Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 18, 2011

Members present: Nick Baham, Denise Fleming, Sharon Green, Susan Gubernat, Mike Mahoney, Sally Murphy, Gretchen Reevy-Manning, Jeff Seitz, Mitch Watnik, Dianne Rush Woods

Members absent: Leroy Morishita

Guests: Linda Dalton, Linda Dobb, Phil Duren, Jennifer Eagen, Stan Hebert, Mark Karplus, Rita Liberti, Penny McCullough, Gigi Nordquist, Julie Olkin, Sue Opp, Glen Perry, Carol Reese, Don Sawyer

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 p.m.

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Fleming/Woods) to approve the agenda as modified to add item “6.5 Discussion of Centers”

2. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

Both the President and Provost are out of town.

The Chair discussed transparency in ExCom processes; he and Donnelly are working to distribute e-agendas with pdf links so that related agenda items are immediately accessible via the agenda. This allows those who do not have access to SharePoint to retrieve relevant agenda item documents more quickly. Discussion took place about whether or not to use SharePoint in tandem with the agenda, only as an archive, to include the agenda with PDF links, or not at all.

The Chair is delighted that people are attending the President’s “Listening Sessions”; 10-15 faculty and staff were at each of the two sessions he attended. Sharon Green is facilitating the sessions. The President is avid listener and communicates with his audience. When asked what the best thing about the campus is, the answer is consistently “the people.”
The dedication of the fuel cell facility on campus was well attended. It should produce enough energy to run about 1400 homes and save the campus $160,000 a year in heating energy costs.

The Chair presented a chart of tenure-track statistics for the last several years. This year (AY11-12), there are 298 tenure track faculty (this includes nine tenure track librarians). In ’08-09, there were a total of 360 TT faculty, so the campus has lost 62 TT positions in the ensuing years.

Mahoney announced that CIC action on SB 1440 (relative to the nine options the CO has in place) will be on ExCom’s 10/25 agenda.

The Chair announced that the IT Advisory Ad Hoc committee has met twice with IT consultant, Jon Rood, former CIO at SFSU, and Don Sawyer, our Interim Administrator in Charge of Informational Technologies. Items discussed included increasing the number of computer labs, the perceived anti-Mac policy, printing in libraries and elsewhere, Cascade (content management system (CMS) for CSUEB’s websites), Blackboard failures during tests, inconsistent journal article downloads processes, who the “go to” staff are for problems, VBT 124 microphone issues, the need for short training videos and a user experience designer, and a catastrophic data loss policy (to address data loss such as the one we experienced SP11). Murphy suggested that the committee also examine the issue of students having access to sensitive information on staff/faculty computers.

B. Report of the President

Not in attendance.

C. Report of the Provost

Not in attendance.

D. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

Statewide Senator Gubernat announced that he next ASCSU meeting is at the beginning of November. She reported that the statewide English Council approved by acclamation a statement in opposition to the CSU Early Start Program, as it is currently defined.

As CSUEB was not in session at the time, we did not pass a resolution on the BOT’s resolution to make campus visits optional for presidential search candidates. Bakersfield passed a post hoc resolution calling for Presidential Search Policy to include a visit and we could do that, too.

3. Appointments

The Chair urged all to encourage colleagues to submit their names for vacant positions.
4. Fall Election

The Fall election process is currently underway.

5. 10-11 CR 2, Center for Math Education and Research (CMER)

M/S/P (Seitz/Fleming) to place on the Senate agenda as an information item.

Julie Olkin (Math and Computer Science) and Phil Duren (Teacher Education) presented the Center for Math Education and Research (CMER). The purpose of the center is to raise visibility, both on and off campus, especially vis-à-vis curriculum development, i.e., the teaching and learning of mathematics. Duren and Olkin presented the CMER website’s focus on three service areas: curriculum development, pre-service teacher training and in-service professional development, and community/student outreach. Both faculty members have worked for the Early Assessment Program and have conducted workshops for high school teachers. CMER recently received a Lesher grant for expanding math academies, bringing the total to $7M in grants awarded to the Center. CMER is self-supporting and provides funding for projects, including release time.

Duren and Olkin responded to questions regarding the relationship with local districts (e.g., HUSD), stating that they run math achievement academies across our service areas. In response to questions about the Center’s mission statement, Olkin and Duren welcomed feedback on expanding the description of the Center’s work with diverse populations, as well as to include concretized data on assessment. Since Duren and Olkin report that data have been positive in terms of CMER’s impact on student and teacher learning, it is important to document the work and make the documentation accessible to all.

In response to how CMER will be embedded in the STEM Institute, the co-directors stated that the way that the Center is designed to work will be to focus on specific characteristics of math education that require experience and expertise. There will be a standing committee, consisting of the STEM director and the two co-directors of CMER. In response to questions about oversight, Duren and Olkin stated that the Centers are set up by the deans and accountable to the Provost.

Other suggestions included finding ways to present CMER’s work to the campus community; Green suggested including a place on the website that links to news and reports. Since Statistics is referenced, there is a need to reconcile that with the fact that, so far, personnel are only from TED and Math.

It was noted that centers may only be chartered for five (5) years at a time.

6. 10-11 CR 3, Center for Sport and Social Justice (CSSJ)

M/S/P (Seitz/Woods) to place on the Senate agenda as an information item.
Rita Liberti presented the Center for Sport and Social Justice (CSSJ). Liberti explained that sport is keenly political; the CSSJ proposal is faculty driven. They plan to start small, with an option in social justice in kinesiology to get UG students involved.

6.5 Discussion of Centers and Institutes Policy

Mahoney stated that there is a Centers and Institutes policy that was approved by the Senate in 2008-09; however, it does not mention anything about ExCom review. There are two different policies - one on the Academic Senate website and one on the Academic Affairs website, and this has caused confusion. He believes that any modification of the Centers and Institutes policy should pass through the Senate.

08-09 CR-5, section d2, states that the proposal will be reviewed by the AVP Research and Sponsored Programs. It then goes to the Senate via the Committee on Research (CR). Per Sue Opp and Linda Dobb, the Provost’s Office made changes in March 2011; center/institute proposals in the AA policy do not go beyond the CR, whose recommendations will be sent as an information item to the Academic Senate. M/S/P (Gubernat/Fleming) to refer the documents to the CR to square the documents.

7. Time, Place, and Manner Policy

In 2007, the Time, Place, and Manner Policy went through the Senate and was approved by President Qayoumi. In 2010-11 an ad hoc committee was formed to update the policy, which went directly from the committee to the President’s cabinet and has been in place. We’ve been asked to replace our existing Senate policy with the new policy, which has not been reviewed by ExCom or the Senate.

There was discussion about the different iterations of the policy, how modifications were made, recent court cases on “free speech zones,” and the history of ExCom and faculty involvement in this policy. In 2010-2011, Senate Chair Woods, and ExCom member Jennifer Eagan were invited to participate on the ad hoc committee (Stan Hebert, Chair) to modify/square things up with recent court cases and thought the report would come back to ExCom and Senate. However, that did not occur. Woods added that the committee formed in good faith.

The policy is not only about infrastructure, since it governs actions of students and faculty. There also appears to be some confusion about who is responsible for managing university property.

Mahoney stated that we need to clarify if this is a Senate document; if so, it cannot be changed or removed without notice.

Baham and others added that it is essential to determine who gets to decide what constitutes a “violation” of the policy. Eagan added that there are too many questions about who makes decisions about traffic and classes.
This discussion will continue at the next ExCom meeting on 11/1/2011.

8. Adjournment

M/S/P (Green/Fleming) to adjourn at 3:59 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Denise Fleming, Secretary