

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

OFFICE OF THE  
ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as amended

Minutes of the Meeting of November 16, 2004

Members Present: Dee Andrews, Norman Bowen, Cal Caplan, Jack Davis, Jennifer Eagan, Judith Faust, Liz Ginno, Susan Gubernat, Doug Highsmith, Tom Hird, Mark Karplus, Kevin Ku, Jose Lopez, Frank Lowenthal, Eve Lynch, Bijan Mashaw, Nan Maxwell, Michael Medeiros, Julie Norton, Chung-Hsing Ouyang, Barbara Paige, Pamela Parlocha, James Perrizo, Laurie Price, Hank Reichman, Juan Robles, Don Sawyer, Michael Schutz, Jeffery Seitz, Jason Singley, Eric Soares, Carl Stempel, Emily Stoper, Jay Tontz, Craig Wilson, Don Wort

Members Absent: Jim Anderson, Diana Balgas, Denise Fleming, Michael Hedrick, Scott Hopkins, Jane Lopus, Rebecca McCormack, Susan Opp, Norma Rees, Eric Suess, Vincenzo Traversa, Donna Wiley, Diane Rush Woods, Jin Yan

Visitors: Carl Bellone, John Charles, Stanley Clark, Maria Deanda Ramos, Armando Gonzales, Neal Hoss, Terry Jones, Myoung-ja Lee Kwon, Tom McCoy, Ann McPartland, Sally Murphy, Roger Parker, Arthurlene Towner, Gale Young

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/ (Schutz/Mashaw) to approve.

M/S/ (Lowenthal/Mashaw) to amend the agenda to add as item #3 that the Senate direct the Chair to communicate immediately with the Chancellor and Board of Trustees regarding the proposed University Name Change that 1.) the Senate has as yet taken no position on the topic and that 2.) the CSUH Academic Senate will make a recommendation at its next meeting on this matter.

Motion passed with a vote of 23 ayes (out of 30).

Agenda approved as amended.

2. Approval of the minutes of October 5, 2004

M/S/P (Caplan/Schutz) to approve. Approved as presented.

3. Name change discussion (Lowenthal)

M/S/ (Lowenthal/Mashaw) to place on the floor for discussion.

Lowenthal noted that he attended the student forum last Thursday and realized that the Academic Senate never made a formal decision on the University Name Change topic; he opined that the Senate would be derelict in its duty not to take a stand on such an important matter. He would like to make sure that the campus community has an opportunity to discuss the issue. Mashaw added that he was in favor of a name change; he understood the reasons behind wanting to change the name of the university but was unsure that the proposed new name would be best. He also had concerns over the cost. Stoper supported the spirit of the motion; she added that we needed something substantive to approve and that normally a resolution is drafted. Reichman noted that it is normal to refer the issue to ExCom as it is their charge to decide how to put this on the Senate agenda. He added that it would be difficult to say whether or not we would actually make a recommendation, if the vote is close, for example. It is also important that we have a resolution or at least a mechanism to prevent a free for all on the floor of the Senate. Caplan opined that the President spent a year collecting information. The Senate doesn't have those resources nor the time. It comes down to emotion rather than data/evidence. Norton noted that in large corporations, their Board makes the decisions on name changes. She is not sure that the Senate has the right in this case. Wort noted that the campus name has evolved over time. We have had several names and this is more inclusive of the populations it serves, such as the Concord campus. Stoper responded that we should discuss this, we are not a corporation but a university with shared governance and the faculty as a body ought to provide its opinion of the issue to the administration. Bellone noted that Jay Colombatto had presented the idea of a name change to the Senate last year (February 3, 2004, <http://imctwo.csuhayward.edu/senate/minutes/03-04%20minutes/sen02-03mapp.pdf>), but no vote was taken.

M/S/ (Soares/Mashaw) that ExCom prepare alternate resolutions that reflect potential positions on the issue and place on a future Senate agenda.

Stempel requested that the final vote be reported, rather than pass/fail. Stoper asked that ExCom include background material in the packet. Reichman added that the Senate discuss this 2 weeks prior to the Board of Trustees meeting. All were viewed as friendly amendments.

Amendments to the motion passed, with one nay vote.

Main motion passed, with 2 nay votes.

### 3. Reports

#### A. Report of the Chair

- Annual Senate Holiday Reception at the President's home, 12/3/04;
- Music Dept is hosting a Madrigal Dinner on two nights (see <http://isis.csuhayward.edu/dbsw/music/Calendar.php>);
- Fall University-wide elections are completed and the results are available on the web (on the Senate NEWS page).

#### B. Report of the President

- No report.

#### C. Report of the Statewide Senators

- Reichman reported they met last week; Vasconcellos talked – biggest notion was to market ourselves to the legislature; D. Spence's report focused on the lower division transfer project; statewide meetings for lead faculty in the project will be held 12/4; Connie Dowell and Bill Robnett gave the statewide library plan ("it was a love fest" in that senators were sympathetic with the plight of libraries); new study of the CSU's impact on the State's economy (on Calstate website); the administration will use this document to ask for support for the CSU from the legislature; CFA Pres. J. Travis informed the Senate that bargaining will begin in the spring; CFA will continue its work on getting more funds beyond the Governor's budget; only one resolution commending CSU students and faculty for their efforts on voter registration was actually passed; other resolutions coming down the pike (see [http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/records/resolutions/2004-2005/11-04\\_resolution\\_packet.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/records/resolutions/2004-2005/11-04_resolution_packet.pdf)). – Caplan added that in Spence's report he emphasized how important the CO views advising; responses were that this ought to be communicated to University Presidents in light of promotion and tenure qualifications, and regarding any requirement for inservice learning, it ought to be accompanied by appropriate funding.
- The minutes can be found on the web at <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Minutes/nov04min.pdf>

#### D. Report of CFA

- McCoy noted that CFA's position on the compact is that we will go to the legislature to ask for more funding.

#### E. Report of Student Government

- No report.

### 4. **04-05 CIC 6**, Application of BIOL 1008, Life on Earth, to General Education Area B1, Life Science Requirement

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

### 5. **04-05 CIC 7**, Application of SOC 2255, Introduction to Sociology Through Sports, to General Education Lower Division Area D, Social Sciences

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

6. **04-05 CIC 8**, Application of KPE 3200, Sport in Film: Cultural Perspectives, to the Cultural Groups/Women General Education Requirement

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

7. **03-04 CIC 30**, Proposed Discontinuance of the Certificate in Commercial Physical Education, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education; **04-05 CAPR 2**, Discontinuation of the Commercial Physical Education Certificate

M/S/P (Tontz/Maxwell) to approve.

8. New Library Initiatives and System-wide Strategic Plan

Myoung-ja Kwon provided background on what Council of Library Directors (COLD) has been doing to align with system-wide strategic planning completed in 2000; meet on a quarterly basis; 3 main projects accomplished; improved access to electronic resources, expanded, centrally and locally, the number of electronic resources, and are working with faculty members to help make our students more information literate. At this point, we need to review plan and decide on future activities; COLD was interested in having a broader 'buy-in' into the planning process as well as requesting help in identifying how to fulfill the needs of our community.

There are three main themes (handout on the planning themes). Kwon asked for feedback (either at meeting or via email) from faculty for each theme (use of technology goes across all themes): 1) Advancing Student Success – achieve information literacy; 2) Advancing Scholarship – provide a significant contribution and support faculty research needs; 3) Advancing Outreach & Community Service – strengthen partnerships with feeder schools, fundraising – an area in which we need to focus attention. Please let Ms. Kwon know if you have any questions or comments.

Stoper asked what was meant by “creating a system of institutional repositories”; Kwon answered that this was envisioned as a CSU-wide repository, digital and/or print, of faculty work; the committee which will work on this item will provide the scope and intent of the repository. Mashaw asked what the library is doing about providing virtual services; Kwon noted that we are providing links to journals available electronically, as well as other forms/links to other resources (Link+, interlibrary loan, etc.). Schutz commended COLD on the plan.

M/S/ (Schutz/Wilson) moved to commend the work of the Library, COLD, and offer a vote of support. Passed.

9. WASC – Feedback on the Draft Report

Sawyer introduced Gale Young and Carl Bellone who have taken leadership on the project. Bellone reported that they have worked on the project using the guidelines in the WASC Handbook and the report has been accused of white washing too many things or airing too much dirty laundry; the report represents the collective voice of the university; there is a 35 page limit to the report with 52 criteria of reviews and we cannot address all criteria in 35 pages. Developed Campus Outcome Teams (COTs) to help distill campus opinions; ultimately, the report is signed by the President. The report is due 12/15. Young stated that the COT chairs have had a huge responsibility, along with the WASC committee, have had to meld all comments and report changes (committee members and chairs stood up and introduced themselves and their role within the process).

General comments: Perrizo noted that with a majority of transfer students, he wondered about the 10 hours of community service in the freshmen student requirements versus the junior level; Reichman stated that he thought that any notation about community service should be taken out as this has not been discussed and if it is in the WASC report, it will be returned to us as a requirement; he went on to state that the requirements stated for tenure need to be modified; placing all of this in a broader context of scholarship and learning – this might be a part of following WASC guidelines, but it ought to be fundamental part of our mission/goals.

Specific parts: WASC insists that we indicate any changes made to the Spring report (2004); Andrews noted that the WASC response to our that report was that we ought not to be so ambitious; are we keeping a lid on our ambitious goals and how we are centralizing assessment; Bellone replied that we have become more focused; the learning outcomes come from the departments on up. Stempel noted that the conclusions ought to move forward with the request that we need the support to do the assessments. Andrews agreed with this idea and noted that our support budgets have been cut in half. Jones reported that the Black Faculty Association was very disappointed in the report in that it seemed to mute their voice and disregard the views of the faculty of color on campus; the report they provided WASC was not included, i.e. there were two serious racial events last year which illustrated the void on this campus and our inability to respond to such events; it's one thing to claim cultural diversity on campus, it's another thing to incorporate people of color into the work of the university. Reichman noted that it is a challenge on this campus to retain students, and the problem is crystallized on campus in terms of our numbers of graduating students of color. Stempel noted that in the introduction we might want to include the graduation rates so that it would be easy to see the percentage of people of color graduating which might make this issue clearer. Wort commended Jones in bringing these issues to the faculty; he also commended the WASC committee for the work done, but the issues that Jones brought up illustrates the work that we need to do to improve the university; the name change also addresses the issue in that we ought to be proud to represent the areas included in the East Bay. Please send your comments as soon as you can. Paige noted that the WASC team work is good, but the wording of "the comments of staff, primarily those of color" illustrates the issue discussed above and ought to be from the university as a whole.

In Chapter 2, Seitz objected to the language referring to a list of courses that students may take for GE as a "smorgasbord of classes." In addition, Seitz wanted the language removed that stated that the GE assessment effort could "serve as a model for degree programs." Bellone noted that the concluding chapter provides what the university will do to address what we feel needs improvement, and he asked that faculty read the conclusion carefully and send comments soon.

Andrews noted that there is a reference to the compact that seems to be overly optimistic and we might want to modify it; Reichman noted that this sentence ought to be deleted as its' promises of future funding won't take place until after the next WASC review. The institutional portfolio is the collection of web pages to make the work transparent.

Send comments directly to either Carl or Gale. Tontz noted that the programs which have a schedule of outside accreditation to 2007 ought to be included.

## 11. Adjournment

M/S/P (Perrizo/Maxwell) at 3:56p.m.

Respectfully submitted by  
Liz Ginno, secretary.