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

Guests: Jane Lopus, Russ Merris, Alan Monat, Leigh Mintz

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Murphy/Ugbah) to approve the agenda with the addition of item 4.A, Appointment of a Replacement for Jim Zarrillo on the Academic Senate in the Spring Quarter.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of February 20, 2001 - not yet available.

3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair
   The Chair reported on her consultations over the question of transition to semesters. It is very clear that we have the right to be fully consulted on this matter. And we will get more time. Vice Chancellor Spence informed Statewide Academic Senate Chair Jackie Kegley that campuses should have "adequate time" to consult. The Chair suggested mid-April, and the President has already cleared that date with Dr. Spence. Ex Comm concurred that mid-April seemed reasonable, since it would give us time to hold a faculty vote. The Chair has also asked that this issue be placed on the agenda of the campus Senate Chairs at the upcoming Academic Conference. The President said the further issue of common starting and ending dates will probably be set aside, according to Dr. Spence. Ugbah observed that the last time Dr. Spence made such a comment, concerning transition to semesters, the postponement proved very short-lived.
   - The Chair further reported that the faculty on this campus seem quite split, some strongly opposing change, and some eager for semesters. The Chair does not believe we have a real choice; she believes that eventually we will be forced to change to semesters.
   - The Chair reported on her consultation with the President, during which the President observed that it would be unwise to cross the Chancellor on this matter, since we might incur his ill-will to our detriment in all the dealings we have with him. The President explained that her remarks referred to the Chancellor's Office, not the Chancellor. Many of the mid-level administrators there seem to have the attitude that Cal State, Hayward is unimaginative, and might say something like "What else do you expect from Cal State, Hayward?" She often encounters a lack of helpful response, as if they feel that they do not have to do things for us because we do not matter.
   - Merris does not believe that transition is inevitable, and would like the first discussion to be over the question of consultation, "Is this really consultation?" If the faculty conclude that it is, then we can debate quarters versus semesters.
   - The Chair suggested three items for the agenda with specific time limits for each: 1) the right to be consulted with adequate time for consultation, 15 minutes; 2) a debate over semesters versus quarters, 60 minutes; and 3) an action plan: where do we go from here?, what questions should we put to the faculty to vote on?, 45 minutes.
   - Ugbah approved the issues, but asked that the issues not be presented as if transition to
semesters is inevitable. Caplan observed that we already know the faculty will be split on the question of quarters versus semesters. Up to now there has not been significant interaction between the faculty and the Chancellor (as opposed to that between the CFA and the Chancellor), and this would be the first time the faculty have the opportunity to confront the Chancellor on the issue of collegiality. It was pointed out that there has been consultation between the Chancellor and the Senate on other issues, such as YRO. It was countered that collegiality, in the sense of give and take, has been noticeably absent. We need to determine whether faculty are willing to stand up and take the issue of collegiality straight on. And that requires more than fifteen minutes.

- Wort observed that when the Statewide Academic Senate debated and passed the Principles for YRO, debate over Resolution V, which says that the administration and faculty should work together to determine the academic calendar, focused explicitly on the right of quarter campuses to remain on the quarter system. Callahan thought that the substantive issue was collegiality, not the transition to semesters.

- Reichman observed that no reasons have ever been given in defense of a common calendar (which is not to be confused with the virtues of semesters over quarters.) Wort responded that Dr. Spence has often stated that the semester system is more cost effective, and that transferability of courses and program articulations would be much easier with a common calendar.

- Langan asked what we would actually do if we make the issue of campus autonomy and collegiality the primary focus, apart from then debating the merits of the quarter versus the semester system. Merris replied that a third possibility exists, because imposition of a common calendar is not within the power of the Chancellor, but is a curriculum matter for the Academic Senate to deal with. We could simply postpone the discussion of semesters versus quarters until the consultation issue had been dealt with.

M/S/P (Soares/Reichman) to adopt the three items proposed by the Chair as the Senate agenda, without time limits.

Opp expressed concern that the debate over consultation would expand to fill the whole time.

- Caplan asked where the figure of $2 million per campus for each of the six campuses came from? The President confirmed that $12 million was left over from funds allocated to conversion to YRO, and that sum was simply divided equally among the campuses. She opined that additional money might be available, if the transition took three years for example, but that the Chancellor could not commit himself to that up front. She also cautioned that the opinions expressed at next week's meeting might not reflect faculty views overall, that those strongly opposed to semesters or strongly in favor of campus autonomy will dominate the discussions. Reichman observed that the Chair could control the amount of time for discussion of the consultation issue, that a Senator could even call the question. He also observed that this is a workload issue, since teaching four courses with x number of students per course on a semester system, as opposed to three courses with x number of students per course on a quarter system, would result in an increase of x number of students (4x versus 3x) being taught, a very heavy burden on courses that emphasize writing.

- Caplan, Sawyer and Murphy volunteered to draft a resolution concerning the faculty's right to consultation. Consensus was reached that Ex Comm should tentatively agree to meet on March 13th, to deal with whatever comes out of next week's extended Senate meeting.

- The Chair continued her report by asking for input on the draft of her report to the Provost on Accountability. Reichman observed that outcomes and assessment is a curricular issue, yet the Assessment Council was established by the administration with no faculty consultation.
B. Report of the President
The President again congratulated Sue Opp on her selection into the Alameda County Hall of Fame.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
The Academic Conference is being held this coming weekend.

4A. Appointment of a Spring Quarter Replacement for Jim Zarrillo (Teacher Education) on the Academic Senate

Rita Liberti and Steve Williams (Educational Psychology) were both nominated to replace Jim Zarrillo in the Senate for the Spring Quarter. Liberti (KPE) was appointed by secret ballot.

4. Deadline for Submissions to the 2000-01 Academic Senate

The deadline for Senate submissions is Tuesday, May 15th, since the last Ex Comm meeting will be May 22nd and the last Senate meeting will be May 29th.

5. Scheduling of Annual Review of Administrators

The annual Review of Administrators was scheduled for April 24th.

6. 00-01 FAC 4, Proposed Revisions to the Promotion, Tenure and Retention Document

M/S/P (Soares/Caplan) to place 00-01 FAC 4 on the Senate agenda.

Two amendments will be proposed on the Senate floor: 1) to strike the clause "and who are Regular members of the Department" from Section 10.1 (item 5); and 2) an amendment to recognize faculty peer evaluations and course syllabi as equally important as student evaluations in Section 4.1.2 (item 3).

7. 00-01 FAC 5, Proposed Revisions to the Ten-Year Academic Calendar

M/S/P (Murphy/Soares) to place 00-01 FAC 5 on the Senate agenda, with one correction: in Fall Quarter, 2001-02 classes begin on September 27, not September 21.

8. 00-01 CAPR 3, Five Year Program Review of the Department of Psychology

M/S/P (Soares/Ugbah) to place 00-01 CAPR 3 on the Senate agenda.

9. Continued discussion of the Report from the Ad-Hoc Committee on Faculty Input into the Budget Process

After discussion of the Report from the Ad-Hoc Committee on Faculty Input into the Budget Process it was agreed that a committee consisting of Stoper, Reichman and Wort will meet with the President and Provost to propose a committee structure and revisions in the budget process that together would allow greater faculty input into determining budgetary priorities.

- In response to the first of the "Questions to Be Addressed" in the Report, the President acknowledged that our present system is not the only way budgets could be done, and expressed her willingness to change the budget process in ways that would allow for greater faculty input, provided faculty were willing to do the work necessary to familiarize themselves
with all five budgets, so that suggestions for increased spending in one area are accompanied
by suggestions as to other areas the funds could be shifted from.
- In regards to the second question about uncommitted monies, Langan pointed out that the
income from the buildings being planned for Internet II, which is projected to reach one
million dollars per year, is one source of uncommitted funds. Lottery funds are another,
although they are now folded into the budget of Academic Affairs. Allocating 99% of each
unit's prior budget would also free up funds.
- In response to the fifth question, the President observed that released time for faculty meant
fewer courses being taught, which meant the potential for lower FTES. It was suggested that
the cost of replacement lecturers would meet that problem. The Chair noted that on a number
of campuses where the committee was consulted there was no problem finding faculty
volunteers, despite the absence of released time and the substantial amounts of time involved.
- In response to the third question, Caplan suggested that each faculty member of the
University Budget and Advisory Committee could familiarize himself or herself with one of
the five units' budgets, and then share that knowledge with the rest of the faculty members.
That would provide the faculty with knowledge that might allow them to make informed
suggestions at the Spring meeting on setting priorities.
- Langan observed that the effort involved in understanding budgetary processes and the
rationale for each sub-unit's was too much to expect for such a minor input into the budgetary
process.
- Reichman observed that there are two distinct goals for faculty input into the budget: one is
finding out where monies are now being spent unnecessarily or wastefully; and the other is
identifying priorities to assist the President in deciding between competing requests for limited
funds. He offered as an example of the latter the Senate's approval of a Student Learning
Center. Faculty were unable to identify a source of funds for a program to which they gave
high priority.
- Wort reminded us that the Statewide Academic Senate had inquired into campus experiences
with Budget Advisory Committees, and that they were seen overall to be not very effective.
Timely availability of data to provide for meaningful input and participation by the faculty in
the establishment of priorities were two of the issues found wanting. Our campus' process
was not highly rated.

10. Adjournment

M/S/P (Callahan/Murphy) to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

William Langan, Secretary