

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as presented

Minutes of the Meeting of March 11, 2003

Members present:, Dee Andrews, David Baggins, Diane Beeson, Fabiola Camarillo, Cal Caplan, Alex Cassuto, LeAnn Christianson, Jennifer Eagan, Dana Edwards, Stevina Evuleocha, Karina Garbesi, Thomas Hird, Matt Johnson, Mark Karplus, Michael Lee, Rita Liberti, Frank Lowenthal, Christopher Lubwama, Penny McCullagh, Russ Merris, Julia Norton, Sue Opp, John Ostarello, Chung-Hsing Ouyang, Pamela Parlocha, Henry Reichman, David Sandberg, Don Sawyer, Michael Schutz, Carl Stempel, Emily Stoper, Susan Sunderland, Bruce Trumbo, Alison Warriner, Jessica Weiss, Donna Wiley, Don Wort, Helen Zong

Members absent: Veronica Aguilar, Chastity Cansino, Sonja Daniels, Alison Germaine, Susan Gubernat, Jennifer Laherty, William Langan, Marco Marquez, William Nico, Evelyn Padua-Andrews, Sylvia Ramos, Norma Rees, Bill Reuter, Steve Ugbah, Veronica Vasquez,

Guests: Brenda Bailey, Carl Bellone, Emily Brizendine, Michael Leung, Tom McCoy, Donald McKillop, Richard Metz, Barbara Paige, Arthurlene Towner

1. Approval of the Agenda

M/S (Caplan/Schutz) to approve the agenda.

The Chair informed the senators that Stoper would introduce an amendment to item #5.

Agenda was passed.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 14, 2002

M/S (Caplan/Schutz) to approve the minutes.

Garbesi requested a change in the minutes. In item #4 of the minutes, starting half way down the section, the corrected statement should read "She also argued that there are two distinct forms, one for general modifications and a second for GE modification and code designations".

Minutes were passed as amended,

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

Chair Wort:

- Announced that FAC reported it has nominated Professor David Eshelman for the Outstanding Professor award for the academic year 2002-03.
- Reported that he will be attending the CSU Budget Summit on March 14. On March 17 and 18 he will attend legislative days in Sacramento.
- Reminded the faculty that voting in the election ends today at 5:00 PM.
- Suggested April 8 as the next XCOM meeting. An Academic Senate meeting is unlikely before April 29. April 22 has been set aside as the annual review of administrators.

- Urged Senators to attend the April 7 special meeting (MI 2002) to review proposed changes in the GE curriculum.

Caplan reported that both the women's and men's basketball teams had won their respective conference tournaments and have been invited to the nationals.

B. Report of the President

ABA VP Richard Metz reported for President Rees.

The student referendum was very close. With 637 votes cast, vote was 299 in favor and 338 opposed. Based upon the low turnout and the strong support of AS, the campus fee advisory committee recommended that the President approve the fee increase. The President makes the ultimate decision.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

Senator Caplan reported that Chancellor Reed addressed the Statewide Academic Senate (SAS) meeting. Caplan had already distributed a page containing CSU budget figures for 2003-04. Reed felt the Governor's budget is the best scenario. If student fees are raised by 25% the CSU would face a \$260 million shortfall. If there is no fee increase the shortfall will be \$402 million. The student fee resolution was passed by the SAS but it was a difficult decision. The student representative to the SAS was very concerned that there had been no warning and no discussion of the proposed fee increase. The fee was approved due to concern for quality and access and was considered a last resort. SAS felt that some percentage of the fee should go to CSU financial aid. Added funds should be used to help current students and programs. SAS also wanted an expansion of the program to inform students about financial aid and how they can obtain financial aid funds.

The SAS also endorsed the principles and recommendations of the Joint Provost/Academic Senate, California State University Task Force on Facilitating Graduation with the following stipulations:

- Plans to improve graduation rates must be constrained by the goal to provide a high-quality, productive, meaningful academic experience for students.
- Certain issues are beyond the control of the CSU (number of units students take at community colleges)
- Whenever policies are considered they must be considered in the context of the budgetary limitations faced by CSU campuses and system.

Senator Reichman continued the report by informing the Senate that he has become a member of the SAS Senate Budgetary Advisory Task Force. There is a need to create support for the governor's budget. SAS voted to send two names to the Governor to consider as the Faculty Trustee. Kathleen E. Kaiser, CSU Chico, and Jacquelyn A. Kegley, CSU Bakersfield, were nominated. The SAS considered a document relating to campus electronic communication. This document urges campuses to institute policies that respect the privacy of faculty. Another document considered was the report of the Task Force on Roles and Responsibilities of Department Chairs. The report indicated that Chair roles differ greatly between campuses and even within a college or school. Another issue considered was that of shared governance on presidential reviews. The trustees passed six criteria, but not one used the word faculty or shared governance. SAS also reaffirmed the authority of the faculty in curricular development. A document covering intellectual property rights passed unanimously. SAS commended the task

force that wrote this document and urged that it be widely distributed to faculty. Campus senates are requested to inform faculty of their rights. Finally, Reichman reported on the first reading discussion of Capacity Enrollment Ceilings and Master Plan revisions of these ceilings. Campus maximums were originally set at 25,000 students and a number of campuses have exceeded those limits. There is a need to revise and re-evaluate these limits. A second reading will take place at the next plenary session, May 8-9.

Discussion followed. Trumbo noted that we have two current documents on intellectual property rights, one drafted by faculty, the other by the computer center. Wiley was troubled by the use of the word permanent reduction in the budget document distributed by Caplan. Reichman responded that there is no real distinction between permanent and temporary. The reductions are permanent until next year's budget.

D. Report of CFA

CFA President McCoy reported that the governor had respected the access issue by authorizing 1200 new job searches. CFA will open renegotiations on issues of workload, salary and benefits. CFA advocates 1700 searches rather than 1200 and wants to tie the salary increases to the consumer price index. Also, CFA wishes to have faculty salary increases no lower than the average percentage increase in administrative salaries.

E. Report of Student Government

AS President Fabiola Camarillo reported that \$3,000 had been allocated for a Philippine Cultural Night. She asked faculty to tell their students that a number of positions in AS governance are vacant. She also reported that she had sent out via e-mail the schedule of activities for March.

4. 02-03 CIC 10 Application of History 4032, Introduction to Public History, to GE Area C4 for the 88-96, 96-98 and Transfer GE Patterns.

M/S/P (Warriner/Reichman) to approve.

5. 02-03 CAPR 1 Outside Accredited Programs- recommendation for changes to 00-01 CAPR 7.

This document proposes to exempt programs that are accredited from the internal five-year review process unless they are denied accreditation.

M/S (Caplan/Norton) to approve.

M/S (Stoper/Norton) to approve the amendment, written by Stoper, to replace the proposed change in 00-01 CAPR 7.

Reichman asked why the document and amendment were only valid for the 2002-03 review cycle. Lee (chair of CAPR) replied that when CAPR made its recommendation they were concerned about what to do this year. After this cycle the document will be modified.

Reichman proposed an amendment to change the wording from "2002-03 cycle" to "2002-03 cycle and thereafter". The maker of and second to the amendment considered this a friendly amendment.

Lee, commenting on the amendment, felt that the three CAPR members present today have no objections. However the amendment does not make clear what CAPR should do with this information. Stoper responded that point one of the amendment was already in the CAPR document, points two and three were included to standardize the faculty allocation process and

point four was included to satisfy the request by the Office of the Chancellor to examine programs requiring more than 186 quarter units (120 semester units). Reichman added that the concern in XCOM was not to force units to undergo a second review but to provide meaningful information to CAPR and the campus community. Lee agreed with Reichman but felt that this would not help in the faculty allocation process. Departments and colleges that were asked were satisfied with the changes proposed in the original CAPR document. Lowenthal asked if there was a list of departments/programs that would be impacted by this change. Bellone read the list of accredited departments/programs directly from the catalog. Lowenthal also asked if the current policies require departments that require more than 186 units to provide justification each time they are subject to the 5-year review process. Norton responded affirmatively. Lubwama wondered what use this added information is to CAPR. Andrews commented that she felt the document should go back to CAPR. In particular she felt that the information required for other matters be provided and reported in the review.

M/S (Andrews/Lowenthal) to refer back to committee.

Discussion turned to the new motion. Wiley suggested that departments/programs were well aware that the accreditation report many not be sufficient for other university decisions and would endeavor to provide it when opportune. Caplan's request was to make what is being changed clearer to the reader. Trumbo added that there was no reason to assume that the accreditation process is equivalent to the 5-year review process. He added that by aligning the 5-year review with the accreditation review makes preparation of the former "simple". Lee asked that interested parties come to CAPR to make their opinions known. Garbesi agreed with Trumbo that accreditation and 5-year reviews are not functionally equivalent. Stoper supported the new motion even though she was the maker of the original amendment. Lowenthal added that the referral to CAPR should include Trumbo's comments. Wiley was concerned that there are many programs up for review this year that need guidance. Lee opined that all of the issues discussed here were already discussed in CAPR. Trumbo suggested that, if this is the case, CAPR's opinions need to be outlined and be persuasive. Towner attended CAPR's meetings and noted that the discussion there did involve the kind of reviews done by accrediting bodies. Caplan called the question. The vote to end discussion passed with more than 75% of the senators voting affirmatively. The vote on the motion to refer back to CAPR passed by a majority vote.

6. 02-03 CAPR 2 Academic Standards- recommendations for changes to 00-01 CAPR 7

This document requires programs undergoing the five-year review process to include their methods for assessing the grading policies of faculty. Programs undergoing review must include annual GPA for all courses in the major and for the major as a whole for the past five years.

M/S (Warriner/Schutz) to approve.

Eagan noted that CAPR was passionately opposed to this two years ago. They reviewed a report that showed that grade inflation was not an issue as CSUH. Also, grades are not, and do not measure, academic standards. Grades are a matter of academic freedom. She was concerned about what would be done with the information. She also added that grades are not a standard for tenure track review process. Osterello, speaking against the motion, argued that the implication that high grades are bad (as a departmental average) and low ones good is really misleading. He argued that high grades show excellent teaching in departments. Lubwama objected to Eagan's comments as a member of the same CAPR committee. Opp, speaking as the director of a multidisciplinary program felt that she had no control whatsoever over the grades in the courses her students took. Merris added that fifteen years ago the office of undergraduate instruction

provided a list of average grades by departments. Cassuto added that this is being done again, broken down by department as well as by faculty member in a department. His department reviewed its own faculty grades, particularly those of lecturers. He felt this was an internal departmental issue rather than an issue in the 5-year review process. Stoper supported the document; departments should add their interpretations. Lowenthal, speaking slightly tongue and cheek, referred to the recent case at the University of Georgia (all students in a coaching fundamentals class received an A and certain athletes did not even attend) and suggested that there was quite a bit of room for interpretation. He advocated a uniform final for all multi-section classes as an internal assessment device. Lee, speaking again for CAPR, reminded the Senate that it was the Senate itself that had referred this assessment issue to CAPR. Baggins, speaking in opposition, felt that the chairs should be reviewing grades, particularly those of lecturers. Reichman argued that grading policies are a measure of standards but felt that the 5-year review was not the place to review this. He also felt, with Cassuto and Baggins, that the issue was really internal to the department. Norton, speaking in favor, argued that if it is not considered in the 5-year review where will it be considered? Eagan added, at the end of the discussion, that this type of analysis may be damaging to faculty hiring.

M/S (Caplan/Lowenthal) to call the question. This motion passed with more than 75% of the votes.

The main motion was defeated.

7. 02-03 CAPR 3 Ethnic Studies Five-Year Review

M/S (Merris/Evuleocha) to approve.

Paige (Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies) thanked CAPR for its report but asked that one part be slightly changed. In the strategic plan section there is a call for recruitment of a full-time faculty in humanities. She requested that this be a full-time tenure track appointment. This was taken as a friendly amendment. Motion passed.

8. Election of a replacement for Jennifer Laherty on the Executive Committee for Spring Quarter, 2003

The following Senators were nominated: Schutz, Opp, Lowenthal, Garbesi.

On the first round ballot no candidate received the required 50% vote and, using policies approved in XCOM, the top two candidates advanced to the next round.

The second round of voting involved candidates Opp and Garbesi. Garbesi received the most votes and was elected to XCOM for the spring quarter.

9. Support of the Bond Act of 2004

Not considered.

10. Adjournment

M/S/P (Sawyer/Merris) to adjourn

Respectfully Submitted

Alex Cassuto, Secretary