

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

OFFICE OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as amended

Minutes of the Academic Senate Meeting, Tuesday, May 30, 2006

Members present: James Ahiakpor, Eileen Barrett, Tom Bickley, David Bowen, Tom Cadwallader, Kevin Callahan, Cal Caplan, Dennis Chester, Jennifer Eagan, Denise Fleming, Karina Garbesi, Susan Gubernat, Mark Karplus, Dawna Komorosky, Eve Lynch, Nan Maxwell, Laura Nelson, Julie Norton, Susan Opp, Chung-Hsing Ouyang, Barbara Paige, Pamela Parlocha, Steve Peng, Robert Phelps, Norma Rees, Hank Reichman, Don Sawyer, Michael Schutz, Jeffery Seitz, Jason Singley, Eirik the Great (Soares), Barbara Storms, Eric Suess, Jay Tontz, Bruce Trumbo, Mitch Watnik, Donna Wiley, Diane Rush Woods, Don Wort, Jin Yan

Members absent: Tom Acord, Linda Beebe, Saurabh Chaudhuri, Jennifer Daniels, Tom Hird, Scott Hopkins, Charlene Jacinto, Bijan Mashaw, Rebecca McCormack, Emily Nye, Tomas Santiago, Shazad Satar, Steve Ugbah,

Guests: Jackie Alnor, Dee Andrews, Nick Baham, Carl Bellone, Bob Brauer, Luz Calvo, Nan Chico, Susan Correia, Kim Huggett, Gretchen Reeve, Alden Reimonenq, Marilyn Silva, Gina Traversa, Vincenzo Traversa, Barry Zepel

Called to order 2:05

1. Approval of the Agenda

M/S/P (Caplan/Wiley) to approve the agenda

2. Approval of the minutes of the meetings of April 25, 2006 and May 16, 2006

M/S/P (Ahiakpor/Maxwell) to approve the minutes of April 25, 2006, as corrected “of” pages, strike “good thing” add comma after “thing” and after “useful”

M/S/P (Caplan/Norton) to approve the minutes of May 16, 2006, as corrected; Caplan added to the Report of the Statewide Academic Senators: Professor Reichman was again elected to the Executive Committee of the Statewide Academic Senate.

Other corrections:

Page 3, Item #12: in second paragraph, strike out the word “there”;

Page 3, Item #14: in first paragraph, change “costs” to “cost”;

Page 4, Item #17: in second paragraph, change “couses” to “courses”; and strike semicolon before the question mark in the next sentence.

Page 5, Item #19-A: correct sentence to read “on May 19 at the Fremont Marriott. . .” and delete gibberish in the right hand margin.

Page 5, Item #19-E: Basu accepted a (not an) New Jersey position.

3. Presentation of the Sue Schaefer Award for 05-06

Sawyer presented the Sue Schaefer Award for 05-06 to Professor Vincenzo Traversa. Traversa was commended for his 36 years of service, during which he served 70 terms on committees. The chair read a commendation and an email from Sue Schaefer.

4. Presentation of the Resolution of Commendation to President Rees

Chair Sawyer presented the Senate Resolution of Commendation to President Rees, which was passed by the Senate at its previous meeting. The Resolution was beautifully framed and presented in honor of her many years of service to CSUEB. The Resolution had requested that President Rees be granted emeritus status, and Provost Kelly presented Rees with that honor as well, in accordance with faculty request.

5. **05-06 CAPR 17**, Five-Year Program Review for Geography and Environmental Studies
M/S/P (Caplan/Soares) to approve CAPR 17

6. **05-06 CAPR 18**, Five-Year Program Review of Art BA and BFA degrees
M/S/P (Tontz/Norton) to approve CAPR 18

7. **05-06 CAPR 19**, Five-Year Program Review for the BS, MS and MATH degree programs in Mathematics
M/S/P (Trumbo/Norton) to approve CAPR 19

8. **05-06 CAPR 20**, Five-Year Program Review for the BS and MS degree programs in Computer Science
M/S/P (Maxwell/Schutz) to approve CAPR 20

9. **05-06 CIC 21**, Upper Division GE application of courses
M/S/P (Schutz/Norton) to approve CIC 21

Watnik stated that KPE-4615 course has more than one prerequisite. Sawyer stated that a course modification form reflects the prerequisites (3330 was dropped). Watnik asked if there is a policy regarding B6. Seitz stated that the policy is one prerequisite that has been approved for LDGE.

10. **05-06 CIC 22**, General Education application of courses
M/S/P (Caplan/Soares) to approve CIC 22

11. **05-06 CIC 23**, General Education application of courses
M/S/P (Schutz/Maxwell) to approve CIC 23

12. **05-06 CIC 24**, Proposed New Option in Genders and Sexualities in Communities of Color
M/S/P (Eagan/Storms) to approve CIC 24

13. **05-06 CIC 25**, Proposed New Minor in Genders and Sexualities in Communities of Color
M/S/P (Maxwell/Norton) to approve CIC 25

14. **05-06 CIC 33**, Faculty Access to Student Use Statistics in Blackboard Courses
M/S/P (Callahan/Trumbo) to approve CIC 33, as modified to ask for Senate approval

Singley asked for some history. Callahan stated that within Blackboard, one can observe statistics, such as at what time students log on, how long they log in for, and what they view; this policy is an attempt to be up-front about it. Trumbo stated that he does not monitor the information because it can be misleading. Students share documents in ways other than Blackboard, so not having logged-in does not mean they haven't read it.

Watnik noted that the document asks for ExCom approval, and it was agreed that the document would be changed to note Senate approval.

15. **05-06 CIC 35, Posting of Curricular Actions**

M/S/P (Caplan/Maxwell) to approve CIC 35

16. **05-06 CIC 36 revised, Request for Senate Approval of All Program Modifications**

M/S/P (Reichman/Caplan) to approve CIC 36, revised as noted

Singley asked if there is a precise definition for what constitutes a substantial modification. Reichman stated that there is not; that is why the decision will be left to the judgment of the AVP for Academic Programs in consultation with the Senate Chair. This process will be easier to use than a formula for determining what constitutes substantial modification. This will also avoid the dangers of either too much or not enough review. ExCom's proposed revision is a compromise, in order to prevent overwhelming CIC and the Senate with every modification. Norton stated that consultation has been a big concern. Garbesi asked if the Senate Chair would have to see every modification, even the small ones; this could create a big load. Sawyer stated that the trigger is the AVP; thus, it would not be burdensome to the Chair.

17. **05-06 FAC 8, Range Elevation**

M/S/P (Barrett/Caplan) to approve FAC 8, as amended

FAC Chair Barrett stated that the document reflects two years of work, including regular consultation with Deans and Department Chairs. A Subcommittee on Lecturers was convened, which gave an opportunity for thorough discussions. Issues included three major points:

- 1) general criteria to include exemplary instructional achievement and currency;
- 2) clarified criteria for specific ranges;
- 3) inclusion of applicants' right to review files and to request reconsideration at all levels.

Barrett added that evaluation of lecturers should not be based on materials outside their work assignment as many do not have time to conduct work outside of work time. There is no intent to hold anyone to a standard that is higher than that for tenure track faculty. There was one area of disagreement, i.e., that the Ph.D. be required at range level C or D.

Caplan noted that this has been scrutinized by all interested parties in the University. Creating a document of this import is difficult and Caplan urged that the document not be rewritten on the floor of the Senate; if the document has weaknesses, the issues should be referred to FAC next year. He also noted that there are important changes and advantages that make it superior to the previous document.

Norton stated that it is great that lecturers can contest a decision. Her concern is with "currency" and how that will be measured. Norton does not want research to be excluded and suggested that the issue of "currency" and grants/research for lecturers be referred to FAC next year.

Karplus distributed a copy of FAC 8, with suggestions for revision of the document. He stated that half of lecturers who applied for range elevation have been denied. and that currently CSUEB is the most stringent in the CSU.

M/S/P (Karplus/Garbesi) with several nos and one abstention to delete the second sentence under Eligibility [In the case of elevation to Range C or above, lecturers also must have completed the appropriate terminal degree for the discipline], and under #4. Range C to restore "or have specialized professional expertise or experience," pasting it after the words "terminal degree."

Discussion ensued regarding whether or not lecturers should be required to have terminal degrees in order to be in the C or D salary range. The following points were brought up:

- Is it fair to require lecturers to spend a long time to get a terminal degree?

- This is a challenging problem due to the difference in what constitutes the terminal degree across programs.
- Should those who do not possess the terminal degree be moved across the range elevation when they are not as “academically qualified” as others?
- That C and D are approximately the equivalent of associate and full professor so it would be problematic to promote without a terminal degree; they do not have to fulfill the research requirements.
- Unlike at a community college, lecturers at CEUEB in many departments are not limited to teaching lower division courses; some teach upper division and grad courses; lecturers who teach upper division should have the Ph.D. Part of what students pay for is the qualification of the faculty who are teaching.
- It is troubling to see a dilution of standards as if we are in competition with community colleges for lecturers. It would be better to offer salaries that are competitive.

Caplan to call the question: passed with one no vote

M/S/NP (Reichman/Norton) to remove “exemplary” everywhere it appears, which was modified to remove “exemplary” in sections 2a – 2i and delete “and must demonstrate exemplary job performance” wherever it appears.

Discussion of the use of the word “exemplary” throughout the document:

- There is no definition or explanation of what is to be exemplary; the language is unclear.
- It makes sense to remove exemplary; however, there are some sentences that will need rewriting.
- “exemplary” can be added to the list of issues to be settled in a later FAC referral.

Singley called for question; not passed.

Further Discussion:

- The problem is on p. 3; when “exemplary” is removed, then there is no difference between range A and B. C is not much clearer.
- “Exemplary” was intended to inspire excellence and may be helpful in evaluating teaching, especially in remedial classes.
- Satisfactory performance is really what needs to be communicated.
- We would rehire anyone doing a competent job; striving for excellence will allow for range elevation/promotion.
- Rather than trying to make massive changes to a document, it should be sent back to the committee to consider.
- We have managed to make judgments about colleagues in the PTR process with language that demonstrates that one meets expectations without using the word “exemplary.”

M/S/NP: Nelson/Watnik: to amend the motion to use “satisfactory” instead of “exemplary”

Opp offered a friendly amendment to substitute “must demonstrate instructional achievement” for “exemplary.” Barrett responded that the friendly amendment doesn’t help since it is part of the general criteria.

Voted to end debate.

Sawyer called for the vote on the amendment [regarding “exemplary”]: not passed, 14 yes, 21 no.

Tontz called for main motion vote. Sawyer reminded the group that this vote was to approve the document *with* the terminal degree amendment which was proposed by Garbesi: passed

18. **05-06 COBRA 4, ADA Compliance and the Cost of Late Textbook Adoptions**

M/S/P (Wort/Norton) to approve COBRA 4

19. **05-06 BEC 8**, Revised Discrimination Grievance Procedures (Fairness Document)

M/S/P (Maxwell/Callahan) to approve BEC 8

Reichman noted that ExCom removed section 3c because it promotes rumor-mongering. Suggests removing entire section 3.

M/S/ (Reichman/ Caplan) To remove 3a-3e MOTION WITHDRAWN

20. Recognition of Standing Chairs, 05-06

Sawyer recognized each of the Standing Chairs for 05-06 and the major accomplishments of each Standing Committee and presented the Chairs with a gift of appreciation for their hard work. President Rees added her praise regarding the marvelous job COBRA has done; absolutely outstanding.

21. Reports

A. Report of the Chair – No report

B. Report of the President

-There will be three commencement ceremonies this year: June 3rd at the Concord Campus (this will be the first commencement on that campus), June 8 for masters degrees, and June 10 for baccalaureates.

-Rees stated that 35 tenure track offers have been accepted, 2 offers are outstanding and 9 searches are still in progress. This represents a lot of work on the part of the faculty.

-On June 23, there will be a memorial service for Ellis McCune in the Theater from 10-12; invitations will be sent to all faculty.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators- No report

D. CFA-No report

E. ASI-No report

22. Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,
Denise Fleming, Secretary