CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of
the ACADEMIC SENATE
Approved as amended

Minutes of the Meeting of November 20, 2001

Members present: Dee Andrews, Kevin Callahan, Cal Caplan, Sally Murphy, Julia Norton, Sue Opp, Norma Rees, Don Sawyer, Eric Soares, Emily Stoper, Susan Sunderland, Don Wort

Guests: Carl Bellone, Julie Glass, Michael Strait, Gale Young, Joe Zelan

1. Approval of the Agenda

M/S/P (Stoper/Opp) to approve the agenda

2. Approval of the minutes of the meetings of November 6 and November 13, 2001 - not yet available.

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

The vote on the calendar question, (Should the University change from a quarter to a semester calendar?) resulted in 230 no votes to 70 yes votes. The Chair extended his congratulations to the faculty for completing a process that began March 6, 2001 and culminated in the vote of the faculty on November 16, 2001. In the absence of President Rees, the Chair reported the results to the Provost. The Chancellor and President Rees were copied on a letter the Chair sent to the CSUH faculty indicating the voting results. The results were also posted on the Senate Web page on Monday afternoon. Soares and the Executive Committee thanked Wort for his leadership in the process.

The Chair then asked the Executive Committee to consider 01-02 BEC 4, the Resolution for Compensation for Lecturers.

M/S (Caplan/Callahan) to place 01-02 BEC 4 on the Senate Agenda.

Wort noted that he had used the language the committee had accepted as a guide in drafting the resolution. It was pointed out that the fourth resolve should include the distribution for the resolution. Stoper suggested that 3.a should be more flexible and use language that allowed for a variation of units from 1 to 3 rather than all or nothing. Andrews (FAC representative) agreed with Stoper that the recommendation should be more flexible. Caplan suggested the document should move forward and the corrections could be made on the Senate floor.

The motion to place on the Senate agenda, with the addition of a resolve that indicates the distribution of the resolution, passed.

B. Report of the President

Rees shared information from the Department of Finance via the Chancellor on the reduction on this year's budget. Presently, the total dollar reduction to the system as a whole is approximately $35 million. CSUH’s portion is still approximately $1 million. The Governor has decided to remove from the budget the money
that was designated for the high energy costs. Some of the reduction is one time money, and it is not clear if this will be a permanent reduction or some unknown base reduction. We will have more information in early January when the Executive Council meets. The Chancellor has instructed the Presidents that the reduction is not to be taken from appointments of tenure track faculty. This means we will have to save money by not filling vacant positions, primarily staff positions. The President has asked each Vice President to take the responsibility for managing the hiring in their own Divisions.

Soares asked if the search for the Vice President of University Advancement will still move forward. The response was yes, especially because of the campaign underway for the new Business and Technology Center. The search for the Vice President of Student Affairs has been postponed.

A question was asked about the impact of the budget reduction on bargaining and the possible loss of the money that was designated for salary compensation. Rees pointed out that the CSU cannot disperse the salary compensation money without a contract. Any money not spent in this year is probably going to be swept up. The partial hiring freeze may help.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators - No report

4. Assessment Council - Interaction with Faculty Government (Julie Glass)

Faculty Development Director Glass reviewed the make up of the Assessment Council, and expressed the Council's wish to work collaboratively and maintain effective communication with faculty governance on the issue of assessment of student learning. Discussion on the role of CAPR and CIC in the assessment of student learning ensued. Murphy pointed out that when course proposals or course modifications are received by CIC, the Committee looks to see if assessment is tied into the process of evaluation. Glass pointed out it would be advantageous to have the courses aligned to the Department assessment plan. Stoper suggested we let CAPR and CIC develop their own procedures, and provide a charge to the committees to work with the Assessment Council.

M/S (Stoper/Opp) to ask both CAPR and CIC to consider the three proposals from the Assessment Council and propose a policy for integrating assessment in program and curricular development and review for approval by the Senate.

Opp suggested the proposals need to be broader to get the faculty on board with regard to student learning. Andrews noted that ALSS is regularly meeting on assessment. Opp queried whether a faculty forum might engage the faculty. Stoper amended her motion to include in the charge that CAPR and CIC look into the feasibility of establishing some type of system for improving faculty involvement in assessment at the department level.

The motion, as amended, passed

5. 01-02 CIC 4, Proposed New Cluster Course THEA 2051, Technology and Culture in Performance (Replacement for ART 2227, Women in Art/Women Artists) in the 2nd Year Humanities Technology and Culture Cluster, and New Cluster Course MUS 1000, Survey of Music Literature (Replacement for MLL 2001, Evil and the Holocaust) in 2nd Year Humanities Holocaust & the Problem of Evil Cluster

M/S (Murphy/Opp) to place on the Senate agenda
Stoper indicated she would like to see more information about the two clusters than what is presented and asked what the clusters look like now. Murphy reviewed the history of the Technology and Culture cluster and pointed out that the Art Department does not wish to continue participating in the cluster. The initial cluster courses were English 2999, Philosophy 2028, and Art 2227. Theatre 2051, Technology and Culture in Performance is replacing the art class. Stoper asked where the technology is in this course? Murphy explained how the course fits into the cluster theme and how the faculty has been working to integrate the course into the cluster.

Murphy reviewed The Holocaust and the Problem of Evil Cluster, which is comprised of PHIL 2029, Theatre 2311 and MLL 2001, Evil and the Holocaust. Professor Traversa, who teaches MLL 2001, wished to teach a 3000 level course rather than the cluster course this year. Therefore, Music 1000 is to be a one-year replacement course. Additionally, Murphy described how the new Music course integrates into the cluster theme.

Caplan addressed his comments and questions to the process of certification of the courses rather than content. Pointing out the scrutiny in the past of other cluster proposals, this document provides no substantiation of whether the courses have been reviewed or approved by the various curricular bodies. Murphy pointed out that the courses would not typically move forward without review by the ALSS Council of Chairs or the ALSS Curriculum Committee. Caplan pointed out that in previous reviews we needed the background of the faculty teaching the course, syllabi, and information on how the course meets the specific requirements and relates to the cluster theme. He recommended that the proposal be sent back to CIC with a request for documentation which includes this scrutiny and identifies which committees reviewed this proposal. He noted that the ALSS Policies and Procedures for Course, Cluster and Program Proposals are on file in the Senate Office.

- Stoper agreed that more background information is needed, including which committees reviewed the proposal. Stoper also asked about the procedures when there is a cluster course change. It was her view that the Senate needs to see the full line-up of courses. Murphy agreed that these changes should be treated the same as other proposals and emphasized the need to provide equitable review to all clusters and courses.

- Caplan pointed out we may need to see a form which has a space for all the various approvals. Bellone agreed we do need more information on how these courses were approved in the background information. Murphy pointed out that cluster proposals came to CIC with syllabi and how the courses fit into the cluster theme. Caplan's view was that CIC needs to send the documentation forward and noted what is presented here seems to be inadequate.

- Sunderland asked how departments are notified of an opening in a cluster? Murphy described the historical process of cluster faculty finding a replacement. Murphy questioned if we should advertise the opening and let people put in a bid for the course or let the faculty who are teaching in the cluster make the decision? Soares suggested we do both, let everyone have an opportunity to compete, and then let the two remaining faculty decide who they work with. Discussion ensued on how the process might work.

- Sunderland pointed out that in looking at the catalog and the course description for Music 1000, it is a great leap to see how this course is a substitution for MLL 2001, Evil and the Holocaust. To an outside person who does not have the benefit of the syllabus, readings or course assignments, or identification of which committees reviewed the proposal and what requirements or criteria were used to evaluate the course, it is very difficult to provide an informed decision. A process needs to be developed that prevents inequitable treatment of colleagues and ensures all proposals are treated the same.

- Murphy reviewed the process from the time Professor Traversa announced his intention not to teach the course to how the remaining cluster faculty contacted the faculty member in music. She indicated she had worked with the new instructor in helping meet the documentation requirements. Murphy noted the process
Callahan asked about this document and the procedures. The Committee consensus was that Murphy would identify the committees which provided the review and their votes and supply the documentation for the Senate meeting.

**The motion passed (6/1/2)**

6. **01-02 CIC 5, Proposed Replacement of G.E. Cluster Courses in the Humanities and Natural Sciences as noted.**

M/S (Stoper/Opp) to place on the Senate Agenda

Stoper indicated her concern that the existing Humanities Clusters were approved in part because of no other choices. She asked if we have a process for soliciting new clusters. Murphy indicated they are not asking for new proposals until it is known what is happening with the clusters. Caplan pointed out that many of these requests are changes of course numbers in clusters. Is that what Music is requesting? For example, what is the difference in the freshman sophomore music course? How is Music 1006 different from Music 2130 or are they the same course? It raises the question of two identical courses with different numbers. Murphy responded it is a number and title change to indicate it is part of a sophomore cluster and to accommodate the explicit identification required of cluster courses for Degree Works.

M/S/P (Soares/Opp) to call the question.

**The motion to place on the Senate agenda passed (7-3-0)**

7. **01-02 CIC 6, Application of BIOL 4025, Human Ecology to G.E. Areas B2 and B5 under the 96/98 Pattern; MLL 1221-32 Self-Paced Elementary German to G.E. Areas C1-3, under the 96/98 Pattern; MLL 1611, Intense Elementary Chinese to G.E Area C-2, under the 96/98 Pattern, MLL 2221-32, Self -Paced Intermediate German to G.E. Areas C1-3, under the 96/98 Pattern; and MLL 3611, New Chinese Cinemas to G.E. Area C1. Under the 96/98 Pattern; Effective Fall Quarter, 2001**

M/S/P (Stoper/Murphy) to place on the Senate Agenda.

8. **01-02 CIC 7, Application of PHIL 3711, Philosophical Dialogue to G.E. Area C4 for the 96/98 and 98/02 Patterns**

M/S (Stoper/Callahan) to place on the Senate agenda.

Callahan voiced his concern that we keep adding courses to the various G.E. categories and that these courses appear to be mushrooming. Stoper saw no problem with this as long as they meet the criteria. Caplan suggested the faculty entertain the thought that unless courses are dropping out we should not just keep adding courses. Murphy made two points to this issue. First these courses are being proposed for 96/98 catalog students. The second point is that for courses in the 98/2002 Pattern, the ALSS curriculum subcommittee is used to vet any course for upper division based upon justification of critical thinking and oral and written communication criteria, which are not the same as the 96/98 Pattern courses. Callahan proposed certifying the courses for some life span, and after a certain amount of time they would drop out. Opp pointed out that the upcoming G.E. review would also include the upper division requirements. Caplan asked
about the documentation on how this course meets the specific requirements? Andrews noted that
information is available in the Senate office and urged EXCOM not to overload the committees and staff in
reproduction of materials. Caplan noted that was not the intention. On materials that CIC approves, there
needs to be a section that provides a sign-off that the course meets the specific requirements.
The motion passed (with one abstention)

9. 01-02 CIC 8, Application of POSC 3419, Labor Policy and Law to G.E. Area D4 for the 98/02 Pattern

M/S/P (Soares/Stoper) to place on the Senate agenda (with one abstention).

10. Academic Standards Report - Implementation

Initial discussion began on how to implement the report. Several members suggested the Committee review
the report and make referrals where appropriate to the Standing Committees. Stoper suggested a similar
procedure to the one used last year for the Enrollment Committee=extensive recommendations. As Senate
Chair she met with the Department Chairs at the School meetings and presented the recommendations.
Andrews spoke to the quality of the report and the valuable information it contained. The report is worthy of
a separate report to the faculty and committees and not simply to be passed out or diffusely addressed. She
went on to identify specific findings within the report that have important information value to the faculty and
University.
- Wort asked the Committee to make a recommendation on how to proceed. Stoper suggested the
committee go through the summary of report recommendations she prepared last year. After discussion of
several of the items, the consensus was that there was too many details for EXCOM to handle. Caplan
suggest that a subcommittee of EXCOM be appointed or formed to review the items and bring back
recommendations on how to implement the report. President Rees pointed out that a variety of
recommendations may take different forms in implementation. The items could be broken out into categories
and then restructured by this body for Senate action. Rees also noted there are a number of ways to share
the information within the report that is enormously valuable to the University now and into the future.

M/S/P (Sunderland/Norton) to amend the motion to form a subcommittee to categorize the items and
recommend steps for dissemination of the information.

Wort asked for sub-committee volunteers; Norton, Andrews and Callahan volunteered. It was agreed that
the subcommittee would meet with Bellone and Martino and other university resource people as needed. The
committee will report back to EXCOM by the second meeting in January 2002.

11. Discussion of process for nomination of Senate Officers and Executive Committee members
    Held over to the next meeting.

12. Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Don Sawyer, Secretary