CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of
the ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting of January 9, 2001

Members Present: Kevin Callahan, Cal Caplan, William Langan, Sally Murphy, Sue Opp, Norma Rees, Henry Reichman, Don Sawyer, Eric Soares, Emily Stoper, Steve Ugbah

Members absent: Don Wort

Guests: Edward Keller, Linda Kinrade, Michael Leung, Jane Lopus, Frank Martino, Tom McCoy, Dick Metz, Leigh Mintz, David Spence, Arthurelene Towner, Donald Wolitzer, Joe Zelan

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Reichman/Murphy) to approve the agenda with the addition of 00-01 BEC 12 as item 7A.

Visit with Vice Chancellor David Spence

David Spence, CSU Executive Vice Chancellor, was welcomed to the Executive Committee meeting by Chair Stoper. Dr. Spence values the opportunity to explain to faculty what the Chancellor's Office is doing, and to listen to us explain what we are doing.

- In response to Ugbah's question about mandating a move from the quarter calendar to the semester calendar, Dr. Spence said that it is thought to be a nice thing to do, but is not enough of a high priority without financial support (mostly in the form of released time for faculty). One time funds of six to seven million dollars (from the buy-out of summer programs) were recently considered, but he, together with President Rees and Dr. Martino, concluded that those were insufficient to fund the transition to semesters on six campuses. He has asked two campuses to examine actual costs. Compensation for faculty time spent restructuring the curriculum would be the primary cost. In response to Stoper's question whether the choice is not up to individual campuses, Dr. Spence replied that three campuses are eager to make the change, and if they did so the remaining three would be under considerable pressure to do likewise. Year-round operation (YRO) works well with the quarter system, but Rees pointed out that semester campuses are being urged to develop summer terms too. Spence added that were the money available, the faculty time spent in curricula redesign would be valuable in itself.

- Caplan observed that the University of Santa Clara set aside money for faculty housing, despite an average starting salary of $60,000, and inquired what the CSU was doing about this. Dr. Spence said that this was a very high priority with the Board of Trustees (BOT), the Chancellor, and Executive Vice Chancellor for Finances Richard West. They are working with banks, developing some creative financing, and other projects. The CSU does have land on some campuses, including Hayward's, and that is a major factor in home pricing, so it gives us some leverage.

- The low starting salary was a related issue brought up. Dr. Spence said that the Chancellor has asked the legislature to re-examine the marginal cost figures, based on an average salary of $42,000-43,000, but the whole subject of marginal costs for FTES is subject to complex negotiations. For example, the CSU is trying to reinstate differential funding for graduate education, which existed until 1994. But he noted that in 1994 FTES funding was
recalculated to reflect the percentage costs of graduate students, so the CSU must pursue only a differential for increased graduate enrollments since then.

- Reichman raised the issue of salaries of full professors. Dr. Spence wondered why salaries were capped in the first place. He suggested that post-tenure reviews could be tied to a 7-8% salary increase. He agreed that the present FMI process is flawed, but that we need some merit process, albeit a better one. This system began badly, because the notion that only 15% of faculty deserve merit pay is wrong. The UC approach, for example, involves faculty review of one-third of the faculty each year. When asked why the CSU is so committed to this flawed FMI system, he responded that the CSU does not believe the union wants any merit process, and to agree to a moratorium would require the whole concept of merit pay to be reintroduced. The governor and the BOT strongly support merit pay, and believe we presently commit 40% of salary increases to it, even though the figure is closer to 17% because SSI's are included under "merit." Dr. Spence observed that the past six to seven months of failed negotiations have rendered discussion about this whole issue very difficult.

- Langan asked why communication seems so difficult to achieve. Dr. Spence noted that he is trying to improve shared governance, working with the statewide Academic Senate. He mentioned the Advisory Committee on Faculty Workload, which is comprised of representatives of the CSU administration, the Academic Senate, and the CFA. But there is more of an adversarial nature to negotiations over collective bargaining issues. Besides merit pay, there are other issues that make communication difficult. He worries that the CFA's insistence on accountability for dollars allocated by the legislature but not spent on faculty compensation will result in re-imposition of a mandated "salary savings" factor (which was 2% at one time) that returns those funds to the state's general fund. At present they are allocated to campuses to spend as they wish. Provost Martino observed that on this campus they are spent within Academic Affairs, allocated to the Schools, who more than likely spend them on lecturers for additional sections. President Rees added that given our stagnant enrollments, these are the only funds available for expanding course offerings.

- Ugbah asked if Spence was implying by his earlier remarks that there was no merit process before FMIs? Is the PT&R process not a merit process? Dr. Spence agreed that the PT&R process is a merit process, and noted that he has never encountered a faculty member who is anti-merit. It is just this process which is so unpopular.

- Ugbah then asked with whom the Chancellor's Office plans to talk about improving the merit process, if not the CFA. Dr. Spence responded that shared governance must be made to work better. He observed that some faculty are members of both the Senate and the CFA, which means that they wear different hats in different settings. There is overlap. But collective bargaining is different than shared governance.

- Kelly, Chair of CIC, inquired about the setting of accountability goals. Are we supposed to identify insignificant increases so we can demonstrate "progress". As an example he cited facility utilization. If we commit to increasing the percentage of courses taught at nights and weekends, when little or no staff support is available, are we not adversely affecting pedagogical quality merely to look good in someone's accountability report? Dr. Spence welcomed the opportunity to clarify this issue, since he was the person primarily involved in drafting the instructions about accountability. There will be indicators on some campuses where the 2 to 5 year projection is no different from the present number. Time to degree is another example where misleading or irrelevant numbers occur. It is not an issue of time, but of the number of units required for the degree, and whether required courses are available to students who want them. The actual time students take to complete their studies depends upon many factors. For many campuses, improvement is possible. What the CSU wants to see is that campuses come in, compare their own data with those from other campuses, and say: we are doing the job already. The Chancellor's Office wants to be able to report to the
BOT, the legislature and the governor that CSU campuses are making this amount of progress towards fulfilling their goals. It is not a matter of comparison of one campus to others. President Rees added that this is one way of avoiding performance pay to campuses, something popular with state legislatures around the country.

- Opp observed that if the accountability indicator for facility utilization should force us to schedule our courses at odd hours and days, traditional students (such as our first time freshmen) would not take them. Dr. Spence replied that that is not the purpose. Only those few campuses (Long Beach, Fullerton, San Diego, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo) which are impacted will be reviewed, because they are turning students away allegedly because of lack of space. Long Beach, for example, shows only a 3% Friday utilization.

- Caplan asked where we are in the impasse over the re-opener negotiations. Dr. Spence responded that the fact-finders report is out for a mandated number of days. The CSU has written a dissent to it.

- Callahan raised the issue of part-time faculty versus full-time faculty and asked about the Chancellor's views regarding tenure. Dr. Spence agreed that the Chancellor gave an anti-tenure speech in the early '90's, but that the Chancellor and Dr. Spence actually dissuaded some Florida BOT members who wanted to eliminate tenure during the '94-'96 period. The Chancellor will not oppose tenure until institutions such as Stanford and Berkeley eliminate it. Dr. Spence acknowledges that the ratio of tenured faculty to lecturers did decline for a number of years. He feels that it is important to have a core of tenured faculty. But he feels a more important issue is the ratio of full-time faculty (be they tenure-track or contract lecturers) to part-time faculty. He would like to see the institution of multi-year contracts for full time lecturers.

- Reichman observed that the present two-tiered fee structure, under which students pay the same fee whether they take 7 or 20 units, encourages students to take more courses than they need or can handle, given their family and employment responsibilities. Dr. Spence agreed that it would be worth studying a fee-per-unit system.

- Sawyer asked what the Chancellor's Office overall intent regarding accountability in terms of outcomes and assessment is. He observed that it is consuming more and more time. Dr. Spence commented that Hayward is clearly in the top tier of campuses in the way we have approached outcomes and assessment, especially in regards to General Education. In terms of program and course content, that is not the central office's business. Accountability is done to provide a basis for the BOT to work with the governor, the legislature and the general public, to demonstrate to them that each campus has something in place for deciding what we aim to provide all our graduating students and for assessing how well we are progressing towards achieving that goal. We should not strive to overwhelm the central office with data and figures. Less is better, keep it simple, identify the six or seven things that we are doing for our students. Any other use of accountability is the faculty's business, not the Chancellor's. The Chancellor's Office wants only to be able to reassure the public, the legislature and the governor that the campuses know what their students are getting.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meetings of November 14 and 21, 2000

M/S/P (Murphy/Callahan) to approve the minutes of November 14th.

M/S/P (Caplan/Murphy) to approve the minutes of November 21st.
3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair
   We will need to replace Jose Lopez on CAPR for the Winter Quarter and to nominate an at
large replacement for Donna Wiley in the Senate for Winter and Spring Quarters.
   - As of December 16th, 32 tenure-track searches have been authorized, plus six formerly
   authorized but unfilled searches have been extended. 31 faculty have retired; the total number
   of separations is unknown. Only 20 new tenure-track faculty joined us this year. By school,
   ALSS has received authorization for 11 searches (and one extended); SCI 7 (and one); SBE 4
   (and one); SEAS 6 (and two); LIB 2 (and one); and the interdisciplinary Engineering program
   2.

   B. Report of the President - There was no report from the President.

   C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
   The Senate meets in plenary session next week; Caplan will participate in the first meeting of
   the Governor's Teacher Education Awards Committee on January 17th.

4. Appointments:

   Two faculty members to serve on the Faculty-Student Subcommittee of FAC
   Eric Soares and Sally Murphy were appointed to serve on the Faculty-Student Subcommittee
   of FAC.

   Spring Quarter replacement for Steve Ugbah (Marketing & Entrepreneurship) on the
   University Advancement Faculty Liaison Committee
   Ugbah's Spring Quarter replacement on the University Advancement Faculty Liaison
   Committee was held over until the next meeting.

   Spring Quarter replacement for Steve Ugbah on the Foundation Board of Directors
   Eric Soares was appointed to serve as the Spring Quarter replacement for Steve Ugbah on the
   Foundation Board of Directors.

5. Appointment of Campus Representative to the Academic Council on International Programs

   Following the recommendation of the Search Committee, Michael Lee (Geography &
   Environmental Studies) was appointed to serve as Campus Representative to the Academic
   Council on International Programs for the remainder of the 2000-2003 term.

6. Schedule for Winter Quarter University-wide Election

   M/S/P (Opp/Caplan) to approve the Winter Quarter University-wide Election Schedule.

7A.00-01 BEC 12, Resolution Regarding Collective Bargaining

   M/S/P (Caplan/Ugbah) to place 00-01 BEC 12 on the Senate agenda.
7B. 00-01 CAPR 1, Five Year Program Review for the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science

M/S (Soares/Callahan) to place 00-01 CAPR 1 on the Senate agenda.

Ugbah inquired whether the department agrees with the outsider reviewer's recommendations against seeking further tenure-track positions. Opp wondered why anyone working in the computer industry would teach for so much lesser pay. Wolitzer (Math Graduate Coordinator) observed that some people like to teach, but that it was harder to hire tenure-track faculty than part-time faculty. All the courses needed for both the graduate and undergraduate programs are being offered, though not enough sections of some required courses to meet demand. Opp inquired about capping undergraduate majors in computer science. Langan and Keller thought this would be unwise during a time when the University was suffering enrollment declines. Ugbah asked about the department's decision not to seek accreditation. Wolitzer explained that all the substantive requirements were being met by the program, but that certain archaic requirements for accreditation (e.g. one year of physics labs as opposed to one year of science labs) would impose unnecessary hardships on our students.

The motion passed.

8. 00-01 CAPR 2, Department Name Change: Chemistry to Chemistry and Biochemistry

M/S/P (Opp/Sawyer) to place 00-01 CAPR 2 on the Senate agenda

Biology had no objections to the name change from Chemistry to Biochemistry.

9. 00-01 CIC 10, Addition to List of Courses Satisfying Upper Division G.E. Requirements Under the 1998-2002 Program (Addendum to 00-01 CIC 7)

M/S/P (Murphy/Caplan) to place 00-01 CIC 10 on the Senate agenda.

10. Report from the Ad-hoc Committee on Faculty Input into the Budget Process - Postponed until next week.

11. Math Competencies

M/S (Murphy/Caplan) to place the memorandum dated December 1, 2000 from CIC on the Senate agenda.

Caplan asked whether these objectives were too broad. Keller responded that there is no specific course subject matter that all students should be required to know. Caplan worried that departments would start designing new courses to satisfy the GE Math requirement and thus attract students to increase their share of FTES. Keller responded that that has not happened yet. Stoper observed that her response to the Statewide Academic Senate is due before the next meeting of the Senate.

M/S/P (Reichman/Caplan) to approve CIC's memo as CSUH's response to the Statewide Academic Senate and to place on the Senate agenda as an information item.
12. Faculty Involvement in Setting Goals for Performance Areas in Accountability Process

Discussion of this item began by focusing on utilization figures for Fridays, which show 8.6%. Langan explained that that does not represent underutilization for the following reasons. 24.1% of our courses are counted as Night (from 4:00 PM on) not Friday; 1.6% as Weekend; and 12.7% as Summer. Approximately 5% of the remaining courses are scheduled at the Contra Campus Center, which does not operate on Fridays. That leaves under 60% of our courses. If half of them are scheduled on a Mon-Wed-Fri pattern, that would appear as 10% on Fridays. Given the fact that mid-afternoon courses are normally scheduled on a Mon-Wed rather than a Mon-Wed-Fri pattern in response to student enrollment patterns, the figure of 8.6% is reasonable.

Further discussion was postponed until next week.

13. Adjournment

M/S/P (Ugbah/Opp) to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

William Langan, Secretary