CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of
the ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as amended

Minutes of the Meeting of February 20, 2001

Members present: Kevin Callahan, Cal Caplan, William Langan, Sue Opp, Henry Reichman, Don Sawyer, Eric Soares, Emily Stoper, Steve Ugbah, Don Wort

Members absent: Sally Murphy, Norma Rees

Guests: Carl Bellone, Gladys DeNecochea, Russ Merris, Dick Metz, Leigh Mintz, Arthurlene Towner, Joe Zelan

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Sawyer/Ugbah) to approve the agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of February 6, 2001

M/S/P (Opp/Soares) to approve the minutes of February 6, 2001

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

The campus has been allocated two million dollars to fund transition to a semester system. We have been given about a month to "consult" about the change. The Chancellor has favored a "common calendar" for some time. Last year we asked four committees (FAC, CAPR, CIC and the Enrollment Task Force) to study the issue and their reports are being distributed today. In general there are equivocal results: faculty are split about evenly in support or opposition to the change. Callahan asked about effect on FTES, to which the Chair replied that national studies of other institutions making the change suggest that enrollment is lost during the first year of the semester system but increased enrollments make up that loss in the second year or even exceed it.

- It is unclear of what our "consultation" is meant to consist. Wort asked whether the transition is really being imposed, and are we consulting on terms of the transition (how long, how costly, etc.) or are we being asked whether we want to make the transition? The Chair thought it might be imposed on us, given Vice Chancellor David Spence's remarks at his meeting with us, to the effect that once sufficient funds became available (approximately two million per campus) there would only be three campuses wanting to remain on the quarter system and that would be too small a group to prevail. The funds apparently are coming out of an allocation for year-round-operations. Caplan asked whether the funding is sufficient to pay for all the faculty time that would be spent restructuring courses, curriculum and program requirements. Activity courses and labs may encounter physical plant limitations, if the transition results in more students per activity or lab.

- Langan suggested that it would be valuable to reflect on the pros and cons of making the transition before becoming committed to opposing it. Sawyer suggested holding a faculty-wide meeting on the question and organizing discussions amongst department chairs because much of the responsibility for effecting a change would fall on them. Reichman observed that for that meeting a clear statement from the Chancellor or President Rees should be obtained as to what our options actually are; the administration should be asked to do an assessment whether two million dollars is sufficient to fund both administrative and faculty costs; and whether we or the Chancellor determines a time table for the transition. Wort suggested that
we seek student input on the question as well. Opp disagreed, pointing out that students would naturally favor the present system to which they are accustomed. She also suggested communicating with community colleges to reshape our curriculum to be in sync with theirs, should we go ahead with the transition.

- Caplan raised the issue of campus autonomy. Merris challenged the Chancellor's right to impose the transition without first negotiating with the union, since it would constitute a change of employment conditions. He also raised the issue of shared governance. He counseled not letting a reply from the Chancellor determine whether we proceed or not. Langan pointed out that the idea of switching to semesters is not a new one; that once UC Berkeley and the local community colleges made the switch it was on the table for us; and that we should debate and decide whether we want to do it, now that funding has been made available. Reichman wished to modify his position in light of these comments. There are two issues we need to discuss: whether we want to make the transition; and campus autonomy. This appears to be one more action in an ever-increasing move towards centralization and standardization: a common calendar first, then common courses (which are already being discussed in some disciplines). We should discuss the faculty role in determining such issues.

- The Chair summarized the discussion in terms of leading towards two motions: one on challenging the right of the system to impose this on us, which is a governance issue; and a second one moving us ahead and involving campus-wide discussion of making a transition to semesters, a pedagogical and curriculum issue.

M/S/P (Wort/Soares) to urge the Chair to solicit as much information as she can on the rights and role of the faculty in making the decision to stay on quarters or switch to semesters, through consultation with the administration, other campus Senate Chairs, members of the Board of Trustees, legislators, and the Statewide Academic Senate.

Ugbah expressed concern about a pattern of apparent consultation. The Vice Chancellor discusses the issue with us as something abstract that might happen in the future, and a few weeks later money is actually allocated. Caplan suggested that the upcoming Statewide Academic Conference might be one opportunity for the Chair to solicit input.

M/S/P (Langan/Reichman) to call for a Faculty Senate meeting (amended by a friendly amendment to an extended Academic Senate meeting to which all the faculty are invited) on March 6th to discuss transition to a semester system. The Chair would begin that meeting with a report of her findings from her inquiries pursuant to the previous motion.

It was agreed by consensus that the four committee reports would be posted on the web and the faculty would be invited to read them.

Continuing her report, the Chair reported that FAC determined not to recommend any of four proposals concerning lecturers that were referred to them: increased opportunities for assigned time; authorization to serve on Standing Committees of the Academic Senate; an increase from 2 to 8 representatives on the Senate; and constitutional recognition of lecturers as regular members of the faculty. The Chair will return to FAC with a request for them to address the additional question in the original charge concerning how to respond to lecturers who wish to serve on committees without compensation.

- The question of postponing the deadline for submission of dossiers for first year retention cases, which is now merely six weeks after the tenure-track candidate's arrival on campus, was determined to be impossible given the CBA's requirement that the President notify first year probationary faculty of her decision to retain them or not by February 15th. The Chair is going
to ask FAC to consider, in light of that, whether probationary faculty should be given two year appointments.
- The Provost asked us to consider modifying our Policy on the Appointment and Review of Administrators to determine whether some of the positions listed for review could be eliminated, given a lack of faculty knowledge about some of those positions and reluctance to serve on review committees.

M/SP (Sawyer/Opp) to refer the question to FAC, with a request to the Provost that he identify which of the administrators he thinks might be eliminated from review.

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

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
A series of legislative days are planned to keep legislators informed of issues of concern to the faculty.

4. Appointment of a Spring Quarter Replacement for Stephen Starling (Management & Finance) on CIC

M/S/P (Ugbah/Soares) to appoint Cesar Maloles (Marketing & Entrepreneurship) as the Spring Quarter replacement for Stephen Starling on CIC.

5. 00-01 CIC 12, Setting Goals Under the CSU Accountability Process

M/S (Ugbah/Langan) to accept 00-01 CIC 12 as the Senate's response to the CSU Accountability Process.

Reichman questioned the increases recommended for Indicator 8. If the percentage of courses scheduled at off times increases by 6%, then the percentage of courses scheduled at the times most popular with students must decrease by 6%. That does not seem a well thought out goal, and could result in lower enrollments. He proposed sending the CIC report to the Provost, with our concerns noted.
- Opp questioned the recommendation regarding Indicator 3.2. What is the purpose of lowering the number of upper-division units students take? If that reflects the fact some departments will opt to lower the total number of units required to 180 from the present 186, why does it not apply to transfer students as well?
- Langan pointed out that the recommendation for Indicator 8 seemed internally inconsistent: for example, most courses scheduled on Friday are also scheduled on Monday-Wednesday. If the former are to increase by 1%, but the total number of traditionally scheduled courses must decrease by 6%, then it would follow that M-W-F course offerings must both increase and decrease.
- Stoper expressed reservations about the recommendations on Indicator 1 endangering the firewall between assessment for accountability and assessment for personnel and allocation purposes.

The motion was withdrawn, without opposition.

M/S/P (Reichman/Langan) to empower the Chair to meet with the Provost to communicate to him our concerns over this campus response to Setting Goals Under the CSU Accountability
Process.

6. **00-01 CIC 13, Substitution of CHEM/ENGR 2060 for BIOL 2010 in Healthier Living G.E. Cluster for Engineering Majors**

   **M/S/P** (Sawyer/Ugbah) to place 00-01 CIC 13 on the Senate agenda.

   Concern was expressed, and will be raised on the Senate floor, about permitting a substitution in a GE cluster for only one group of majors. It seems to violate the integrity of the cluster, and is exclusionary.


   **M/S/P** (Soares/Reichman) to place 00-01 CIC 14 on the Senate agenda.

8. **Draft Report: AThe CSU at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Achieving the Highest Levels of Quality and Meeting the Needs of California**

   **M/S/P** (Langan/Soares) to endorse the draft report of “The CSU at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Achieving the Highest Levels of Quality and Meeting the Needs of California” while asking the Chair to convey our concerns about the numbering and order of policy recommendations, which leaves the (hopefully false) impression that CSU authorization to grant doctorates is our top priority.

9. **Service Learning**

   **M/S/P** (Caplan/Sawyer) to refer to CIC the creation of a plan, a vision, policies, procedures, faculty voice in selection of a service learning coordinator, and other matters related to serviced learning.

10. **Continued Discussion of the Report from the Ad-Hoc Committee on Faculty Input into the Budget Process**

   Postponed until next meeting.

11. **Adjournment**

   **M/S/P** (Ugbah/Soares) to adjourn.

   Respectfully submitted,

   William Langan, Secretary