committee chairs
Wed., Jan. 21, 10 a.m. - 5 p.m., ex com meets
Thurs., Jan. 22, 8:30 - 9:45 a.m., ex com meets
Mon., Jan 26, 1-5 (or as necessary) p.m., ex com meets
Tues., Jan 27, if necessary, ex com meets at 8:30

1. Approval of agenda
2. Approval of minutes of December ex com meeting (attached)
3. Announcements and Reports:
   3.1. Chair’s report
   3.2. Reports by Standing Committee Chairs
   3.3. ITP Taskforce
   3.4. David Spence (time certain tba)
   3.5. Any other reports
4. Times certain:
   4.1. tba: David Spence
   4.2. Wed., 1:30 p.m.: committee liaison (return no later than 2:30 p.m.)
   4.3. Mon., 2 p.m.: meet with chancellor and vice-chancellors re BOT agenda
5. Discussion:
   5.1. Formulating a policy on faculty/senate role in administrative searches in the
       CO: how do we go about doing this? How has the senate formulated policy like
       this before? (Need to discuss with Marshelle present; I’ve attached the SFSU
       policy. You may all want to take a look at your campus policies and think about
       what we’d want in such a policy.)
   5.2. The legislature (Need to discuss with Cristy present)
      5.2.1. Liu committee hearings: what should we expect next?
      5.2.2. Master Plan legislation, planning for the Feb. ICAS meeting re Master
              Plan legislation: to what extent can we develop a common legislative
              agenda with ICAS?
      5.2.3. The spring legislative session more generally--how do we take part? As
              part of a single CSU leg day on Mar 22? With our own effort? Other
              possibilities?
5.3. BOT agenda, preparatory to meeting with chancellor and vice-chancellors.

5.4. The budget: let's talk about strategies before the BAT meeting on Wed. if time permits, or, if we don't get to this item by 5 p.m., we'll still need to talk about follow-up to the BAT meeting on Wed. We need especially to address the increase in SFR and the likely reduction in enrollments, and to begin to prepare the senate's position on these, for us to use with the legislature. Let's include the graduate differential proposal that we discussed in December. We need to begin to put together the package that we'll take to the legislature, preferably with support from the CO. Cristy needs to be present for as much of this as possible.

5.5. Agenda/logistics for campus senate chairs' meeting and interim meetings in February

5.6. POL: resolution, next steps

5.7. IMPAC/CAN: next steps

5.8. Senate assigned time and the 2004-05 budget: next steps

6. Action:
   6.1. Sustainability: see the two resolutions drafted by Jackie (attached)

7. Agenda for January plenary:

   7.1. times certain: Farar, Spence, Lenz (re budget), Travis, Platen; Reed and West unavailable,
   7.2. 2nd reading, Review of the CSU GWAR in 2002
   7.3. 2nd reading, Policies on Employment of Graduate Students
   7.4. 1st reading, waiver, Support for Proposition 56, the Budget Accountability Act
   7.5. 1st reading, Support for the CSU Project on Lower-division Requirements in Majors
Executive Committee
Academic Senate of the California State University
Minutes of December 3-4, 2003

1. The Committee was convened by Chair Cherny at 5:00 p.m. on December 3rd. Present were Executive Committee members Cherny, Hood, Kegley and Snyder, as well as Committee Chair Thobaben, Faculty Trustee Kaiser, and Interim Executive Director Peacock. Committee member McNeil and Committee Chairs Cates, Jensen and Thompson joined the committee Thursday morning.

2. The Agenda was approved with several additions.

3. The Minutes of the November meeting were approved as distributed.

4. Chair’s Report

- At the Provosts’ meeting, budget reductions were discussed.
- **Mid-Year Reduction.** This will be $23.8 million this year, $11.3 million in unallocated reductions and $12.5 million from outreach programs. For 2004-2005 the governor has proposed $74.6 million; of that amount, $22.6 million would be unallocated reductions, and $52 million would be reductions from outreach programs, including $37 million from the Educational Opportunity Program. There appears to be little understanding of the composition of outreach and early assessment. However, if the legislature fails to approve these designated reductions, they will be made as undesignated reductions, which is preferred by the Chancellor’s Office. There will be enrollment target reductions to reflect this reduced funding.
- **2004-2005.** For 2004-2005, the Chancellor’s Office anticipates the same range of reductions as we received this year: $300-400 million. The impact will be absorbed by a combination of layoffs, enrollment reductions, and “efficiencies”—the last of these apparently a favorite approach of the new DOF. If not buffered by a fee increase, a reduction of this size could amount to a 12% enrollment loss.
- **CSU Mentor** CSU Mentor will be mandatory next year, although students may request a paper application. More than 50% of applicants choose 4 or more campuses.
- **CMS** Although there is some unhappiness about the CMS student module, it is required and all campuses are still expected to implement it.

5. **ITP.** ITP Chair Snyder reported on next week’s meeting to finalize the reports on regions and balance.

6. **Liu Committee Hearings Dec. 9th.** This set of hearings will deal exclusively with Community College Funding. The Chair led a discussion of the technology initiative and discussed his Dec. 9th meeting with Bruce Hamlett and Carol Twigg.

7. **POL.** The committee discussed and edited the POL Draft which will be forwarded to the Senate as an information item.
8. IMPAC/CAN The committee marked up the IMPAC/CAN draft MOU. Bob will issue another draft for e-mail approval before taking this to Larry Pitts of UC.

9. Proposed CSU Admission Notification Date Policy. UC/CSU Admissions Committees had a joint meeting. They propose to send out admissions notifications between March 1-31, with a response deadline of May 1. Some provosts expressed concern about this schedule, but were mollified when told that early acceptance notifications would be permitted. Academic Affairs is to discuss this during the January plenary.

10. Graduate Differential Proposal (12/15). The Chair reported that, while visiting San Diego, he and Trustee Kaiser received a suggestion that now is the time to push for the graduate differential as a no-cost item that would yield a more accurate measurement of graduate FTES. This will be discussed further, including discussions with the Chancellor’s Office.

11. Presidents’ Commission on Teacher Preparation. Executive Vice Chancellor Spence considers that many of the tasks have been completed.

12. February Senate Chairs and Committee Meetings. The Senate Chairs plan to meet in February in Sacramento, and FGA is likely to meet in Sacramento. There was discussion whether all the committees might meet there. The Chair will check with Ann to see if a Sacramento Interim Meeting would adversely impact our Hilton room guarantee, with the Sacramento campus regarding logistics, and with standing committee chairs to determine their preferences.

13. Master Plan Bills and ICAS. It would be helpful if Senate Committees could draft resolutions stating the Senate’s positions on the major omnibus Master Plan bills currently before the Legislature. The next meeting of the Intersegmental Committees of the Academic Senates will be February 17th and our positions need to be developed before that time.

14. CSSA EOP Resolution. The Chair will speak with Charles Reed, David Spence and Karen Ylvert-Zamarripa about drafting a letter opposing the targeted reduction to EOP.

15. The Committee adjourned at 4:00 p.m. on December 4th.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Hood
Secretary

(These Minutes have not been approved.)
ATTACHMENT 1:

POLICY ON SEARCH COMMITTEES FOR
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS
Academic Senate Policy #F92-180

This document recognizes that faculty and administrators at San Francisco State University aspire toward the same goal: that of maintaining excellence in carrying out the mission of the University. Given the inter-relatedness of faculty and administrative responsibilities, and the need for coordination in carrying out these responsibilities, we endorse the principle that faculty should play an essential role in the selection of San Francisco State University administrators.

The procedures that follow are designed to ensure full consultation with faculty and clear delineation of responsibilities in the process of selecting San Francisco State University administrators, especially those involved in making decisions directly affecting the quality of academic programs. While we recognize that the ultimate responsibility for the appointment of administrators rests with the University President, we also recognize that the faculty must have the opportunity to select their representatives, deliberate as necessary, and make recommendations as provided below, with the assurance that those recommendations will receive serious consideration and will normally be accepted. Students and staff should be represented on all such committees.

A. Mission of the Search Committee

The mission of the search committee is to obtain, seek information about, screen, interview, and recommend candidates for the position in question.

B. Composition of the Search Committee

1. Composition of the search committees shall vary by category as follows:

   Category Ia: Deans of Colleges
   The Committee shall consist of:
   - An elected majority of faculty members from the unit.
   - At least one staff member elected from the unit.
   - Additional members appointed by the President
   - The committee chair shall be elected by the committee

   Category Ib: Librarian of the University
   The Committee shall consist of:
   - An elected majority of faculty members with at least two faculty from the unit.
   - At least two staff members elected from the unit.
   - Additional members appointed by the President.
   - The committee chair shall be elected by the committee.

   Category II: Position(s) with Most Direct Impact on Faculty
   Vice President from Academic Affairs.
   The search committee(s) for the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall consist of 1) an elected majority of faculty members, one member from each college and the Library, and 2) members appointed by the President.

   Category III: Positions with Significant Impact on Faculty
   Faculty shall have significant elected representation and, however selected, shall constitute a majority on search committees for the following positions:
   - Vice Presidents (other than Vice President for Academic Affairs)
   - Dean of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development
   - Dean of Undergraduate Studies
   - Dean of Graduate Studies
   - Dean of Extended Learning
Category IV: Positions with Impact on Faculty
Faculty shall have elected representation on Search Committees for the following positions:
  Dean of Students
  Director, Disability Resource Center
  Director, Educational Opportunity Programs
  Director, International Programs
  Director, Human Resources
  Chief, Public Safety
  Dean, Human Relations
  University Comptroller
  Director, Academic Services
  Director, Affirmative Action
  Director, Audio Visual/Instructional Television Center

Before a search begins for a position that is new, or has been reclassified or re-titled, the President or
designee, in consultation with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, shall determine the
appropriate category of faculty representation, consistent with the positions’ impact upon faculty, students
and staff.

2. The basic composition and size of a search committee for an administrative position will vary according to the
nature of the position and shall be determined by the President in consultation with the Executive Committee of the
Academic Senate. Committees should be constituted to reflect the balance and diversity appropriate to the search,
including ethnicity, gender, rank and professional expertise. The faculty shares the responsibility for such diversity
and balance. The views of the unit concerned should be sought regarding the job description and composition of the
Committee.

3. The unit in question, i.e., the unit reporting to the administrator and most affected by the positions, shall be
represented on the Committee except for compelling reasons as determined by the President in consultation with the
Executive Committee.

4. Faculty representatives shall be selected by campus-wide election except where otherwise stated. The Faculty
may establish specific criteria for nomination as appropriate.

5. Members of the Committee shall not be candidates for the position. Should a Committee member have a conflict
of interest with regard to the selection process, that person must resign from the Committee. Should this be a person
selected through the Academic Senate election process, the person having received the next highest number of votes
shall be seated as the replacement.

C. Guidelines for Consultation

1. The President or Vice President shall convene the first meeting of the Search Committee, shall indicate the budget
for the search and deadline for the Committee’s final report; the President or Vice President may appoint the
Committee Chair with the concurrence of the Committee, except in Category I searches.

2. The Search Committee shall be involved from the beginning of the search process. Normally, the Committee shall
develop the position description and qualifications, scope of the recruitment effort, timeliness, and advertisement of
the position.

3. At the time the position is formally advertised, the Committee shall inform the campus community of the position
description and application deadline dates, and invite applications and nominations.
4. The Committee shall operate under the University’s Affirmative Action Policy diligently to seek qualified candidates from under-represented groups as specified in that policy.

5. All Applicants, regardless of prior association with the University, shall be evaluated by the same criteria, and be given equal consideration and treatment by the Search Committee throughout the screening process. Applicants shall not be either excluded or included solely because of their geographical proximity to San Francisco State University.

6. The Committee shall provide opportunity for members of the University community to meet with candidates invited for interviews, and shall follow this by actively seeking evaluative comments from those who have attended such meetings. Comments received shall become part of the basis for further deliberation and for selection of the slate submitted to the President.

7. In consultation with the President or designee the Committee shall make extensive background checks on all finalists and may decide whether or not to conduct on-site visits to each finalist’s place of employment.

8. The Search Committee shall seek full consensus of its members on the recommendation of the final slate to the President. However, any name submitted on the final slate must receive at least a majority vote of approval from the Search Committee. Whenever possible, a minimum of three nominees shall be recommended to the President by the Search Committee.

9. No person shall be appointed who has not been recommended by the Search Committee.

10. If no nominee is acceptable to the President, the President shall, in consultation with the Search Committee, Academic Senate Executive Committee and the unit affected, (a) ask the Search Committee to submit a new slate, or (b) begin the search process again.

11. Any appointment with tenure in an academic department shall be made only after an evaluation and tenure recommendations by the appropriate department, as provided by the University policy on retention and tenure.

12. The committee shall keep the University community informed of its activities and shall submit a final report to the President or designee, who, within limits of confidentiality, will report to the Academic Senate Executive Committee on its efforts.

D. Acting Administrators

In cases where an incumbent administrator resigns, dies, retires, or is removed, or in cases where a search process fails, the President shall, in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the unit involved, appoint an acting administrator for a term not to exceed one year. When the position has not been filled through usual procedures within that year, the President, after consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the unit involved, may re-appoint an acting administrator.

**APPROVED BY PRESIDENT CORRIGAN ON MARCH 15, 1993**
ATTACHMENT 2A:

RESOLVED, that the CSU Academic Senate strongly supports and recommends to the Board of Trustees the adoption of the CSSA resolutions on a CSU Sustainability Policy.

Rationale: The CSSA resolutions on a CSU Sustainability Policy demonstrate careful reflection and substantial research on the issues of energy savings, sustainability and “green buildings.” The type of actions recommended by the CSSA most likely will provide substantial benefit to the CSU in cost savings and in savings for natural and human resources. These steps would also place CSU in a leadership position in the area of environmental consciousness.

ATTACHMENT 2B:

RESOLVED, that the CSU Academic Senate urge the Board of Trustees to adopt sustainability policy that

1. requires all new and renovated buildings be designed and built to a LEED Silver rating or higher without binding the CSU to pursue LEED certifications; and
2. seeks reduction of energy use per CSU student by 20 percent by 2014 and 40 percent by 2024 through energy conservation programs, energy-efficient building design and use of high-efficiency equipment and systems; and
3. directs that 25 percent of energy use in the CSU system be from renewable sources by 2014 and 50 percent from renewable sources by 2024; and be it further

Rationale: The US Green Building Council developed the “Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating system as a voluntary, consensus-based, market-driven building rating system based on existing proved technology that evaluates environmental performance from a “whole building” perspective over a building’s life cycle, providing a definitive standard for what constitutes a “green building.” This standard seeks to fulfill three primary objectives: implement high energy/water efficiency, conserve natural resources, and create healthy environment. The expected results of conformance to the standard are substantially lower operating, maintenance and healthcare expenses and higher occupant productivity. The energy conservation and efficiency features that are designed into LEED buildings offer the most cost-effective means of reducing the cost and environmental impact of providing energy services. Further, the evidence is that LEED Silver designed buildings cost no more than non-LEED buildings when the appropriate design concepts, technologies and materials are incorporated at the beginning of the design process.

A new sustainability policy as envisioned above will allow CSU to continue to be a leader in the efforts for responsible, cost-effective, development and consumption of resources. The Los Angeles Community College District and the University of California have each recently adopted forward-looking sustainability policies and Governor Schwarzenegger’s “Environmental Policy Agenda stipulates that 20 percent of all electricity sold on the grid come from renewable energy sources by 2010, with 33 percent coming from renewable energy sources by 2020. Finally, this resolution supports a similar resolution recently passed by the CSSA.