

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

OFFICE OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as corrected

Minutes of the Final Academic Senate Meeting, Tuesday, June 1, 2010

Members Present: Dee Andrews, Becky Beal, Korey Brunetti, Luz Calvo, Cal Caplan, Chris Chamberlain, Don Choi, Roger Doering, Jennifer Eagan, Lynn Eudey, Kelly Fan, Denise Fleming, Susan Gubernat, Evelia Jiminez, Joanna Lee, Michael Lee, Christopher Lubwama, Mike Mahoney, Monique Manopoulos, James Mitchell, Julia Olkin, Asha Rao, Gretchen Reevy-Manning, Henry Reichman, Michael Schutz, Jeffery Seitz, Aline Soules, David Stronck, Eric Suess, Claudia Uhde-Stone, Dianne Rush Woods, Meiling Wu

Members Absent: O. Bobby Aden, William Alnor, Michelle Collay, Marissa DeHerrera, Rohan Dixit, David Epperson, Toni Fogarty, Melissa Grottkau, Erik Helgren, Linda Ivey, Barbara Jackowski, Joshua Kerr, Derek Kimball, Rita Liberti, Evelyn Lopez-Munoz, Eve Lynch, Bijan Mashaw, Christopher Moreman, Lynn Paringer, Mo Qayoumi, Elaine Shingleton, Jillian Trevisanut, Ellen Veomett

Guests: John Charles, Debby DeAngelis, Rosanne Harris, Jim Houpis, Dave Larson, Sue Opp, Don Sawyer, Sue Schaefer, Jean Simutis, Terri Swartz, Bruce Trumbo Donna Wiley

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:13 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda

M/S/P (Mitchell/Caplan) to approve the agenda as modified, removing #3

2. Approval of the Minutes from the meeting on 5-18-10

M/S/P with one abstention (Chamberlain/Mitchell) to approve the minutes of 5-18-10

4. Reports

a. Report of the Chair

The Chair announced that there will be a special senate meeting on June 8, from 2-4, for faculty discussion of the budget.

Rush Woods encouraged all to attend graduation; stressed how important our presence is to students, some of whom are the first ones in their family to graduate from college. Speakers will include Yuri Kalchiyama and Jack DaCosta. Honorary Degrees were noted (one recipient has a health issue and will be presented at an appropriate future event), as was the schedule for grad ceremonies.

The Chair thanked members of the Academic Senate for their service this year; she offered particular thanks to members of the Executive Committee, who have been extremely busy during a daunting and stressful year. She presented certificates to Mitchell, Lubwama, Kimball, Eagan, Gubernat, Reichman, Caplan, Rao, and Fleming. The body applauded Rush Woods for her service.

b. Report of the President

The Provost reported for the President, who is away this week. He thanked Rush Woods for her service and ExCom members. He also reinforced the encouragement to attend graduation—not a duty, but a pleasure.

c. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

Gubernat reported that she and Reichman will be in Sacramento and Long Beach next week meeting with community college representatives.

d. Report of CFA

Eagan reported for Kim Geron. She invited Senators to a CFA luncheon from noon-1:45, prior to next week's special Senate meeting.

e. Report of Student Government

No report.

5. Sue Schaefer Award Presentation

Sue Schaefer presented the award, given in her honor annually for outstanding service to faculty, to Dr. Bruce Trumbo. She noted his longstanding service to the University (on every committee on campus) and to the National Science Foundation and for his active research. He is a friend, mentor and guiding light. Trumbo thanked Schaefer for her kind words and Russ Merris for helping start the award, Watnik for nominating him, and FAC for selecting him. Trumbo stated that these are especially important times to participate in faculty governance and especially for younger faculty to be involved. He hopes that the award will underscore this.

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

M/S/P with 5 abstentions (Mitchell/Rao) to accept the report

The MPA Program Review was referred back to CAPR for revision, to provide faculty in the program with more opportunity to participate in the five-year review, provide input in preparation of the review, and the opportunity to address unsubstantiated comments by the outside reviewer. There are still some issues that need resolving to achieve accreditation, hopefully within the next 5 years. With a new chair, the elements are in place to help achieve that goal. CAPR recommended the program be approved without modification and that they submit annual reports (as do all programs) to keep CAPR updated on their efforts. CAPR will look carefully at those reports.

It was noted that the program is no longer accredited because the number of faculty is below the minimum threshold for eligibility. However, accreditation may be more of a luxury than a necessity. Schwartz added that the MPA program is no longer subject to NAASPA accreditation guidelines, but will fall under AACSB accreditation protocol, since they are no longer exempt. Reichman added that CAPR should adjust the review schedule, to which Lee noted that both will be reviewed in 2013-14, so it works out. Eagan noted that a case may still be made for exemption from AACSB and Houpis noted that he would get together with Fogarty and Swartz and sort it out. It was noted by the Chair that this was not part of the current action.

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

M/S/P (Mitchell/Chamberlain) to approve the list of courses, as amended

M/S/P (Manopoulos /Olkin) to retain MLL 3130 (considered friendly)

M/S/P (Olkin/Soules) to retain MATH 6210 (considered friendly)

Intro was given by Eagan. Corrections of titles by Schutz:

1001: Intro to Sociology for Science, Technology, & Society

2001: Intro to Sociology, Urban Sociology

List goes out for courses that have not been taught in three years; chairs review for retention and/or banking. Reichman noted that courses cannot be retained indefinitely (only 1 additional year). Opp noted that even if a course is not banked, it can still be revived.

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

M/S/P with one abstention (Fleming/Mitchell) to approve

M/NP (Schutz/not seconded) to send letter to the CSU urging that FERP be extended.

Andrews explained the history of the issue and noted that the lecturer subcommittee strongly supported the addition of lecturers and that there was no controversy with it on FAC. She noted an informational correction: the Bylaws section that would be changed is Article 1 Section 4.

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

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

Andrews gave the introduction. Coaching faculty have been moved to Administration and Finance, but are still covered by the CBA as they are Section 3: Faculty. This complicates evaluation because CBA section 15.2 requires that only tenured faculty and administrators may make recommendations regarding unit 3 faculty; thus, the Athletic Director, who is not unit 3 faculty, cannot make those recommendations. Section 15.23 states that unit 3 coaches (peers) and their supervisors must have input into their evaluations. The revised policy provides that both the coaches and Athletic Director will make evaluations, not recommendations, to the President, who will serve as the chief academic officer in the review. Dave Larsen and coaches were acknowledged for their input and assistance. No other faculty constituency within Academic Affairs requested involvement in evaluation of coaches.

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

M/S/P (Andrews/Mitchell) to approve

Andrews stated that this is the second year of revisions to the RTP process. She acknowledged helpful suggestions from the Office of Faculty Development, as well as who had some Julie Glass and Jane Lopus, who were instrumental in identifying issues. FAC's RTP subcommittee (w/Julie Glass as an ex-officio member) held four extended meetings. Changes include the addition of a section on professional misconduct added into "ethical consideration" as part of a standing category about bias. Part b applies to when a faculty member engages in unprofessional conduct (e.g., plagiarism, etc.). The University P&T committee would determine how serious the alleged misconduct was and whether or not to investigate.

Another change dealt with the process for professional achievement and went through several permutations. Also, revision to the introduction to Section of 4.0 is intended to address discrepancies between our disciplines, which results in some committees being too severe

because they do not understand a discipline. All requirements would be generated by the departments.

M/S/P with 1 abstention (Reichman/Gubernat) to revise the section on guidelines, as noted on Sharepoint, which would delete the College Dean from the process of approving guidelines for professional achievement. “To be considered in the retention, tenure, and promotion process, department guidelines for professional achievement must be approved by a [2/3 super] majority vote of all regular faculty in the department [delete: "and by the College Dean"] [add: ", by the College RTP Committee, and by the University Faculty Affairs Committee"]. Department guidelines, with a dated memorandum recording approval by the department [delete: "and by the College Dean"] [add "and by the University Faculty Affairs Committee"], shall be kept on file in the offices of the College Dean and the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. Department guidelines may not be used retroactively. Any revisions of department guidelines must also be approved by a [add" two-thirds super"] majority vote of the department faculty [delete: "and by the College Dean."][add: ", by the College RTP Committee, and by the University Faculty Affairs Committee."]

Reichman stated that promotion and tenure criteria have always been the purview of the faculty. By leaving it to the department, the policies may diverge such as to not be equivalent, which is where FAC would come into play. They are, however, encouraged to work with the Dean. Gubernat added that oversight should exist, but conducted by faculty.

The Provost agreed that RTP policies are 110% the purview of the faculty and we need to protect this, but the Deans should be part of the oversight process to ensure that departments are using similar standards/criteria.

Reichman argued that the dean has input in the consultation process; however, it would be big mistake to formalize an approval role for the dean because doing so would undermine the faculty’s role as the body that approves the criteria.

Andrews suggested adding ...“for the purpose of maintaining equity.” In response to the Provost’s statement that consultation does not offer a mechanism for reconciliation, Eagan stated that the college RTP committee could serve that function. In response to Seitz’ question regarding whether the deans would have a better understanding than committee chairs that are elected annually, Reichman responded that those we elect to RTP committees are capable and there is no reason to trust a college dean more than the committee; deans also change and are new. This touches on the fundamental principle of shared governance, i.e., that faculty establish RTP criteria. Seitz noted that some departments are so small they are not represented on college RTP committees. Lee inquired who would set bottom benchmarks and how would disagreements be resolved?

Andrews stated that after two years of intensive work with this document, it was a mistake to include the college deans in the approval process on this document and referenced the Trustees Statement on Collegiality, which states that the faculty are in charge of standards and curriculum. The reference to consultation with college deans was for the purposes of departmental equity. All departments are guaranteed representation on the college committee. If there is not a member of a given department on the college committee, then it is up to the department chair to find someone already serving on the committee who will represent them as well.

M/S/withdrawn (Andrews/Gubernat) to add ...“in order to ensure equity among disciplines”

Rao noted that there was more scrutiny from level to level, Department Chair to Dean. Andrews noted that more changes would create confusion and withdrew hers. She added there were more changes to come in the future. Email your concerns to her for next year.

Soules called the question on the original motion.

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

M/S/P (Mitchell/Andrews) to approve

M/S/ (deemed friendly by Andrews) (Caplan/Reichman) amend 2.1 to add “... and the University Library”

12. ACIP Report (Donna Wiley)

Applications to the program remained steady at 12 students. All were accepted, with two going to Taiwan (they had requested Japan). It is a diverse group, with some who are first generation and some who are going back home to study. 20 faculty participated in the interviews. Wiley particularly thanked Sally Murphy for helping students get their GE requirements met and majors checks so that they might participate. She encouraged all faculty to participate next year. A “Learn Spanish in Spain” program is coming, which is exciting. The Fall & Spring Council meetings were cut back to one day each due to budget concerns. Another concern due to budget cuts is the reduction in language classes in the CSU, which makes it more difficult for students to participate in this program. She also suggested that Orientation should include information on the Study Abroad program.

Wiley’s written report is on SharePoint, which senators are encouraged to read.. More information about the program may be found at www.calstate.edu/IP

13. IT update

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.

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. The benefits for students and faculty include saving money and 24/7 access; we will not need to buy software, as it is browser-based. 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 contact IT with requests. Eagan stated that there are many problems with the ticketing system and asked that faculty be involved in ticketing redesign. Charles added that they are working on remote support since there has been a 34% staff reduction. Rao suggested a college-specific contact person or liaison, such as the Library has.

Contrary to rumor, not all labs will be closed; faculty have asked for 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. It was also noted by John Charles that students on wait lists need access to Virtual Labs in the first two weeks.

14. Diversity Plan compliance and an upcoming Campus Climate Survey (Terry Jones)

The chair commended Dr. Jones and his committee for the successful outcome of Diversity Day. The Chair thanked CLASS for their participation and encouraged other colleges to participate.

Jones also thanked all for their participation; it was a big success. He reported on the Diversity Plan, calling it an “enforcement mechanism” and stated that the committee originally wanted a VP for Diversity and Equity to monitor and hold the campus community accountable. The current plan is for the entire university and will require participation of the entire campus. He asked faculty to commit to it.

Jones stated that we were asked by WASC a couple of years ago to conduct a campus climate study; this has not been done.

15. Update on the Special Senate meeting on June 8th

The Chair stated that the meeting will be held from 2-4 p.m. in Sci S143 and will be held regardless of whether or not there is a quorum. There will be no action items; the format will be a faculty-led discussion. The Chair has received approximately thirty questions and found 4 general themes: 1) What’s happening in other campuses? 2) What are the issues/changes around lecturers and the effects of those changes? 3) Budget issues/clarification 4) Values – how do we meet needs and move forward? These 4 themes will serve as a guide to discussions. Sues & Eagan have agreed to facilitate discussions. The Chair encourages all to attend.

Fleming commended the Chair who has done a great job in very difficult times. A certificate, signed by senators was presented to Rush Woods.

Don Sawyer announced that this is the last Senate meeting for Cal Caplan as a regular faculty member and colleague of 44 years.

16. Adjournment

M/S/P (Andrews/ Mitchell) to adjourn

Respectfully submitted,
Denise Fleming, Secretary