Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, April 12, 2011

Members present: Jennifer Eagan, Denise Fleming, Mike Mahoney, Jim Mitchell, Asha Rao, Jeff Seitz, Tammie Simmons-Mosley, Dianne Rush Woods

Members absent: Susan Gubernat, Mo Qayoumi

Guests: Eileen Barrett, Linda Dalton, Kim Geron, Jiansheng Guo, James Houpis, Mark Karplus, Sally Murphy, Sue Opp, Donna Wiley, Rhea Williamson

Preceding the meeting, the Committee met in closed session with the Provost to discuss personnel issues

The meeting was called to order at 2:45

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Rao/Seitz) to approve the agenda as amended to insert item 10a: A2E2 Student Fee Proposal

2. Approval of the minutes of past meeting.

M/S/P (Mitchell/Seitz) Approval of the minutes of 3/1/11, as modified

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

The Chair stated that ExCom will meet with Chancellor Reed regarding the transition plan from 10:30-11:25 on Monday, April 18, in SSA 4600; she urged all members to attend.

On 4/19/11, ExCom will meet in closed session for the annual administrative review

Woods reported that she attended the Council of Senate Chairs last week; there are approximately 8 members that will not be returning as chairs next year. In addition, Woods learned that Northridge is hiring up to 100 tenure-track faculty and Fullerton will be hiring 75; CSUEB is hiring two TT faculty (Social Work). In addition, none of the chairs had a clear sense of how the system would handle a $1B cut; all campuses have plans in place for the $.5B cut.

Woods noted that CSULA and Pomona both recently voted down changing from quarter to semester system, ostensibly because there would be no money for implementation.

Woods announced that there are 12 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activity Funding grants (one 4-unit course of assigned time) available for faculty hired prior to 2008. She thanked administration for responding to faculty demand.

There are two support staff in the Senate Office and both are retiring; the Chair also announced she will not seek another term as Senate Chair.
B. Report of the President

No report; the President is in Long Beach

C. Report of the Provost

The Provost stated that the CSU is facing a revenue problem, not a funding problem. He stressed how important it will be for all to work together to fight the budget battle. Rather than using reserves to compensate for the loss of revenue, these could have been used to improve the quality of education for our students. Most campuses are coping with the $.5B cut, but he questions how the campuses can possibly handle another $.5B cut. He opined that the state needs to fulfill its obligation.

Dalton stated that February target for next year is the only operational one we have (which includes the $.5B cut) and there have been no new announcements. At this point, we are looking at enrollment of 11,300 FTE CA residents and 1,000 non-residents. In addition, we will have a state supported summer. Not certain what will happen if the cut is $1B.

It appears that there will not likely be a June vote to extend the sales tax. If the measure is placed on the ballot in September or November, any resulting funds will not arrive in for this academic year. Further, holding a vote after June will mean that the question will not involve a tax extension, but a vote on a new tax, which would require 2/3 approval.

The Provost stated that Brothwell is completing some calculations, including the proposed fee increase, after which a UPABC meeting will be scheduled. He added that students cannot be un-admitted. We have admitted students for the February target and they need to be served. He noted that the scenarios include a big fee increase or a cut in FTES, which may put Financial Aid at risk for many students.

D. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

The Statewide Academic Senate adopted language related to academic freedom (see “Resolution 7” posted on web). This would change the Statewide Constitution, which will require a special election at each campus.

M/S/P (Mitchell/Mahoney) to accept and to place on Senate agenda for placement on the ballot.

4. Appointments

M/S/P (Seitz/ Mitchell) to approve Mitch Watnik to replace Julia Norton on FAC for SP11
M/S/P (Wood/Eagan) to approve Keith Inman to replace Aline Soules as Senator at large for SP11 (pending confirmation).

5. Approval of the Preliminary Lists for the Spring elections

M/S/P (Mitchell/Mahoney) to approve the Preliminary List of Nominees for Spring 11 Election

6. Approval of the CLASS Dean job description (continued from the last meeting)

M/S/P (Mahoney/Mitchell) to approve as amended at the last meeting and provided on sharepoint (date, online, and number of TT and Lectures)
M/S/P (Mahoney/Fleming) to change the May date for reviewing applications to September 15, 2011

7. 10-11 BEC 9, proposed Constitution/Bylaws changes regarding the Academic Senate and ExCom memberships

M/S/P (Mitchell/Eagan) to place on the Senate
8. **10-11 FAC 3, Visiting Scholar Policy**

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

This would apply to our scholars, not to Fulbright Scholars (which ORSP runs).

9. **ExCom feedback to the Dashboard Working Draft’s indicators and measures**

As the Committee had no immediate comments, Dalton suggested members email or phone her with any feedback. It was also noted that feedback on relevant components from the Standing Committees had been requested as well, but none had discussed it at their meetings. Dalton wanted to know if anything was glaringly absent from the list or inappropriate. The Senate Coordinator will send this out to the standing committee members for email feedback, as it is needed by next week.

10. **Academic Access, Enhancement and Excellence Fee (A2E2) Fee Presentation**

M/S/P (Fleming/Woods) to place on the Senate Agenda as a presentation and additional forum

M/S/P (Mahoney/Eagan) to extend 10 minutes

The Provost stated that in 16 years the state hasn’t increase funds toward increasing the quality of education and in AY 09-10, CSUEB collected a total of $87K in course fees and is “dead last” in the system. In comparison, CSU Chico’s College of Science alone collected $180K. There are department, college, and university fees; the last two are most fluid and adaptable and many of the CSUs have college/university fees.

Each campus independently decides whether and when to put forth a fee proposal to the Chancellor’s Office (CO). The President proposed the idea of A2E2 to the CO and Reed put an April 30th deadline on receiving the full proposal; we are therefore proceeding with some urgency because there is a short window during which the CO is open to consider a CSUEB proposal. The political arena takes over in May and fee proposals are not allowed. Otherwise, we will likely have to wait three years, due to the political climate.

Houpis added that surveys show that significant numbers of CSU students do not buy any books due to costs, so this proposal would ensure they get them and he expects that many factors in the proposal will help retention rates by ensuring access and providing academic enhancement funding. He noted that when touring the campus, equipment was suitable in some areas for preparation for 1910, not the modern workforce. The fees would produce the equivalent of a $5M endowment per year. He also noted that the number of apps being developed for university is astounding, which could be a great help for struggling students to provide individualized instruction in certain academic areas. He noted that the placeholder is important and we would have more time to discuss the merits of aspects of the proposal. He also noted that this is a multicultural campus and we provide less support to our students, which is bothersome.

Opp and Murphy explained that the A2E2 proposal will fund expanded advising, mentoring, tutoring, and other services; new and enhanced educational equipment and supplies in classrooms and laboratories; support for research, creative activities, and civic engagement efforts involving students; electronic evaluations of teaching; support for pedagogical improvements; and East Bay Reply.

There are 3 parts to the fee proposal:

1) A2E2 fund - $120/qtr to be given to Academic Affairs
2) Electronic text adoptions (costs 45% of printed text equivalent) A faculty/student committee would decide on details such as rolling out the e-text component, although actual text adoption (including whether e-texts are a benefit or not) is the purview of the faculty member.
3) Tablet or netbook or notebook (one-time fee) to provide equal technology/equal access for all students (the cost of which would be included in financial aid reimbursement) A faculty/student committee would decide on details such as type of device.
If the fee is approved, E-textbooks will be offered for incoming freshman clusters starting F11 (for General Studies and some cluster/disciplinary and linked courses). eBooks cost about 45% of the price of printed texts, so this will save money, provide equal access, and ensure currency of educational materials. Faculty have been encouraged for quite awhile to consider e-texts or open source materials when possible, and many have done so, but e-texts are not necessarily recommended for majors courses, and students often save them for reference. Academic Affairs will provide professional development and incentives for faculty to help encourage the adoption of e-texts.

If the fee is approved, as early as F11, each first-time freshman would pay a (one-time) fee for a tablet (or notebook), which will likely be bundled with an iClicker and perhaps other perks (such as insurance). This device will function as an e-reader, serving as a uniform platform for web access and classroom activities for home or on-the-go use. The choice of device and the resulting fee will be decided by a student/faculty committee.

By F13, all new undergraduates will pay the notebook/tablet fee; by F14, all students will be required to do so.

Only $8 (or $24 per year) of student fees goes to Academic Affairs at this time, as compared to $129 for athletics, $165 for ASI, and $180 for RAW.

Concerns were raised including increased fees for students that are already struggling financially, transferring the cost of closing the labs to students, increased off-task behavior in class (e.g., surfing the net during class time). Forums for faculty and students are planned.

11. Continued Review and discussion of the Faculty Governance Distribution List for possible modification (current list is provided on Sharepoint)

No time

12. Revision of the Centers and Institutes document (Dobb)

No report

13. Update regarding Faculty Profiles (Dobb)

No report

14. Discussion regarding the Statewide Technology Steering Committee (TSC), and the possibility of a “bold, systemwide initiative in online learning”; and the recent EB visit of the Katz group, which will formulate recommendations to the TSC and Chancellor’s Office

15. Adjournment at 4:20PM

Respectfully submitted,
Denise Fleming, Secretary