

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

OFFICE OF THE  
ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as corrected

Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting, Tuesday, April 25, 2006

Members present: Tom Acord, James Ahiakpor, Eileen Barrett, Tom Bickley, Kevin Callahan, Cal Caplan, Dennis Chester, Denise Fleming, Karina Garbesi, Susan Gubernat, Tom Hird, Mark Karplus, Dawna Komorosky, Eve Lynch, Nan Maxwell, Laura Nelson, Julie Norton, Emily Nye, Susan Opp, Chung-Hsing Ouyang, Barbara Paige, Pamela Parlocha, Steve Peng, Robert Phelps, Hank Reichman, Don Sawyer, Michael Schutz, Jeffery Seitz, Jason Singley, Eric Soares, Eric Suess, Jay Tontz, Bruce Trumbo, Steve Ugbah, Mitch Watnik, Donna Wiley, Don Wort

Members absent: Linda Beebe, David Bowen, Tom Cadwallader, Saurabh Chaudhuri, Jennifer Daniels, Jennifer Eagan, Scott Hopkins, Charlene Jacinto, Bijan Mashaw, Rebecca McCormack, Norma Rees, Tomas Santiago, Shazad Satar, Barbara Storms, Diane Rush Woods, Jin Yan

Guests: Carl Bellone, R.H. Good, Angela Laijan, Valerie Helgren Lempesis, Michael Leung, Arthurlene Towner, James Kelly, Jim Zarillo

Meeting called to order at 2:07 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda

M/S/P (Norton/Garbesi) to approve the agenda, as amended

M/S/P (Karplus/Schutz) to add an agenda item "amendment to the Constitution and Bylaws to increase the number of lecturers on the Senate from 2 to 5." This received 2/3 vote, and the chair added it as item #14.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of March 7, 2006

M/S/P (Caplan/Maxwell) to approve the minutes of the meeting of March 7, 2006, as corrected

3. **05-06 CIC 14**, Proposed New Certificate in Spanish for the Professions

M/S/P (Hird/Tontz) to approve 05-06 CIC 14.

4. **05-06 CIC 17**, Proposed New Minor in Early Childhood Education

M/S/P (Caplan/Maxwell) to approve 05-06 CIC 17

5. **05-06 CAPR 5**, New BA in Biochemistry/ **05-06 CIC 13**, Proposed New BA Degree in Biochemistry

M/S/P (Soares/Caplan) to approve 05-06 CAPR 5 and 05-06 CIC 3

6. **05-06 CAPR 12**, New MS Degree in Biostatistics, **05-06 CIC 20**, Proposed New MS Degree in Biostatistics

M/S/P (Schutz/Callahan) to approve 05-06 CAPR 12 and 05-06 CIC 20

7. **05-06 CIC 19**, Proposed New Minor in Biostatistics

M/S/P (Caplan/Schutz) to approve 05-06 CIC 19

8. **05-06 CAPR 13**, Proposed name change for the Department of Statistics

M/S/P (Norton/Schutz) to approve 05-06 CAPR 13

9. **05-06 CAPR 7 revised**, Five-Year Program Review for the BA Spanish and French, as amended by **05-06 BEC 5**

M/S/P (Norton/Wort) to approve 05-06 CAPR 7 revised, as amended by 05-06 BEC 5

10. **05-06 CAPR 10**, Five-Year Program Review for the BS and BA degree programs in Physics

M/S/P (Callahan/Opp) to approve 05-06 CAPR 10

11. **05-06 CAPR 11**, Five-Year Program Review for the BS degree in Speech Pathology and Audiology, and a Master of Science degree in Speech-Language Pathology

M/S/P (Soares/Maxwell) to approve 05-06 CAPR 11

In reference to sentence in second paragraph of background information that reads: "The CSD is educating more students in an efficient and effective manner as evidenced by an FTES of 130.9 and a SFR of 29.5." Reichman questioned the logic that an increase in students would necessarily equate to students being taught more effectively and efficiently. He suggested that we avoid these kinds of judgments.

12. **05-06 CAPR 8 revised**, Formation, Dissolution, Merger, or Name change of Academic Units

M/S/P (Maxwell/Norton) to approve 05-06 CAPR 8 revised

Seitz expressed concern about the amount of work that CAPR is doing and the amount of paperwork that would be required for a formation, dissolution, merger, or name change. Norton stated that this does not usually amount to more than a couple of pages, although the more extensive the change, the more they may want to submit to make their argument. Reichman added that such work is part of the price that we pay for shared governance. In addition, such policies and methods for implementing policies are a necessary means to ensure fair consideration of changes. Acord asked if the Chancellor's Office needs to approve such changes as administrative structures. Reichman stated that only programs and buildings need to be approved by the CO.

13. **05-06 CAPR 9**, Evaluation & Planning document

M/S/P (Caplan/Norton) to approve 05-06 CAPR 9, Evaluation & Planning document

Maxwell acknowledged the amount of work that CAPR put into this document, but will vote against the document because it does not adequately address the nature and needs of the College of Business and Economics. Maxwell also stated that reinstating annual reports is a lot of work for both CAPR and faculty; further, learning outcomes do not change every year, so why should there be a report every year? Opp stated that in terms of student outcomes, it is not necessary to assess every student in every program every year.

Norton stated that the piece on assessment does not constitute extra work. The information is required in Science, possibly most colleges. The annual report is brief. CAPR has reviewed more than 20 programs this year because many departments have postponed their programs one or two years, many due to new chairs. By having the one-page report each year, chairs and others who write reports will have access to the annual reports, providing important background material as they craft their program reviews.

Seitz opposes due the CBE concerns; university-wide reporting requirements and policies should fit all colleges. Accord questioned the role of the Dean in the reporting process, particularly in light of the number of reports in CLASS. Norton stated that involvement of the Dean closes the communication loop; the Dean will be part of the dialog and monitoring of CAPR recommendations. Reichman will vote for the motion; as an outside reviewer at other institutions, he has been impressed with the detail and rigor of reviews and the responsible involvement of administrators in reviewing programs and believes that this document integrates the processes better. Reichman stated that he believes this applies to the CBE, as we review programs, not departments and that the annual report does not create an onerous burden; would support a limitation on the number of pages in the report; the annual report will be useful to the department chair and during the five year review process. It is a step forward.

Hird stated that he has been involved in multiple program reviews and that the easiest one to conduct was one where there were annual reports to rely on for background information. Hird added that involvement of the Deans is a good thing, practical and useful, as they will be able to provide input into how goals can be met and the types of support and resources they can provide. In the past nothing happened after a review. Also, the refinement of the document and the process is written into the document, which states that CAPR will review this process in a couple of years and will refine as needed.

Soares stated that there is nothing to stop programs or departments from writing reports, if needed; views the reports as “make work” that will be put aside. Caplan stated that CEAS has been writing reports for the past 15 years without any undue burden; the reports give a written history and help programs hone arguments for resources and will fuel needed changes. In addition, the reports will help prepare for accreditation and keep the accreditation ethos alive in non-accreditation years. Garbesi stated that it would be unfortunate to lose the amount of work that CAPR has done; the dividing issue appears to be the annual reports. Thus, it may be helpful to divide the motion into two parts, considering the annual reports in a separate motion. Schutz thought we should try this new process; that it can be reevaluated in the next year or two. Acord stated that the CAPR policy is 19 pages long and appears to be more work. Norton stated that the only new piece is the one page annual report; many existing documents were brought together in this document.

M/S/P (Tontz/Garbesi) to divide the motion to consider the document in two parts, first voting on sections 1 and 3, then section 2.

Sections 1 and 3 passed.

Section 2 passed with 17 for, 16 opposed

Trumbo stated that those who oppose number 2 have not addressed what a new chair would do who is not familiar with the history of the department.

Singley supports the document because he believes that all departments should be up to par and that there is probably a need for this type of accountability in some departments; in addition, the amount of work is minimal and will yield benefits.

14. M/S/P(Karplus/Schutz) to submit to the University Faculty an amendment to the Constitution and Bylaws to increase the number of lecturers on the Senate from 2 to 5.

Singley questioned how the number of lecturer representatives should be determined

and believes that this merits a longer discussion.

M/S/P (Trumbo/Caplan) to refer this to FAC to be addressed as a first order of business, to facilitate a faculty election by the end of the fall quarter.

Karplus would like to see a vote at this meeting, but in the event that there are not adequate votes, he would support a strong referral to FAC. Trumbo was supportive of a referral to FAC, but not one that mandated a particular outcome. Reichman supports increasing the number of lecturer representatives on the senate and echoed Trumbo's reluctance to mandate an outcome; and noted that giving FAC a year would stonewall the issue; would prefer giving them until end of the Fall quarter early enough so we could have a faculty vote by end of Fall quarter.

Caplan favors referral to FAC so that the faculty review process is not bypassed, particularly in light of a potential change in the Constitution. Caplan recommended against imposing a time constraint on FAC in the interest of a thorough investigation and exploration of the issues. Schutz agreed that FAC should not be instructed, but suggested perhaps there should be a straw vote to show that the Senate takes this issue seriously. Wort stated that the referral from the Senate Chair will convey the urgency and importance of the issue and that we need a full and fair discussion and we need to give the committee a chance to do their job. Karplus added that he would like to see the issue come to the faculty by the end of Fall 2006.

Garbesi supports the proposal as written; she would like to hear some more about the history of the issue since it is her understanding that FAC has not addressed this for more than a year. Sawyer stated that the history of the issue has not been investigated and apologized for the delay.

Tontz supports a referral to FAC and wonders if staff representation should also be called into question. Reichman stated that the Academic Senate is established as the voice of the faculty; its voice is to be supplemented by other voices. While lecturers are faculty, staff and students are not. This motion comes as a result of a significant increase in lecturers in the last 15 years. Schutz requested that the minutes reflect that all who spoke were in favor of an increase in the number of lecturer representatives.

#### 14. Reports

##### A. Report of the Chair

- The Chair reported that he participated in Welcome Day for student visitors on Saturday and commended Enrollment and Student Services on their job preparing for the day. The Chair encouraged faculty to take enrollment and recruiting seriously and see it as every faculty member's business. At Welcome Day, Sawyer heard from several potential students and families that the faculty phone calls had a profound impact on them. Enrollment is the number one issue for all of us. Do what you can to help.
- Announcements include a reception for Julie Glass on April 26, in LI 2300; the largest job fair in CSUEB's history on April 27 in the Gymnasium, and the third presentation in the Jewish culture and History Series on May 3 in the University Theatre. May 8 is the beginning of the Presidential Candidate visits with an open forum and reception to follow. Please attend; your input and feedback is critical to the committee.

##### B. Report of the President

- Provost Kelly reported on the tenure track search; as of April 24<sup>th</sup>, 24 offers have

been accepted, 10 offers have been declined, and 7 offers are still pending. The Provost thanked the faculty for their diligent work. Kelly referred to an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education of an upcoming conference in Oakland. Hayward has pulled back its funding for the Zucchini Festival; CSUEB is a leading sponsor and has 100 tickets to the festival.

#### C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

- Caplan reported that the Statewide Academic Senate is optimistic about the new Vice Chancellor who appears to be a faculty advocate; both the Vice Chancellor and Chancellor Reed indicated that there may be an increase in allocations; change in graduate differential, which will result in an increase in funds for the university. There is good news about the results of the Early Assessment Program, which is promising for juniors. Resolutions and draft minutes have been distributed.
- Reichman thanked the body for its vote on the CSU Constitution revision and support of the reduction in Statewide Academic Senators.

#### D. Report of CFA

- Reichman reported for Tom McCoy. CFA and CSU have reached an agreement about contractual agreements during the summer; low enrolled classes may result in a slight reduction in faculty salary, which faculty can refuse to teach. Negotiations on salary continue; Barnes, the designated mediator, has been helpful during facilitated discussion on salary, workload, and Appointment Article 12, as part of SB 1212. There are three salary problems: all faculty are underpaid as represented by the CPEC gap, CSU faculty are paid at a lower rate than community college faculty, and salary compression is at approximately 25-30% below CPEC levels. In addition, salary inversion is resulting in new hires being paid more than faculty who were hired 2-3 years prior.
- CFA has a comprehensive proposal on the table. The Assembly passed a resolution with several principles: reduce CPEC gap; guarantee step increases for faculty; correct inversion and compression problems; remove the salary cap at each level; provide a fair salary increase for each year of the contract. Discussions have been helpful in clarifying issues. CFA's main strengths come from mobilizing faculty; the next demonstration is on May 3, when CFA will hold a demonstration outside offices of Business Roundtable Offices in Sacramento and Trustee Bill Hauk.

#### E. Report of Student Government

- No report

#### 15. Adjournment

M/S/P (Maxwell/Accord) to adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 3:47 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Denise Fleming, Secretary