

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as amended

Minutes of the Meeting of June 3, 2003

Members present: Dee Andrews, Diana Bargas Diane Beeson, Cal Caplan, Alex Cassuto, LeAnn Christianson, Jennifer Eagan, Dana Edwards, Bryant Estep, Stevina Evuleocha, Karina Garbesi, Alison Germaine, Tom Hird, Matt Johnson, Mark Karplus, William Langan, Michael Lee, Sherman Lewis, Jane Lopus, Frank Lowenthal, Christopher Lubwama, Russ Merris, William Nico, Julia Norton, Sue Opp, John Ostarello, Chung-Hsing Ouyang, Pamela Parlocha, Norma Rees, Henry Reichman, Bill Reuter, David Sandberg, Don Sawyer, Michael Schutz, Jeffrey Seitz, Liane Sieux, Carl Stempel, Emily Stoper, Susan Sunderland, Bruce Trumbo, Steve Ugbah, Alison Warriner, Jessica Weiss, Donna Wiley, Don Wort

Members absent: Derrick Duggins, Susan Gubernat, Javier Gutierrez, Rita Liberti, Penny McCullagh, Evelyn Padua-Andrews, Sylvia Ramos, Veronica Vasquez

Guests: Brenda Bailey, Linda Beebe, Hadi Behzad, Carl Bellone, Joy Bhadury, Solomon Cason, Susan Correia, Jack Davis, Jean Easterly, Denise Fleming, Skye Gentile, Terrence Kelly, David Larson, Chong Lee, Michael Leung, Nancy Mangold, Tom McCoy, Richard Metz, Alan Monat, Sally Murphy, Fung-Shine Pan, John Primes, Joanne Schwab, Eric Soares, Melany Spielman, Bob Strobel, Eric Suess, Rich Symmons, Arthurlene Towner, Craig Wilson, Patricia Zajac

1. Approval of the Agenda

M/S (Sawyer/Lubwama) to approve the agenda.

Wiley asked that a resolution (distributed to the Senate) in support of Dean Jay Tontz be added to the agenda. Wort suggested that item 3, Reports, be moved to the end of the agenda. Merris argued that any addition to the agenda must receive a 2/3rds vote. He opposed adding the resolution to the agenda since it is not relevant for the Senate to consider the resolution and there are already rules that cover the review of administrators. Wort ruled the resolution in order and Stoper asked for an immediate vote. The vote to put the resolution on the Senate agenda passed 21 ayes, 4 nays and 5 abstentions. Lowenthal asked that this resolution be considered early since there were many guests at the meeting that were there only for this matter. Wort ruled that it would be considered as item 4b, and renumbered item 4 to 4a.

Agenda was passed as amended.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of May 20, 2003

M/S/P (Hird/Warriner) to approve the minutes.

3. Reports

Moved to after item 15

4a. Sue Schaefer Faculty Service Award.

The Sue Schaefer Faculty Service Award was presented to Professor Julia Norton of the Department of Statistics. Wort, in making the award, cited Norton's contributions to faculty governance as well as her valued contributions in research, administration and teaching. He

listed some of her service to the University which included terms on the Academic Senate, Executive Committee, CIC, Academic Standards Committee, Library Advisory Committee, CAPR, Budget Advisory Committee, many search and review committees. She has been a leader in various aspects of financial planning and has also been instrumental in developing student diversity programs. Her research contributions include methods to evaluate effective teaching. Norton has been a mentor and has provided encouragement and technical help to junior faculty on campus.

Norton received a check and certificate and her name on the award plaque. After a sustained round of applause from Senators and other members of the audience, Norton thanked everyone for their involvement.

4b. Resolution in Support of Dean Jay L. Tontz

The Resolution put forward is as follows:

“BE IT RESOLVED THAT: The Academic Senate of California State University, Hayward recognizes the overwhelming support of the faculty of the College of Business and Economics (CBE) for Dr. Jay L. Tontz and his longstanding and effective leadership of their college.

BE IT ALSO RESOLVED THAT: The Academic Senate joins with the CBE faculty in requesting that President Norma Rees rescind her acceptance of the resignation of Dr. Jay L. Tontz and instead encourage Dr. Tontz to withdraw his resignation.”

M/S (Wiley/Garbesi) to support the resolution from the College of Business and Economics.

Wiley introduced the resolution in support of Dean Tontz. Wort read the resolution which had been distributed to the Senate. He mentioned that the staff of CBE had signed a similar resolution. Bhadury presented the original resolution with ninety-seven faculty signatures from the College.

Lowenthal began the discussion by stating that he will abstain when a vote is taken. He argued that the Senate is interjecting itself in the review process where it has no role. He was a member of Tontz’ review committee. He was disappointed that “things” were not done with greater grace.

Wort stated that he will rule as out of order any mention of, or discussion of, the review committee since that is not part of the resolution.

Reichman added that he, too, will abstain. He knows nothing of the reasons why Tontz resigned or why the President accepted his resignation. He knows nothing of the circumstances preceding these actions. Merris, supporting the stances of Lowenthal and Reichman, also felt uncomfortable voting without more information. If the process was wrong the Senate should address the issue. Caplan, echoing other comments, supported the first part of the resolution but had no knowledge of the facts and added that if the process was wrong it should be discussed. Wiley argued that there is no mention of process in this resolution; the resolution calls for the overwhelming support of the CBE faculty and asks the President to rescind her acceptance of Tontz’ resignation.

Stoper suggested dividing the motion. Wort asked if there was any objection to this as a friendly amendment. Hearing none Wort indicated that discussion on the first resolved clause could proceed. Andrews express sympathy with the CBE faculty supporting its Dean.

A vote was taken on the first resolved clause. This passed.

Discussion then turned to the second resolved clause. Schutz asked why this had been brought to the attention of the Senate. Wiley responded that it was brought to this body for it to show support for the CBE faculty as it voices its concern.

A vote was taken on the second resolved clause. This motion failed 10 ayes, 16 nays and 13 abstentions.

5. 02-03 BEC 7, Election of an Affirmative Action Liaison Officer for 2003-05

M/S/P (Garbesi/Langan) to appoint David Larson as the new AALO for 03-05.

6. 02-03 CAPR8/CIC 29, Discontinuance of the M.S. Program in Nursing (Geriatric Nurse Practitioner Program)

M/S/P (Norton/Stoper) to approve.

7. 02-03 CAPR 9/CIC 32, Discontinuance of the Adapted Physical Education Specialist Credential

M/S/P (Caplan/Lubwama) to approve.

8. 02-03 CAPR 10/CIC 31, New Credential in Special Education Teacher Internship Program for Level I Education Specialist Program in Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Disabilities

M/S (Caplan/Warriner) to approve.

Reichman observed that the effective date of implementation, as amended by ExCom, is Fall 2003, not Fall 2004. Bellone clarified that he had discussions with CEAS and determined that this was an accreditation issue. Normal date of implementation should have been Fall 2004 but an exception had to be made in this case. The amendment to Fall 2003 stands.

Motion passed.

9. 02-03 CAPR 11, Creation of a New Department of Social Work in the College of Arts, Letters and Social Sciences

Discussion was postponed until a time certain 3:40

10. 02-03 CAPR 12, Department of Recreation and Community Services Five-Year Review

M/S/P (Lubwama/Opp) to approve.

11. 02-03 CAPR 14, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education Five-Year Review

M/S/P (Opp/Caplan) to approve.

12. 02-03 CIC 12 as amended, Five-Year Review of General Education

M/S (Norton/Schutz) to approve.

Stoper began by noting that she was a member of the committee that drafted this document. While she generally supported the document she was troubled by limiting section C, under the Junior-Senior Level Requirements, to just sciences. She wished to change this to sciences or scientific reasoning. This was then put in the form of a motion.

M/S (Stoper/Langan) to change part C so that it would read, “4 unit upper-division course in the sciences or scientific reasoning that includes numeracy, quantitative analysis, information literacy, and critical thinking skills.”

Opp noted that this would also change the area B description on the last page of the document. Stoper believed that this proposed amendment was not a clarification but an expansion of what the science requirement would be. Any course with scientific reasoning and scientific methodology would now be included. Reichman supported the amendment although he began by expressing his support for GE courses in the natural sciences. He suggested that it was less important to study a particular science than to be exposed to scientific reasoning in general. He added that any course would still have to have substantive numeracy requirements. The great majority of approved courses would be from CSc, but there may well be other courses in other colleges that focus on scientific reasoning. Garbesi agreed that students should have a broader choice but did not feel the amendment, as written, would do so. She argued that the word “and” should be substituted for “or” in the programmatic description. Stoper clarified her amendment and Garbesi withdrew her objection.

Merris suggested that the section A description be changed from “history, literature or philosophy” to “historical, literary or philosophical inquiry”. This was taken as a friendly amendment to Stoper’s amendment. Opp did not see a clear parallel between Merris’ friendly amendment and Stoper’s amendment. She did not agree with the latter since this would remove students from the knowledge area. Ostarello wondered how numeracy and quantitative analysis would be taught in scientific reasoning courses. He felt that students need these to be good citizens. Andrews responded that the lower division G.E. program prepares the students for these two requirements. Students really need to learn about the scientific way of knowing. She favored giving the students more options. She also drew the distinction between doing science and learning about science. She worried that many upper division science courses are designed for majors and have many prerequisites, so new courses may be needed with more general prerequisites. She also suggested “scientific inquiry” in C.

Seitz argued against the amendment; there is a difference between classes that do and classes that review. He favored the former for the science course. Zajac, speaking as the Liberal Studies director argued that the Liberal Studies program already had five science courses and four mathematics courses. She felt that one of the required courses, Technology and Values, should be included in the G.E. science program. Reichman proposed to change the first part of the description in C to “scientific inquiry”, which would make it consistent with A. (Beeson seconded.) Reichman did not feel any current course in history or philosophy would meet the stated requirements.

Trumbo asked who will decide on the adequacy of a course. Stoper replied that this would be determined by the G. E. Subcommittee and, ultimately, the Senate itself. Nico pointed out that the word science is not capitalized; thus an acceptable course does not need to come from CSc. He felt the document was clear as originally written and should go forward that way. Beeson reiterated the significant effect this might have on Liberal Studies. Lowenthal said that he hoped that we were not simply running away from the word science. We need to project well-trained graduates. Ugbah argued that the history of science and philosophy of science courses mentioned by Reichman properly belong in section A. Osterello wondered if, instead, we were discussing the English requirements would we be satisfied with a philosophy of English course as opposed to a writing course in the Department of English? Opp commented that we look at the learning outcomes. We are here to vote on knowledge rather than learning specifics. Andrews, responding partially to Osterello, stated that much of her history classes teach writing skills. She likes the word inquiry since its focus is more

on the ways of learning. She supported the amendment. Norton felt we were talking around the issues.

After some additional discussion that mainly repeated positions already taken, a vote was taken on Stoper's amendment, as modified by Merris' and Reichman's suggestions. The amendment failed by a vote of 14 ayes, 21 nays and 3 abstentions.

Discussion turned to another aspect of the proposal. Murphy informed the Senate that our cluster program had been selected as a model program to study leaning communities. A grant was received to undertake this study. Also Murphy was invited to write an article on learning communities. Apparently we have been identified as a University with a well-developed freshmen G.E. program. The issue of action item 1c. (elimination of GS1013, addition of one unit to LIBY 1010) was raised. Murphy favored keeping GS 1013. She felt CIC was unduly influenced by initial surveys but later cohorts have put the course to good use. Two conferences based upon freshmen clusters, one held last year and one this year, were developed through this course. She recommended adding back GS 1013 while maintaining the 2 units in LIBY 1010 and making the G.E. package 73 units. She was unable to make the motion since she was not a member of the Senate. Stoper, also a member of CIC, explained that she was not in favor of this and that there were five different proposals for the one unit freed by eliminating GS 1013. Hird, taking a different tack, argued that there really has not been a proper review of G. E. The appropriate review process was not followed. In any case, he urged the Senate to consider forming a Department of General Education. At this point we are trying to set curriculum without criteria.

Hird moved to divide the motion. This action failed for lack of second.

Schutz added that he has taught many clusters. Students lack fundamental skills. He lent his support to Sally.

M/S (Opp/Schutz) to reinstate GS 1013 but leave the unit count of LIBY at 2 as proposed in 1c.

Stoper opposed raising the GE package to 73 units. She also felt this would impose an added cost to the University. Trumbo agreed. Murphy agreed with the amendment since she feels that GS 1013 is a learning experience and it is proving to be exciting to the students.

Warriner agreed; from her perspective the third quarter of GS is a valuable experience for the students. This is where they can really think about the cluster and how it relates to the world.

Garbesi worried about the added unit and M/S (Garbesi/Lubwama) to add back GS 1013 but drop the second unit of LIBY 1010. Langan opposed the amendment on the grounds that students need more information literacy/critical thinking.

Amendment fails.

Opp's original amendment was voted on and it failed as well (14/17/3). The Senate was now back to a discussion of the main motion

The Senate considered the time certain item.

9. 02-03 CAPR 11, Creation of a New Department of Social Work in the College of Arts, Letters and Social Sciences

M/S/P (Sawyer/Garbesi) to approve.

The Senate returned to item 12

Cassuto asked why the lifelong understanding component was now proposed as an upper division component. In the past it could be fulfilled with selected courses at all levels.

Murphy replied that this item was required by Executive Order 595.

Wort asked for fifteen minutes more time. This was M/S/P Reuter/Garbesi)

Langan felt that Action Item 4 was very vague; it could include all courses or exclude all courses. Reichman also was nervous about this item but did not feel this could be solved on the floor of the Senate. EO 595 is more complicated than it seems, difficult to apply as an overlay, and may become an obstacle to students.

Paige was very concerned with the loss of the capstone course requirement. She believed this was one of the most innovative parts of our curriculum. Not only are these courses interdisciplinary, the capstone courses show the concept of interdisciplinary clearly to students. Hird favored postponing the vote until the full proposal is submitted.

M/S (Hird/Caplan) to postpone the vote.

Stoper, speaking in opposition, suggested this was just a first pass at broad policy; once this is passed the learning outcomes will be developed. Seitz also opposed delaying this proposal. He believed that learning outcomes committees cannot do their work without a document to guide them. Warriner urged rejection; learning committees are ready to start within the week.

Hird's motion was voted upon and failed.

The main motion was now voted upon and it passed.

Wort requested additional time. M/S/P (Ostarello/Trumbo)

13. 02-03 CIC 34, General Education Mission Statement

M/S (Trumbo/Schutz) to approve.

M/S (Reuter/Langan) to replace the current document with an amended one that was distributed to the Senate. It stated,

**“California State University Hayward
General Education
Mission Statement**

The Cal State Hayward General Education Program, taken with a major and electives, will assure that graduates have made measurable progress towards becoming educated persons for life in a diverse society. The General Education Program will help graduates:

A. to think clearly and logically, to find information and examine it critically, to communicate orally and in writing, and to reason quantitatively;

B. to acquire appreciable knowledge about their own bodies and minds, about how human society has developed and how it now functions, about the physical world in which they live, about the other forms of life with which they share that world, and about the cultural endeavours and legacies of their civilizations;

C. to understand and appreciate the principles, methodologies, value systems, and thought processes employed in human inquiries.

The General Education Program seeks to present these skills, understandings, and appreciations as interrelated elements, not as isolated fragments, of a student's academic program.”

Sawyer wondered why this statement is being proposed when we voted to have a committee of the faculty develop one. Stoper replied that CIC became aware of the excellent GE objectives statement in CSU Exec Order 595 and decided to adapt it slightly rather than delaying development of the Learning Outcomes until after a committee could write a new mission statement. Trumbo added that this mission statement, if passed, should be included in the catalog to help students.

The substitute motion passed.

14. 02-03 CIC 21, Application of PHIL 3536, Economic Justice, to G.E. Area C4 for the 1988/96, 1996/98, 1998/03, and Transfer G.E. Patterns

M/S/P (Langan/Schutz) to approve.

15. 02-03 FUFM 1, Resolution in Support of Studying Smart Growth in Hayward

M/S (Ostarello/Merris) to approve.

Metz spoke in opposition of this motion. As a result of the demise of the 238 freeway there are some parcels of land available. CSUH is trying to have these parcels turned over to the Board of Trustees so that they can be used by CSUH for lower cost faculty housing. Stoper asked how the study proposed by Lewis would hurt these plans. Metz replied that the study would cost money and, if the parcels were used as proposed by Lewis, there would be no chance for faculty housing. The plan might hurt us since student housing built along the corridor would compete with current on-campus student housing.

Reichman thought “Smart Growth” was a loaded term, without definition.

Caplan agreed with Metz; we need to attract faculty through affordable faculty housing and campus life would be enhanced by on-campus student housing. Lewis countered that the purpose of his proposal is to study the feasibility and demand for student housing. The car free issue is also questionable; he simply favors studying the alternatives. Garbesi agreed with Lewis adding that Smart Growth is a widely accepted term in urban planning. There are potential positives and negatives. Studying smart growth is a way of studying the issue. Rees commented that CSUH would not fund the smart study. It could be funded by a number of different agencies. Both Brauer and Lewis are on the Hayward (Route 238) committee, so we are well represented. (Lewis distributed a rebuttal to the Metz/Brauer letter of May 28 which was included in the Senate meeting packet.)

A vote on the motion was taken and it passed.

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

Chair Wort:

- Sadly announced the passing of Professor Patricia Radin who was an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication.
- Announced that Susan Correia had been selected as faculty governance coordinator and that Joanne Schwab had been selected as her assistant.

- Thanked the Senate for the honor of being Chair for the past two years. He dedicated the accomplishments of the Senate to Connie Sexauer. Contributions to the Connie Sexauer Memorial Fund can be made through the CSUH Foundation Office.

B. Report of the President

President Rees briefly reported that the budget situation remains uncertain but seems to be worsening for the CSU.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

No report.

D. Report of CFA

No report.

E. Report of Student Government

No report.

16. Adjournment

M/S/P (Sawyer/Schutz) to adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted

Alex Cassuto, Secretary