

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

OFFICE OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE

Amended Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 6, 2012

Members:

Present: Jennifer Eagan, Liz Ginno, James Houpis, Pat Jennings, James Murray, Gretchen Reevy-Manning, Mitch Watnik

Absent: Denise Fleming, Susan Gubernat

Guests:

Linda Dalton, Linda Dobb, Jiansheng Guo, Mark Karplus, Amber Machamer, Sue Opp, Glen Perry, Sophie Rollins, Don Sawyer, Angela Schneider, Kaameelah Wesley, Donna Wiley

Meeting called to order: 2:05 p.m.

Agenda

- approved without objections, 5-0-0

Murray suggested as secretary by acclamation

Minutes of 10/30/12

- not available

Report of the Chair:

Senate is meeting next week for Planning for Distinction discussion with President and the VPs.
Regrets from Susan Gubernat, can't participate this week

Report of the Provost:

A2E2 committee is seated except student reps

Moving ahead with advising centers in all colleges, posting new positions

IREE forms are being circulated around colleges

Funding for replacing course fees is being disbursed to colleges

Next week will report on....

- Jason Singley is in charge of student & faculty research
- came up with new research "academy"
- 150 students interested, 67 research plans, and 30 awards of \$1500 each

Planning for Distinction handout

- showing experience and broad representation
- steering committee is UPABC plus extra people, color code of folks from different parts of university
 - (faculty, academic staff, budget, PEMSA)
- Watnik comments on activities of Steering Committee last week
- determined quorum rules
- VP Dalton corrected one of the entries on the committees for Distinction
- Karplus comments on color coding on names
- VP Dalton addresses the role of the steering committee, which she chairs
- each task group submits to steering committee, and steering committee can help create consistency between task groups
- Support Program Task Group- colors of names are from diff colleges
- Instructional Program Task Group- colors of names are chair/non-chair
- Eagan asks if committee meetings are on calendar (checked and is now; but no room # yet)
- workshop Nov 27,28 is a leadership forum for those not on 3 committees, but might need to provide input
- question of which meetings are open and closed, but not yet fully determined says VP Dalton
- Eagan asks about rumor that meetings might be closed on basis of personnel discussions, but Eagan states that since it as an advisory committee and not making decisions, then discussions are not protected on that basis. Asks if this closed meeting violates Brown Act.
- Watnik states that consultants recommend closed meetings
- Provost Houpis states these meetings won't violate Brown Act, but will check to be sure of interpretation
- recommendations of the Planning for Distinction process will need to go through Senate procedure
- Houpis acknowledges the speed of process and associated anxiety
- might have templates in January
- final recommendations will go to Senate at end of year and spill over to next AY
- Houpis states that there will be open forums for questions about Planning for Distinction
- Reevy suggests we all read Brown Act, and asks purpose of closed meetings
- Houpis answers that some faculty might criticize their own department and have repercussions
- Ginno asks if we should move 5a to ask questions
- Watnik suggests we limit questions now in Excom to 15 minutes; committee agrees by acclamation
- Questions from Ginno:
 - where did the money come from? Coming from "contingency fund", not academic affairs, as suggested by Brad Wells
 - was regular staff asked to serve? (some are staff, but some were not on what basis?)
 - how did info about this get out? Watnik answers all CSUEB received a communique
- Houpis open to suggestions for better communication
- Watnik suggested making easier website address
- Watnik asks if we are amenable to inviting the chairs of the Task Groups to Senate meeting next week. Is Excomm amenable?
- Jennings asks if we should postpone until president is back in town

- Watnik suggests we having standing item in senate agenda for updates
- Sophie Rollins emailed questions to Watnik :
- How are the teams chosen? i.e. task forces; Watnik solicited from COBRA and CAPR chairs; and from Deans
- Houpis suggested sending questions to Lori and getting typed answers into FAQ
- Why are we seeking distinction? marketing? by necessity?
- Houpis discusses different ways to be distinctive

4a. Old Business:

12-13 BEC5: Ginno/Reevy to Senate

Pat discusses background, moved programs from stateside to CSO should be reviewed and we should define “significant changes”

Watnik discusses at CIC about language in BEC5 that is not accurate and asks if we can amend BEC5 #3 to address and preserve same # of academic units

Eagan asks what would happen is a new CSO Online course required teaching in summer; Dobb answers that it would be a separate contract

Eagan asks who would decide when these courses would be offered; Murray answers that online task force is discussing that issue now

Eagan suggests that we make #3 more vague to make it more accurate

-Houpis asks about #2 and if it is accurate, because it is not allowed

-example of Women’s Studies approved state-support but never offered, but now offered as self-support

Houpis suggests better language to be more accurate of original concern of #2

Houpis suggests #3 may violate academic freedom

Watnik suggests Jennings’ amendment to change to units instead of weeks would address Houpis’ concerns

Opp says that curricular procedure does not ask about # weeks of instruction

Jennings asks if move from 10 to 8 weeks could affect quality

Eagan asks if starting early is allowable stateside, but CSO might allow it

Ginno amends motion to send to CIC with changes for consideration

Sawyer suggests that ExCom give CIC a specific charge

Motion to refer to CIC, (M Murray /S Reevy/P)

5B: discussion of ballot rules

Last week we had vigorous discussion and vote by email on referring ballot issue to senate

suggest that we could improve the ballot, seeking feedback via email

Eagan suggests we refer it to FAC

Reevy asks 1) no longer have minimum # for an election, and 2) does petition method reduce discussion of issues?

Eagan suggests details of background info and rights of petitioners

At the next ExCom meeting we will talk details of the charge

5C: 12-13 CIC3

Jennings asks if this is an entrance exam, but they can't transfer UD and avoid re-taking material they already know, competency exam

CSUEB only granting 20 units but could have requested even more

Eagan asks what courses exactly are displaced? Ask Nursing to be there, asks for amendment for specific courses that are replaced

AVP Perry asks for us to be clear how PEMSA accounts for this course

AVP Opp says they are not registering for these courses

Eagan asks what course are displaced, and Opp says this should be reflected in their Roadmaps

Eagan asks Nursing to provide roadmap for these students, add to background info

5D: 12-13 CAPR4: Ginno/Reevy

does not state "or designee" sub for AV APGS, but CAPR has been assuming

President will change his appointee if APGS sends a diff designee

this change will make it similar to historical procedure

Reevy asks if this is a change of the membership or just an interpretation

Watnik cites precedent of interpretation

Karplus asks if we refer back to CAPR

Ginno states that #7 shows that still needs other changes in this committee

Eagan asks if we can fix this now to help CAPR, then deal with language

later, Eagan suggests that our discussion shows it needs to be clarified

AVP Opp points out that she would be voting on CIC and CAPR and her designee has been doing good job

Ginno suggests we send records of this to Senate office

Vote 5-0-0 to send this to Senate

Skip 5E

5F, Senate agenda:

add CAPR 4 and CIC3

time certain for Planning for Distinction, 3pm

Dianne Rush-Woods last year said we could have senate public comment

period in meeting but some comments might not be relevant to senate

Eagan says announcements are nice to inform campus

community Reevy suggests only 5 min at beginning of Senate

meeting Pat wonders if we should set aside more time with

faculty

Vote to approve 5-0-0

5E: Self-support Subcommittee of Senate

seven volunteers

Watnik asks if we should add one from Excomm. Wiley asks if there should be FAC on it too.

Eagan agrees someone for from Excom should be. Watnik offers to serve on this subcommittee.

Maybe Sweety Law could serve since Business does self-support

Provost says we have no plans to move to CSO

Provost says Planning for Distinction rumors can be emailed directly to his office

Adjourn Ginno/Eagan

Adjourned: 3:57 p.m.