

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as presented

Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, May 4, 2004

Members Present: Dee Andrews, Norman Bowen, Cal Caplan, Leann Christianson, Jack Davis, Jennifer Eagan, Bryant Estep, Liz Ginno, Jessica Goodkind, Michael Hedrick, Doug Highsmith, Thomas Hird, Mark Karplus, Bill Langan, Jane Lopus, Frank Lowenthal, Bijan Mashaw, Russ Merris, William Nico, Julia Norton (chair), John Ostarello, Pamela Parlocha, James Perrizo, Norma Rees, Hank Reichman, Michael Schutz, Jeffery Seitz, Eric Soares, Carl Stempel, Emily Stoper, Michael Strait, Eric Suess, Bruce Trumbo, Steve Ugbah, Alison Warriner, Jessica Weiss, Donna Wiley, Craig Wilson, Don Wort

Members Absent: Diana Bargas, Monique Berlanga, Alex Braun II, Alex Cassuto, Denise Fleming, Don Gailey, Karina Garbesi, Susan Gubernat, Kevin Horan, Edwin McLay, Laurie Price, Hollie Svedbeck, Vincenzo Traversa, Lenni Velez

Visitors: Carl Bellone, Bob Brauer, Jay Colombatto, Susan Correia, David Larson, Tom McCoy, Sonjia Redmond, Joanne Schwab, Jodi Servatius, Richard Symmons, Gale Young

1. Approval of the agenda
M/S/P (Hird/Langan)
2. Approval of the minutes of April 6, 2004
M/S/P (Hird/Langan). Add Craig Wilson to those who attended.
3. Reports
 - a. Report of the chair
 - June 1, 2004, 1:00 –there will be a Budget Summit, prior to that day’s Senate meeting; COBRA will provide their report before the meeting for review; this is the faculty’s opportunity to provide input; approximately 60 layoff notices went out to staff; remember that there are numerous quarterly lecturers who have not had their contract renewed as well; staff cuts are in primarily in the administration offices; please remember to show your appreciation to staff.
 - b. Report of the President
 - Supports Norton’s report; Reichman commended the President on the public nature of the staff layoff announcement, many campuses do not inform their faculty; Rees reminded the Senate that we won’t know for sure until the Governor signs the budget (end of June-Oct). McCoy asked about the number of (FTES) lecturers who will not be renewed – Rees replied that the information is in the planning scenarios of the deans right now; and in response to his second question she answered that, yes, the CSU has informed the legislature that we have had almost a 30% cut over 2 years; Rees also reminded us that no degree program can be closed on this campus without action by the Senate; no campuses are slated for closure.
 - fees will be acted upon by the BOT in May and the increase may have an impact on the number of master’s students enrolled; if we lose enrollment next year, it means even less money;

-we hoped to get 900 first time freshmen enrolled for Fall Quarter and looks like we're getting there (we had 600 last Fall); it isn't obvious that we will meet the target without a lot of work; if fees increase 40% for grads, we may get fewer graduate enrollees.

-Lowenthal asked if the Post Tenure Review Committee is authorized to view the last 5-year review letter (Norton will investigate this); also what role does the chair have in the review and why is that person designated as the "appropriate administrator"; Clark replied that this part of the CBA was reviewed and determined by each college as to who is defined as the "appropriate administrator."

-McCoy asked Clark about SLO borrowing money for CMS (PeopleSoft) upgrade and what implications this has for CSUH. Clark replied that he is updated by John Charles and, although some SLO faculty are urging delay, the most recent information is that they have no plans to delay; SLO plans to go forward; Rees remarked that the system that SLO/CSUH jointly rely on is an old one and SLO needs to either repair or update.

c. Report of the Statewide Senators

-Caplan noted that they will be meeting tomorrow;

-Women's Water Polo team took 4th place in a national competition; the women's softball team has qualified for the regionals

-Reichman added that on the agenda there are a number of resolutions re: academic freedom and the 45/15 plan.

d. Report of CFA

-McCoy reported on the efforts of the CFA to bring attention to the plight of the CSU; the teach-in was very successful here on campus; over 200 letters were written to legislatures; students marched on Sacramento; 1200 students marched on Los Angeles – the "largest and loudest" demonstration; SFSU had a forum with Arianna Huffington with over 200 in attendance and the students at SFSU basically took over the meeting (550 students); SJSU held a town hall on the budget cuts with over 400 in attendance.

e. Report of Student Government

-Estep reported that ASI is holding elections this quarter and asked faculty to encourage students to vote. Norton thanked the students for several good events.

4. **03-04 CIC 19**, Approval of Freshman Clusters in 2004-09 General Education Program M/S/P (Stoper/Warriner) to approve.

Larsen suggested that, in future reiterations of this, that the forms for the clusters have some language regarding consultation with appropriate departments as is done with new/changes in courses. He was not consulted regarding "Global Environments." Stoper promised to follow up on it. Reichman asked about the rotation of clusters; Stoper replied that CIC will be discussing this at next week's meeting.

5. **03-04 CIC 20**, Retention of Infrequently Offered Courses M/S (Osterello/Stoper) to approve.

Reichman moved to keep History 3550 as an active course, as they are offering it in the Fall. Approved as amended.

6. **03-04 CIC 21**, Request for Approval of Prelicensure Nursing Option & Advanced Placement Option, both in the B.S. in Nursing M/S/P (Stoper/Parloacha) to approve.

Merris remarked that one of his pet peeves is the possibility/eventuality of having technology driving curriculum (rather than the other way around). Bellone replied that in this case, the change is basically driven by costs.

7. **03-04 CIC 16**, Proposed New Certificate in Engineering Management M/S/P (Seitz/Wort) to approve; motion passed with one abstention.

Soares asked why it is to begin in 2005; Bellone replied that the dates are basically driven by the publication date of the catalog/schedules.

Friendly amendment to add any needed prerequisite(s).

8. **03-04 CIC 17**, Proposed New Certificate in Quality Management M/S/P (Seitz/Wort) to approve; motion passed with one abstention.

9. Resolution on Equitable Scholarly Publishing M/S (Highsmith/Hedrick) to approve.

A lively discussion ensued with comments ranging from:

-that this does not seem to be an equitable route to take to protest the high prices of these kinds of journals, and a more valid way to protest might be to have faculty write letters instead; that faculty who follow the suggestions might punish those faculty who leave CSUH; that it doesn't address the issue of electronic subscriptions and losing access to those journals that we decide later on to cancel; that doesn't this basically go against the free market?
-to that the document simply asks faculty to give careful consideration to following the suggestions, and that it is something that the statewide senate would welcome to help in the future negotiating of high priced publishers; that some fields may be more affected by the specific publisher; that this is supposed to be more of a "shot across the bow"; that CSUH is not on the cutting edge on this issue as we have modeled the resolution on those by UCB, UCSC, Stanford, etc., and our efforts are to keep access to as many sources as possible; that doesn't this resolution simply ask faculty to consider their options when they go to publish?
-some recommended that the faculty recommend to their professional/academic associations to create/publish articles rather than relying on commercial publishers who have basically created a monopoly on scholarly publication.

Motion carried (22 for, 7 against, 1 abstention).

10. WASC Mission Statement Group
Servatius handed out the document, for review and comment, and gave some background; the Committee has four faculty members from each college, plus a couple of administrative appointees, and was asked to participate in the Campus Outcomes Team. The recommended mission, vision and values statements were discussed, the campus surveyed, and then discussed again. The values and vision statements were to help round out the mission statement. The Committee plans to bring it back to the campus community to review and comment again.

-comments on the documents included: the work of the Committee was applauded, and that item 7 be placed as number 1; that the mission statement narrows the mission of the university too much; we also are to meet the educational needs of California; none of the statements mention the word freedom, academic freedom, freedom of inquiry, etc., and these ideas should be an integral part of our mission; there was concern that the results of the campus standards report(?) included - our concern about how our students learn, with a stronger statement on high academic achievement; that there was a fundamental omission that we need our students to be able to communicate and this should be added; that the array of activities that we promote ought to include enlightenment; that we ought to add the development of knowledge; concern over “ensuring” student success – we need to make sure that there is student effort included; that high academic performance -- “all the students” – “guarantee” “each student’s success” might be taken as that we accept all students and pass them all; that we need to include that CSUH offers education as part of creating meaningful lives in general without the attachment to work; so much emphasis on the linking of theory to application versus fostering intellectual inquiry and freedom first; emphasis on applied research; that our current mission statement is good in that we strive to “provide an academic excellence for a diverse society,” and this should be retained; there was not enough emphasis on the diversity of the campus; that there is no mention of the idea of challenging the intellect; the word diversity is missing and ought to be explicitly stated; questioned why the outcome is asked for in a one-sentence mission statement; we should not ignore all the work done by constituents of the campus; that the term “competence” is a low bar term and we are way beyond competence; that adding the three different statements together still do not cover the current mission statement; it was suggested that the committee ought to consider the ideas provided and not worry about the length of the mission statement but that it capture the essence of the university.

-that the “quest for all students” and once they are students we ought to cater to their needs; in reference to ensure each student’s success, what is a faculty member’s obligation to the students in their class?—not necessarily succeed with an A, or a B;

-that the results were taken from comments given to their web-based survey; that the Committee on Practice responses on the diversity statement compelled the committee to try and spell out what that meant to CSUH; that the term “diversity” lost its punch and meaning, and that they wanted to write about the actions the university takes/makes in terms of diversity and provide specifics; that many of the responses targeted the terms “diversity” and “excellence”; that those are two jargon words that we shouldn’t shy away from using along with our definitions of what they mean to us; that the suggested statements do provide us with expandability for changes in the future; that most of everything that folks have added is already in the statements and that a one-sentence mission statement can prove useful.

-that this university is being asked to cut faculty, pass students without ensuring literacy, and perhaps that is why academic excellence has been dropped; this was objected to and discussion ensued about whether we do or don’t graduate students who have not passed the literacy requirement.

11. Adjournment

M/S/P (Egan/Reichman) to adjourn at 3:34pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

Liz Ginno, Secretary