

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

OFFICE OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as corrected

Minutes of the February 3, 2004 Meeting

Members Present: Dee Andrews, Diana Bargas, Monique Berlanga, Norman Bowen, Cal Caplan, Alex Cassuto, Leann Christianson, Jennifer Eagan, Denise Fleming, Don Gailey, Karina Garbesi, Liz Ginno, Jessica Goodkind, Michael Hedrick, Doug Highsmith, Thomas Hird, Kevin Horan, John Kilgour, Bill Langan, Jane Lopus, Frank Lowenthal, Edwin McLay, Russ Merris, William Nico, Julia Norton (chair), Pamela Parlocha, James Perrizo, Norma Rees, Hank Reichman, Michael Schutz, Jeffery Seitz, Emily Stoper, Michael Strait, Eric Suess, Alison Warriner, Jessica Weiss, Donna Wiley, Craig Wilson, Don Wort

Members Absent: Alex Braun II, Jack Davis, Bryant Estep, Susan Gubernat, Mark Karplus, Bijan Mashaw, John Ostarello, Laurie Price, Carl Stempel, Hollie Svedbeck, Vincenzo Traversa, Bruce Trumbo, Steve Ugbah, Lenni Velez

Visitors: Evelyn Padua Andrews, Carl Bellone, Robert Brust (Pioneer), Bob Burt, Stanley Clark, Jay Colombatto, Susan Correia, Jeanne Ekdahl, Rosanne Harris, Emily Nye, Sonjia Redmond, Don Sawyer, Joanne Schwab, Marilyn Silva, Aline Soules, Richard Symmons, Jay L Tontz,

1. Approval of the Agenda
(M/S/P) Langan/Fleming.
Norton added one item, Proposition 56, as item 7, and renumbered the rest.
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 27, 2004
(M/S/P) Wort/Cassuto.
Add Jessica Weiss as present. On last page, John ought to be Ostarello.
3. Report of the President
-Rees shared that on the basis of the last CSU budget given to the Presidents, the CSU will reduce enrollment by 5% (from last Fall's numbers, about 650 students) on the grounds that it is not possible for the university to teach the same number of students with a reduced budget. We are actually losing more than 5% of our budget. If our enrollment next year is more than 1% less than target, we will lose additional funding. We will be taking our enrollment cut from areas other than first year freshmen. Please share this concern with your colleagues and shoot for the target enrollment. Caplan remarked that information on how this budget crisis has been interpreted by other campuses has been distributed by Tom McCoy and himself. Reichman suggested that Rees' email communiqué to the faculty regarding legislators and their contact information be sent to students as well. Wort complimented Rees on the content of the email communiqué. Rees said that we must match the classes offered with student needs in an even more effective way. The Provost will be working with the Deans and Bellone and Strobel in order to make this difficult match. We will try to increase frosh enrollment. Some grad programs will be reduced. This will address our enrollment imbalance. When asked about the benefit of enrolling more students, Rees said that the only advantage is that we would keep the fees, but that's just a drop in the bucket.
4. Continued discussion of 03-04 CIC 7-amended, Revision of the University Writing Skills Requirement (There was a main motion to approve, and consideration of an amendment proposing to eliminate item #1 on the document, which would continue to require the test.)

Discussion on the motion to drop item #1: Warriner provided more statistics on the WST (Writing Skills Test): of the 45 students polled who had already failed the WST, 30 said they would opt to take the test; 59 freshmen said they would take the test and 14 would take the class. Schutz remarked that we ought to err on the side of not offering more classes than we have to. Fleming stated that she views

education as a service and business; if the WST is a barrier to our ESL (English as a Second Language) students, anything that requires specialized knowledge ought to be reviewed as an equity issue; in the past, they found that of the 525 English as a first language students, 75% passed the WST as an undergraduate, 32% of ESL students passed, 78% of graduate students passed, 37% ESL graduate students passed. We should consider equitability issues and subjecting our ESL students to the humiliation of repeated failures. Andrews noted that from the perspective of a member on the Layoff Committee (UCL), the budget is so bad that anything that is an extra service, such as offering a different form of testing, is not something that we can afford at this time due to the unpredictability of resources. Bowen disagreed and supports keeping #1 on the proposal because this would put more of an emphasis on writing within the disciplines, not on a standardized test. Faculty ought to work with students on their writing in their role as advisors. Additional resources for remedial/improving writing should be given to departments. Cassuto remarked that difficult budget times force us to make difficult choices. He supports the proposal. The humiliation for students in failing the WST (eg. The Vienna Program) is great and ought not be ignored as a cultural issue. He also favors the portfolio approach. Caplan is in favor of the amendment because: 1) the variability of student scores is because the test was changed; 2) the test is more consistent whereas a course and grading would change depending on the instructor. Reichman defined the WST as a means to meet the CSU requirement. It is also a kind of placement test so that students can test out of other courses; to make the test optional because it somehow humiliates students, would mean that any other required tests, such as the EPT and the ELM, ought to be treated the same. The WST provides adequate screening of entering juniors and should not be taken away. Hird opposes the amendment because we ought to be thinking of the students and not simply resource limitations. He would be willing to support an amendment that provides ESL students with the choice and not other students. Seitz is against the motion to remove item #1; a basic writing class is not an extravagant thing if it means that our students will write better. Strait is also against the amendment and argued with the notion that the classes are the same as remediation; it is part of our responsibility to teach our students good writing skills in the baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate programs. He also argued that it should be more about our academic standards vs budgetary concerns, ; within the past 14 years the test has had 8 substantive changes to no affect; Bellone remarked that students are not allowed to take the WST until the end of their first quarter, by which time they could have taken a class and learned how to write and pass the test during their 2nd quarter. He added that ESL students want to take the class first and we have to say no. It doesn't seem right. Bowen added that he advises many non-native students, but most complaints that he hears come from native speakers. (M/S/P) Stoper/Caplan to call the question.

(M/S) Reichman/Bowen to remove item #1 and subsequent related language. Motion failed.

(M/S) Andrews/Ginno offered a friendly motion to change the name to "Writing Skills Evaluation" to remove the punitive image. Wort remarked that there would be a lot of costly paperwork to change the related documents. Stoper remarked that it is to fulfill the Writing Skills Requirement, not evaluation. Motion failed.

Schutz asked for explanation of item #7. Warriner replied that some ESL students who are not able to pass the course would get that notification on their transcripts. Caplan noted that all students must pass the WST to fulfill the requirement; and if a student takes the course 3 times and still fails, then they can appeal. Cassuto remarked that the university is not compensated if the student takes the course for a 3rd time.

Main motion passes (one nay vote). (CIC 7 amended passes, as presented)

5. 03-04 BEC 8, Faculty Diversity & Equity Committee (Policy Changes)

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

Rees noted that the Special Assistant for Diversity and Equal Opportunity, dealt with a wide variety of issues with faculty and staff. There was a steep learning curve and due to the abundance of state and national laws and interpretations of policies, it was determined that a professional with that expertise

would be a benefit to the University. Dorian West was hired and works in Human Resources. Rees asked the current AALO (Affirmative Action Liaison Officer), David Larsen, if there were any holes created by that change in the process. Larsen offered to fill the gaps.

6. Academic Senate Forum on the University Name Change Exploration. (Jay Colombatto, Director of Marketing Communications)

Rees remarked that the reason we have a Director of Marketing Communications is that we needed a professional in the field. The person was put in the President's office so that they would work with the whole university using existing support. Colombatto is an alum of CSUH and has done a lot of research on the image of the University. The name change was brought to her attention from a variety of sources about a year ago. No decision has been made about this, but Rees did find out that to change the name we merely need approval by the Board of Trustees (some BoT members have also remarked to Rees that the name is a problem). More work will go on and more feedback from constituencies will be sought.

Background information: Colombatto has investigated strengthening the CSUH image, looked at retention issues, and our role as a regional university. He conducted some constituency research on how we are received in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. Some of his findings are:

- Our enrollment is out of balance, one of the lowest ratios of lower to upper division FTES. -We have never reached our enrollment potential. Obstacles to our enrollment goals are building awareness, marketing concerns, and overcoming misperceptions arising from the name and image.
- Awareness of CSUH in Alameda & Contra Costa counties has declined over the past few years.
- Degrees from CSUH are seen as less than those obtained from SJSU & SFSU.
- Part of our problem is our name; survey respondents told us that the name is not a positive association. Even local newspapers have remarked that we ought to be linked to a regional name, i.e. "Bay Area," or "East Bay State." Focus groups and discussions always brought up the problem that our name does not adequately reflect the campus.

In May 2003, the Integrated Marketing Council recommended that we investigate the costs of changing our name. Currently, the State provides 65% of the CSU financial support. Private giving is essential to the campus as this number will only decline. CSUH ranks 7th from the bottom in private endowments, and within the CSU, we rank 22/23 in terms of outside funding. Our fundraising activities have shown that our name is a barrier. Alumni, key donors, and legislators, all agree that our name does not communicate our regional vibrancy, growth, etc., and they support a name change. Because of our goals, we want to be known as the East Bay university and as serving the educational needs of the Alameda and Contra Costa county's constituency. The name that has been suggested is CSU East Bay, Hayward Hills and CSU East Bay, Concord. Although there is no unanimity about the new name so far, a change is supported.

Colombatto passed out a list of 5 questions for forum discussion. Seitz noted that he was not opposed to a name change, but as a geologist he thought "east bay" was too general, and some of his students have made fun of it referring to us a "E-Bay University." Hird asked if it was at all possible to honor something other than a place? Colombatto answered that there have been suggestions of using a "created" name. Cassuto stated that we have a lot of alumni who are proud of being from CSU Hayward. The image problem is not the name; you cannot change an image simply by changing the name. It's a deeper issue and he agrees that our image needs a boost. Bowen noted that our community college colleagues have responded that they refer their students to other institutions and we would need to change how people think about us, not the name. Have we done surveys on alums and prospective students regarding the name change? Their feedback is important. He also remarked that as a member of the East Bay Forum of a few years ago, this very idea of leveraging the name "east bay" and discovered that there wasn't anything to leverage. It had no particular buzz. Colombatto responded that we are most concerned about alums and started the process with them. So far, they have great pride and affinity and would support a name change if it supported long-range goals and objectives; a random sample of prospective students/teachers/counselors has shown the Hayward name makes them feel unsafe and lack of quality. Horan remarked that logistically the CCC has issues with having a similar name as a community college; one name that students have given him is using "Mt. Diablo".

Students at CCC believe that their location should be part of their name, regardless. Reichman has thought for years that the name Hayward is too narrow; concerns are 1) effects on existing alumni (not only identity but practical stuff like getting transcripts); 2) timing regarding the costs of changing the name; and 3) key is not the name, get out the message that we are a great place to go to college, and if the name facilitates that then great. Colombatto noted that this is not meant to be a cosmetic change, but tied to substantive development changes into a new identity, too. Garbesi asked for any information about what are the bad perceptions – are we perceived as “less than” SJSU & SFSU because we are smaller? Caplan commented that in terms of the alumni, those who were recruited here are CSUH alums in spite of the name. In the future what will be good for the university? Historically, we had a focus of isolationism for a long period and a resistance to change which may have added to the misperceptions of others about us. That has changed in the last 10 years, but perhaps that image lingers.

Norton stopped discussion due to time limitations and recommended that faculty send their comments to Jay Colombatto (jcolombatto@bay.csuhayward.edu, x5-3808). Colombatto’s presentation will be posted to the Senate web page on the Senate minutes page.

7. Proposed Resolution Regarding Budget Accountability (Proposition 56)

(M/S) Reichman/Eagan to approve.

(M/S) Lowenthal/Cassuto to add an “unfriendly amendment” which would also endorse Props 57, 58, all school district parcel taxes, and all sales tax increases.

Lowenthal noted that this not a bond on higher education and does not belong on our agenda. Reichman remarked that the rationale in the motion shows how it is relevant, and the statewide senate also felt it relevant (even though many are Republicans). Reichman also noted that it is beyond the pale to attribute personal views of others in writing which they do not hold and argued that this is beyond collegial efforts. Stoper commended Lowenthal for his humor in his amendment and that we all need to laugh at ourselves.

Motion failed unanimously, by acclamation.

(M/S/P) Cassuto/Langan to call the question.

Andrews noted that this proposition is desperately need to help straighten out the way California is governed as it is currently undemocratic. We are a public institution and we ought to support good government and this proposition is good government.

Motion passed with 26 ayes, 2 nays, 1 abstention.

8. Adjournment

(M/S/P) Warriner/Cassuto to adjourn (4:04).

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Ginno, Secretary