Minutes of the Final Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, May 25, 2010


Members absent: Cal Caplan, Derek Kimball

Guests: Dee Andrews, John Charles, Linda Dalton, Debby DeAngelis, Linda Dobb, Toni Fogarty, Kim Geron, Jim Houpis, Mark Karplus, David Larson, Michael Lee, Mike Mahoney, Susan Opp, Glen Perry, Carol Reese, Gretchen Reevy, Don Sawyer, Gale Young

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Fleming/Gubernat) to approve the agenda as amended to move item #9 to item #6

2. Approval of the minutes

M/S/P with one abstention (Gubernat/Mitchell) to approve the minutes of 1-19-2010
M/S/P (Fleming/Gubernat) to approve the minutes of 4-20-2010
M/S/P (Reichman/Lubwama) to approve the minutes of 4-27-10
M/S/P with two abstentions (Gubernat/Lubwama) to approve the minutes of 5-11-2010

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

The Chair thanked the committee for their hard work and support during what has been a difficult year. Rush-Woods attended a virtual Academic Senate Chairs meeting and believes we are holding together well compared with some.

The Chair announced that Dr. Jeff Seitz was selected to receive the Outstanding Professor of the Year Award; Bruce Trumbo received the Sue Schaefer Faculty Service Award. We are proud of them!

Rush-Woods asked that the Committee show our support for students by attending graduation.

There will be a special Senate meeting on June 8th, which will be discussed later in the meeting; faculty who have additional questions should send them in as soon as possible.

B. Report of the President

The President thanked those individuals and departments that participated in Diversity Day; it
was a lot of work, but all enjoyed the camaraderie and the opportunity to see the accomplishments of colleagues.

Qayoumi reported that yesterday, May 24th, was CSU Lobby day in Sacramento. All those present recognized that the economy is poor and budget difficulties have devastated human services. Participants were sympathetic to the financial plight of higher education and there are efforts to determine if some revenue enhancement, e.g., extend sales tax and vehicle license tax, might be a possibility. If the CSU receives $366M or part of the $305M, this will be very helpful to campuses as it would result in an additional 29,000 students being served, a message to which all related very well. Unions and individuals have brought the message to Sacramento and the President believes there is increased empathy for IHEs.

The President also reported on continuing projects, including the online campus and STEM. We are working with CISCO and the California Consortium of Science and Technology. Cal Tech will give a virtual campus presentation.

In response to Rao’s question regarding the upcoming gubernatorial election, Qayoumi stated that he attended the Posner and Whitman debate and IHEs were not mentioned once; the focus was on immigration and carrying handguns was mentioned. He added that we are helping TechNet, a consortium of Silicon Valley Companies, to put together the higher ed section of an agenda the consortium plans to send to the governor. After the primaries, we should all play a critical role in bringing the message to the candidates about the importance of IHE.

There was discussion about the position announcement for the Student Health & Counseling Services Director (formerly held by Kathy Coleman who has a doctoral degree); Eagan and others shared their concerns about the education requirement has been lowered to a Bachelor’s degree and 3 years experience, particularly for the head of a student counseling service which would supervise MDs. Qayoumi stated that the job is not part of the Senate approval process. Sawyer added that HMOs often employ hospital administrators with a background in business and noted that these requirements fall within the pattern of the field. He suggested that a report on the hiring practices be shared with ExCom to make sure that this question is adequately addressed.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

No report

4. Appointments

Mitchell/Eagan will review the appointments noted in the Senate Office document for the 2010-2011 Committees. It was noted that CCAC, among others, prefer Spring appointments so they can begin meeting earlier in the year. Reichman offered that some appointments could be made via email. Woods stated that we would move on and not make appointments at this time.

5. Online Campus Coordinator – appointment of search committee

M/S/P (Fleming/Gubernat) to appoint Jim Mitchell, Dianne Woods, and Gary McBride to the search committee.

Only three colleges sent names of nominees (need a member from COS) and the Library reported that no tenured members were willing to serve on the committee, so they provided an
untenured name, which was unacceptable to ExCom. The Library may forfeit their representation, but Science needs to find a rep. It was noted that this is an important position, as the campus will put a lot of energy/resources/prestige into online education. Houpis suggested that we ask Leung for assistance, as he knows who is working over the summer. Woods noted that she would contact Leung and provide a name for ExCom approval.

9. 09-10 FAC 9, Policy for the Appointment, Placement and Evaluation of Coaches

M/S/P (Rao/Fleming) to place on the Senate agenda

Dee Andrews, Chair of FAC, gave the intro. This is a more fleshed out policy than the previous one, but not fundamentally different. Key problem was conformity to the CBA, which Caplan brought to FAC’s attention. Under 15.2, “Only tenured faculty unit employees and academic administrators may engage in deliberations and make recommendations to the President regarding the evaluation of a faculty unit employee”. 15.23 and 15.24 state that “such evaluations shall include student evaluations of teaching performance for those with teaching duties, evaluations by appropriate administrators and/or department chair, and an opportunity for peer input.” The original document has the term “recommendation,” which has been changed to “evaluation” throughout. A recent arbitration agreement has just confirmed that this is the correct way to proceed. Consulted other policies around the CSU, many are unclear and will need to be made clearer. Consulted with KIN, no constituencies in Academic Affairs believe they are qualified to evaluate coaches, so this is a fair solution since coaches are faculty.

6. 09-10 CAPR 18, Program Review for MPA

M/S/P with one abstention (Fleming/Lubwama) to place on the Senate agenda

This document was previously sent back to CAPR to be amended because it lacked adequate faculty involvement; this has been addressed this year by allowing Chair Fogarty and the department to provide input, correct statistics, and make recommendations. The summary was written by the Program Chair, which is part of the new policy. The program, faculty and CAPR were pleased with the new review.

In response to Reichman’s question regarding why there is no stipulation that the program be reviewed since they are modifying in preparation for accreditation (and will likely make further modifications), Lee stated that the department will be submitting annual reports and the CAPR chair will review the reports, so there is adequate oversight. Fogarty added that all programs are evolving and undergoing evaluation and modifications, so such a requirement would be repetitive. The department does not know when they will be going up for accreditation since they are now down two faculty and, thus, do not have enough faculty to meet accreditation requirements. They can be considered yearly, but resources/faculty must be in place to meet the guidelines. Lee opined that it is not CAPR’s expertise or intent to serve as an accreditation review body; Fogarty has indicated a willingness to submit annual review and stay in contact with CAPR.

7. 09-10 CIC 33, Retention of Infrequently Offered Courses Not Taught for Three Years

M/S/P (Mitchell/Fleming) to place on the Senate agenda
ExCom noted that the list seemed longer this year and that it is important to do this to keep the catalog current.

8. 09-10 FAC 5revised, Modifications to the Emeritus Policy, incl Lecturers

M/S/P (Mitchell/Eagan) to place on the Senate agenda

Andrews gave the introduction and believes significant improvement has been made. This policy is separate from FERP and pre-retirement policies as it only reviews the emeritus faculty policy. Emeritus policies from around the country were reviewed; the average time in service for awarding emeritus status was about 10 years, so FAC lowered ours from 12 to 10 years. It was noted that the role of Emeritus faculty on our campus has been increasing; emeriti are particularly active in assisting with advancement of the university. There are also many more benefits to encourage attachment to the university. There were questions to FAC about lecturer eligibility and if emeritus status could be withdrawn. The Lecturer Subcommittee was strongly in favor of emeritus status; this has been increasingly common throughout the CSU, with some cases automatic, and some cases requiring an application. The Provost’s Office determined that full-time is 450 units (10 years at fulltime). President can withdraw emeritus status for cause.

Since eligibility of lecturers and the required years of service will be changed to 10 years, Reichman noted that the Bylaws must be changed to retroactively align with the date the Senate approves the emeritus policy changes. Andrews noted that consideration of the “applying” issue would be done later, and agreed with Woods that 4-5 years would be reasonable. Reichman stated that it would be an insult to faculty to apply, rather than an understanding that they have earned it. Gubernat noted that the largest scholarship came from an emeritus annuity and agreed that they are an important constituency.

10. 09-10 FAC 10 Revisions/Clarifications for RTP

M/S/P (Fleming/Gubernat)

Intro by Andrews. This is the second round of revisions to improve and update our RTP process. The most significant changes were made last year and some glitches were observed and reported. The RTP subcommittee held four meetings to consider proposed changes. There are no structural changes in this document. There is still no word on how to review faculty with joint appointments (there is a disparity with the CBA and campus policy) and the role of the University during the rebuttal period at the final level of review. FAC will consider those next Fall.

Discussion ensued regarding procedure when accusations of misconduct have been brought against a candidate, e.g., plagiarism, as there is no place in the policy where this is addressed. This might be paralleled with the case of bias, where the candidate has a grievance. Andrews noted a concern of that being missing, as it is a complex legal issue, but only professional misconduct was addressed, which parallels the “bias” issue.

Reichman commended the committee for a thorough job. He asked that the proposed process for the department guidelines for professional achievement to be determined “in consultation” with the dean, rather than approval. In that case, a dean would have the say in something that historically has been the exclusive province of the faculty; creating the standards is a faculty purview.
There was discussion regarding whether or not this document should go to the University P&T committee for review; the problem is an introduction of administrator approval into the standards. Andrews stated that such a review would not be suitable for the University P&T committee as it is too small; a college-level committee would be better suited for this purpose.

The Provost stated that the role of faculty is to establish standards and criteria. The role of the dean is to show that similar disciplines have similar standards and similar criteria. Could be grievable if the criteria are vastly different.

Eagan stated this points to a problem with departmental guidelines. What happens when faculty and the dean have vastly different notions of the criteria? Who would mediate? Lubwama added that the department must be consistent and congruent with university level criteria. Reichman stated that there still needs to be a faculty body to oversee this. He will take the responsibility to investigate and make a recommendation for new language to the Senate. Woods noted that these criteria should be similar across the university, as SW is close to EPSY (for example). Andrews offered to look at other campus policies. Rao commended the committee, as it was a long process.

Houpis stated that at Chico, deans did have role of approving. The dean brought all disciplines together to find what was of similar value and criteria and make sure those are included. He mentioned the 7 Habits of effective educators/Boyers model of scholarship. The deans led the discussions.

11. 09-10 FAC 11, Professional Leave Policy revisions

M/S/P (Fleming/Gubernat) to place on the Senate agenda

12. IT Update (Holly Fowler)

Holly Fowler, who replaced Rachel Clemmons as the Director of Communications and Service Coordination on campus, provided an update on campus IT status.

*NetID Password Policy Change:* passwords will expire every 120 days. Passwords must be a minimum of 6 characters long; cannot use the last three passwords, NETID, or the first or last name as a password. A Communiqué will be sent out in early June with a reminder one week later; she hopes all can change their password before leaving for the summer.

*Service Catalog Overview:* IT now presents all of their services in a user-friendly format with descriptions and expectation for services. The catalog will be successful only if employees can understand what is available and are able to use the service. Services are divided by audience: faculty, staff, and students. Services are categorized with detailed information, and employ the use of icons to drill down. The first round of feedback has been positive. Next step will be to populate all of the content for the services, making sure icons are there and all is linked to a ticketing system. They are hoping to go live by July 30; go live in static format Aug 12th.

*Virtual Computer Lab (VCL) Overview:* a synergy project we have been working on with Northridge; SFSU is working with CSU Fullerton. So far, 22 faculty from all colleges have faculty members participating in a pilot. Virtual Computer Labs are a remote service, similar to VPN; you may reserve a computer with certain software for yourself or for a whole class. The benefit for the university is saving money; for students and faculty benefits include 24/7 access from anywhere and more software availability. We will not need to buy software, as it is browser-based, and using old computers will still work. We can add new software. All labs will
have the same software; this provides more processing power and increases opportunities for grants. It is possible to pilot a project during the summer.

Discussion ensued regarding limited access and a limited number of licenses for software; faculty need to sign up for computer time. Eagan stated that there are many problems with the ticketing system and asked that faculty be involved in ticketing redesign. She noted that no one is there to open tickets on Sundays. Charles added that they are working on remote support to fix computer issues, since there has been a 34% staff reduction. Rao suggested a college-specific contact person or liaison, such as the Library has. This will be brought to FSSAC tomorrow.

Contrary to rumor, not all labs will be closed; many small labs are closing but faculty want the larger computing labs. The VCL project allows us to rethink what is needed for labs as we move forward and provide this information to Academic Affairs. The software will be on the server rather than only in 1 room and there are no restrictions for software availability.

13. Discussion to address the petition for a Special Senate meeting regarding the budget

Rush-Woods reported that the President and Provost will not attend the special meeting, which will be a faculty led discussion. She has been working with the Provost to obtain answers to questions, which have been partitioned into four categories: budget, vision (what does the Senate want going forward), impact of the loss of lecturers, and comparison of our status with other campuses. Faculty will lead discussion of each category: Eric Suess (budget), Eagan (vision and values), Rush-Woods (comparison of CSUEB with other campuses). Rush-Woods plans to contact Reevy to see if she will lead the discussion lecturers. Woods will contact the chairs of other senates. Notes will be takes at the meeting, but not “minutes.” A quorum is not needed, as it is a special session and no decisions will be made.

14. Adjournment

M/S/P (Fleming/Mitchell) to adjourn at 4:02

Respectfully submitted,
Denise Fleming, Secretary