

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as Amended

Minutes of the Meeting of January 11, 2005

Members Present: Jim Anderson, Dee Andrews, Diana Bargas, Linda Beebe, Norman Bowen, Cal Caplan, Lynn Comerford, Jennifer Eagan, Judith Faust, Denise Fleming, Michael Hedrick, Doug Highsmith, Tom Hird, Scott Hopkins, Mark Karplus, Teena Khatri, Jose Lopez, Jane Lopus, Frank Lowenthal, Bijan Mashaw, Nan Maxwell, Michael Medeiros, Rebecca McCormack, Julie Norton, Susan Opp, Chung-Hsing Ouyang, Barbara Paige, James Perrizo, Laurie Price, Norma Rees, Hank Reichman, Don Sawyer, Michael Schutz, Jeffery Seitz, Jason Singley, Eric Soares, Carl Stempel, Emily Stoper, Eric Suess, Jay Tontz, Donna Wiley, Diane Rush Woods, Don Wort, Jin Yan

Members Absent: Alex Braun, Jack Davis, Liz Ginno, Susan Gubernat, Kevin Ku, Eve Lynch, Pamela Parlocha, Juan Robles, Vincenzo Traversa, Craig Wilson

Visitors: Rita Akpan, Kerry Barlow, Carl Bellone, Simme Black, Bob Burt, Brady Calma, John Charles, Stanley Clark, Charles Cole III, Ann Halvorsen, Juanita Higares, Ari Houshang, Mary Hubins, Kim Huggett, Terry Jones, Harold Kemp, Michelle LaCentra, David Larson, Michael Leung, Tom McCoy, D. McKinney, Amanda Mendoza, Michelle Meyer (Daily Review), Saeid Motavalli, John Ostarello, Terry Peppin, Tina Phillips, Sonjia Redmond, Chris Shakelford, Sheri Sharp, Arthurlene Towner, Vicki Vieler,

1. Approval of the Agenda
The Chair asked for motion to approve, as amended by striking item #5 **04-05 BEC 5**, Postponement of Academic Reviews
M/S/P (Norton/Caplan)
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting on November 16, 2004
M/S (Wort/Schutz)
Approved as amended by replacing “as well as noting” with “and” on page 4, 3rd line.
3. Reports
 - A. Report of the Chair
 - Anyone who is affected by tsunami and needs support should notify the President’s Office.
 - Homecoming, Friday, Jan 28th. Faculty, staff, and students are encouraged to participate in the many activities on campus that week, including attending the women’s water polo, men and women’s softball games, office decorating, fashion show, and more.
 - B. Report of the President
We’ll have to wait for May Revise, but the Compact has remained intact in the Governor’s budget.
 - C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
No report; There will be a meeting next week
 - D. Report of CFA
CFA thinks the Governor’s budget is inadequate; will be distributing a petition for faculty to sign, asking to increase the base budget, money to increase enrollment, and to get first year funding for ACR 73 (increases faculty/lecturer ratio). He encouraged all to become involved.
 - E. Report of Student Government
No report

4. **04-05 CAPR 6**, Discontinuation of the “Creative Arts Option” and the Recreation and Community Theatre Option,” both in the Theatre Arts Major and **04-05 CIC 9**, Discontinuance of the Option in Creative Arts and the Option in Recreation and Community Theatre, in the Theatre Arts Major

M/S/P (Norton/Caplan) to approve

5. deleted from agenda

6. **03-04 CIC 32-amended**, Writing and Information Literacy Learning Outcomes for General Education (G.E.) requirements

M/S (Hird/Stoper) to approve

Stoper, Chair of CIC, noted a typo – delete “two” in the 5th row of the third paragraph in background. Andrews expressed concerns about writing outcomes for C4 stating that this would equate to about 20 pages of writing per student in courses that have about 50 students per class. This would ask a faculty member to read 2700 pages and poses a serious workload issue. Supports intensive writing, but believes an adjustment (e.g. multiple drafts or reduction to 4500 words per student).

Motion: (Andrews/Reichman) to amend the number 6000 to 4500 and “and/or” second drafts.

Stemple noted that at 250 words per page in 12 font, this is still 19 pp. Bowen expressed concern that phrasing (informal writing, drafts of papers) does not include anything to require a student to write a formal analytical research paper. Too vague. Wort added that we ought to work on reducing our course load as other campuses have and was ruled out of order. Stoper stated that she supports the amendment; D4 does include a research paper, so it wouldn’t need to be done in C4.

Motion Approved

Reichman offered an additional amendment, same page, item #3: to replace the end of the sentence that starts with “use later invention and...” in favor of “to rethink and revise.” and to strike item #4 altogether. Lowenthal second.

Stoper and Andrews supported the amendment.

Motion approved.

Main motion approved, as amended on the floor

7. **04-05 CIC 4/CAPR 4**, Proposed M.S. in Engineering Management
M/S (Mashaw/Seitz) to approve

Reichman suggested a friendly amendment to CIC 4, to add “on a voluntary basis” to the Background Information after the words “with little or no remuneration”, so that it does not appear that faculty will be required to work for no compensation. Maxwell added that the admission criteria didn’t mention GMAT & GRE, to which Motavalli responded that he would look into that. Wort added that it was a model job for a new program and a job well done.

Approved, with the correction to the background of CIC 4.

8. **04-05 CIC 5/CAPR 3**, Proposed B.A. in Physics
M/S (Seitz/Opp) to approve

Lowenthal raised several concerns about number of units (88), content of classes, and physics courses that are listed as 4 units in catalog, but are three unit classes in the proposal. Singley responded to the concerns, noting that some of the information that Lowenthal is referencing is out of date, as Physics has strengthened its BS, trying to make our program more in line with other colleges. The BA is added at no additional cost, as it requires similar but fewer classes than the BS. Opp and Maxwell supported Singley, stating that other Science BA programs and the BA in Economics are also less demanding than

the BS. This is common. Stempel inquired about the required units at UCB and Stanford being lower. Singley replied that there is a difference in what is stated in the catalog vs. what happens in practice. Stanford has a much higher workload than is reflected in units; CSUH decided to reflect the workload in increased units.

Approved with 1 no.

9. **04-05 CIC 11, Academic Renewal**
M/S (Stoper/Schutz) to approve

Several faculty wanted a C- to be subject to academic renewal since this grade can alter chances for med school. Lopez asked what data did we use to make a determination about this? Who are the students who tend to seek academic renewal? Who will be most impacted?

M/S (Caplan/Wort) to amend the document to include grade of C-

Seitz opined that the document should not be amended, as it promotes student responsibility and conserves our resources. Reichman agreed that the thrust of the proposal is to facilitate graduation and resources are limited. This grants renewal in some cases when it needed to be petitioned in the past; almost more liberal. Faculty can give the student a D+. Schutz agreed with the previous speakers and added that a C- earns credit in a credit/no credit system. Opp opined that Med schools look at grades, not just GPA.

Discussion was suspended by the Chair, due to the Time Certain on the next issue, until after item # 10 or the next meeting, as time allows.

10. **04-05 BAS 1, University Name Change**
M/S (Caplan/Wort) to approve the document and place the issue on the Senate floor

There was discussion on this topic for 45 minutes. Senators were allowed to have the floor to express their views first and then, *when senators had an opportunity to speak and rebut*, the discussion was *then* opened to the University Community, as time allowed, *first to faculty, then staff and students*. For the sake of brevity of the minutes, the main points of opinion are listed, without names.

- concerned about students. None have spoken in favor of name change. Many are upset that they have not had a voice. Lives in Hayward and is upset about the message that is sent about Hayward. There has been a lot of support from the community. Name change is vague
- thinks that the name should not be changed at this time, as other things need to be changed first, e.g., transfer student evaluations should be done first
- opposed to name change as research does not support it. Lippman study has virtually no information or data on name change; some evidence that people do not react well to Hayward, but that is about location, not the sound of the word; no research on effect of a name change to East Bay. Page 20 of memo from Colombatto to President, admits that we have taken 40 years to establish our current name. Mostly based on speculation.
- wants to do what is good for the University in the long run. SFSU and others have names that work for them, but Turlock, Seaside and Hayward do not work. This is a risk to do something that might help.
- opposes; taking a risk does not make the risk necessarily good. Athletics may make the difference in the renown of SJSU and SFSU
- Emeriti representative reported that at its last meeting, the Emeriti Faculty Association voted against the name change.
- has changed opinion; now in favor. Listened to CCC Board of Supervisor's comments that we do not appear to have the kind of commitment to CCC that we should; the name change is one small part of a larger vision; we need to be a regional university in name as well as practise

- does not support name change; lives in town, appreciates the town. Using the catchment area name, UCB would be named “UC The World”
- student rep. Against the name change, but noted it did make students excited about a cause, which is unusual on this campus.
- Before he did not oppose the name change, but now he supports it; will not be a panacea; didn’t think it is as big a deal as it has become; The new name will show that we serve the broader area, our service area; Monterey Bay is also a regional name, Dominguez Hills is not a place on map.
- Congratulates students on passion for their school. Would like to expand on that. Finds it hard to adjust to the idea, but supports the new name; real change is happening here, with new buildings, etc.; good time to do it; also noted that Hayward is still in the name of this campus – Hayward Hills.
- supports. After 25 years of sports recruiting, no stats, but experience has shown that the name was not a help; wants those from other areas to feel a connection to the university, the kind of passion we see here
- supports. Name change will better reflect our campus and the way it has evolved and will continue to evolve; noted growth in C.C. campus; also noted that we had other names in the past
- supports. As a resident of Hayward, is proud of the university and the city; the relationship between the university and the city is mostly about the name and doesn’t go further
- supports the name change, changing nature of university necessitates a name that reflects its nature. A resident of Hayward, been here 30 years, three kids attended here; also noted that BART stations have signs “East Bay trains this way”
- opposes. Research is flawed, process is flawed. Impact unknown on recruiting faculty, students, student jobs, getting grants; noted a 30% frosh increase, so name change not necessary, thought name change would impact international student enrollment
- supports. Hayward resident, taught in Hayward schools, was in first class to graduate after last name change; name reflects the nature of our relationship with the larger community; important to show that we don’t just represent Hayward
- opposes. Hayward is an accurate name, majority of classes taught here; last name change did not help and no evidence that this one will improve enrollment
- others have thought we might lose our commitment to Hayward. We won’t. Nothing wrong with having a commitment to broader area; we are a regional institution.
- opposes. Has degrees from CSUH. Does not think a name change will make an enrollment difference.
- contrary to an earlier statement, faculty were in fact informed about the name change. We had a long presentation at the Senate last year. Colombatto report brings into question Hayward’s commitment to us.
- opposes name change, not in principle, but we should make an effort to determine why we have a mixed reputation and why counselors at feeder colleges first suggest SF and SJSU; this is only a cosmetic change; also believes CC needs more resources.
- Regarding regional name, SFSU should change their name to “West Bay”. Concerned about costs for this change, doesn’t want money to be diverted to this.
- Rees: There are individuals and corporations that are specifically interested in donating money for name change and those funds can only be used for that.
- those funds should be used for other purposes. Going from a brand name to a non-brand name will lose us customers
- contrary to contention that we do not have a plan, we do have plans in place, but we lack adequate resources—not because of the name, but because of state funding
- not sure about his position, but knows that CC wants a 4 year college. We need to be in all of our service areas. Encourages us to think about what we need to do to serve our constituents; make ourselves indispensable in serving all the people, including minorities, or we will lose the battle.
- (Board member, ASI) we have spent 50 minutes on an issue that will affect us for the next 50 years. Believes that students have not been adequately consulted nor early enough in the process.
- People of CC deserve better than we’ve delivered. Deserve our own campus.

- This is not merely an issue of passion, but is an issue of policy. The students were not taken into account; 80% do not agree with this. At a forum with 100 students, there was not one in support. President did not provide requested research.

Ballots were distributed to Academic Senators present and voting was by written ballot.

Final Vote:

20 in support

23 not in support

1 abstain

11. Adjournment

M/S/P (Maxwell, Reichman)

Respectfully Submitted,
Denise Fleming, Acting Secretary