CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of
The ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting of January 7, 2003

Members Present: Dee Andrews, Cal Caplan, Alex Cassuto, Stevina Evuleocha, Jennifer Laherty, Julia Norton, Norma Rees, Hank Reichman, Don Sawyer, Emily Stoper, Alison Warriner, Don Wort

Members Absent: none

Visitors: Carl Bellone, Nan Chico, Terry Jones, Mark Karplus, Myoung-ja Lee Kwon, Bill Langan, Frank Martino, Tom McCoy, Penny McCullagh, Richard Metz, Sonjia Redmond, Jody Servatius, Aline Soules, Michael Strait, Bruce Trumbo, Gale Young

1. Approval of the agenda.
   M/S (Sawyer/Stoper) to approve
   M/S (Sawyer/Stoper), at Wort’s suggestion, to add an item 12 b. , Memorandum from Executive Vice Chancellor David Spence written to all members of the Academic Council.
   M/S (Sawyer, Laherty), at Sawyer’s suggestion, that item 8 should be considered after item 3, and item 12 be considered immediately after item 8.
   Caplan asked what the deadline was for item 12. The WASC deadline is January 15. XCOM agreed to a time certain discussion of item 12 for 3:00 while leaving this item in its original order.
   Agenda was approved with modifications.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of November 26, 2002
   M/S/P (Caplan/Evuleocha)

3. Reports

   A. Report of the Chair
   Chair Wort welcomed back members of XCOM and guests and wished everyone a Happy New Year. He reviewed the schedule for the next two weeks. There will be a regular Academic Senate meeting on January 14 and a special meeting to consider ACR 73 with guests Gary Hammerstrom (Office of the Chancellor, SFSU) and George Diehr, (CFA, San Marcos).
   Stoper was asked to report on the progress of the discussion of G.E. in CIC. She reported that CIC is approaching a decision. It is working on the next draft of the GE document. The secretary of CIC will put the 6-7 ideas for GE on Blackboard for discussion. CIC would like to have faculty input on these possibilities. CIC will have an all day retreat to finalize its deliberations.
   Wort added that replacements for David Larson on the Academic Senate for winter and Jennifer Laherty on Academic Senate and XCOM for spring would be needed.

   B. Report of the President

   President Rees reported that she had sent budget updates to faculty at their home addresses over the holiday break. She has no additional information beyond what was sent out.
The Governor will issue a preliminary budget for 2003-04 on January 11. The next week the members of the Chancellor’s Academic Council will go over the preliminary budget.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

Reichman reported that the Senate would meet in two weeks.

8. 02-03 CIC 7 Proposed Online Coursework (EDUI 6706) to Fulfill the Graduate Writing Assessment for the Masters of Science in Education, Option in Online Teaching and Learning.

M/S/P (Stoper, Sawyer) to forward to the Academic Senate

Andrews asked if there was a discrepancy between the document and the background information. The document accepts the online course as a method to fulfill the writing assessment if the student receives a grade of B or better. This is not mentioned in the background information. Warriner responded that this was an unintended omission. Andrews also asked why this course was being recognized for special attention since many other graduate courses have substantial writing components. Warriner responded that this was a unique course, at least for the time being, in that it was offered only on-line.

Caplan reminded XCOM again that the merits of any proposal should be discussed at the Academic Senate meeting and not by XCOM.

Reichman suggested that the action requested be changed to reflect the requirement that a grade of B or higher is needed to satisfy the assessment requirement. This was taken as a friendly amendment.

Motion passed unanimously

4. Appointments:

- M/S (Sawyer/Caplan) to appoint Alex Cassuto to the SEM steering Committee.
- M/S (Evuleocha/Caplan) to appoint Lettie Ramirez to the SEM Integrated Marketing Workgroup
- M/S (Reichman/Stoper) to appoint Michael Lee as ACIP representative (Academic Council on International Programs).
- M/S (Stoper/Andrews) to appoint Carl Stempel to replace David Larson on the Academic Senate for winter-03.

5. Schedule for Winter Quarter University-wide Election and email notification of Call for Self-Nomination by Petition.

M/S/P (Sawyer, Cassuto) to approve, including email notification.

6. 02-03 CIC 4 Proposed New Cluster Course THEA 2211, Asian Thought in Theatre, in the 2nd Year Humanities Asian Thought Cluster.

M/S/P (Andrews/Cassuto) to forward to the Academic Senate

7. 02-03 CIC 5, Designation of Unique Course Number for Cluster Course in the Humanities, Area C; Mus 2020 to Replace MUS 1000 in the Holocaust and the Problems of Evil Cluster

M/S/P (Warriner/Caplan) to forward to the Academic Senate
9. 02-03 CIC 7, Proposed Title Change for the Honors Program at CSUH

M/S/P (Cassuto/Evuleocha) to forward to the Academic Senate

10. 02-03 CIC 8 Application of History 3530, the Shaping of North America, 1492-1850, to G.E. Area C4 for the 98/03 Pattern

M/S/P (Norton/Reichman) to forward to the Academic Senate

11. 02-03 CIC 9 Application of KPE 3200, Sports in Film, to G.E. Area D4 for the 98/03 Pattern

M/S/P (Norton, Sawyer) to forward to the Academic Senate

12a. Final WASC Proposal

M/S (Sawyer/Norton) to approve the final WASCPC Draft Document

Comments to the initial draft had been sent to WASCPC (WASC Planning Committee) and the revisions have been incorporated in a new draft that was distributed to XCOM members and guests. Revisions were mainly indicated by gray highlighting but, at a certain point, the writer’s computer refused to accept additional highlighting so some minor comments were not highlighted.

Also distributed were Stoper’s comments to the initial draft, and replies from WASCPC members Strait and Sawyer. In addition, in the back of the new WASCPC draft, WASC’s 2001 Worksheet, was included. The latter document, not seen prior to this by any but one of XCOM’s members, raised some concerns beyond those raised in Stoper’s document.

Stoper began the discussion with an eloquent apology. Having attributed motives to the writers of the draft in her written comments, she asked that all such comments be retracted. She also expressed hope that a minority report would not be necessary.

Bellone commented that WASC requires the campus to respond to certain issues. The WASCPC was happy that the faculty had taken the process seriously. The PC did not intend to centralize the process of assessment, rather it continues to leave this to department autonomy. There was no intent to create a new, permanent, administrative structure. The committees created will be inclusive. The PC wants an accreditation process that is successful in receiving a 10-year accreditation. The process should also help to deal with the controversial issues of the University.

Reichman agreed with Stoper’s written comments on centralization and was gratified to hear that this was just a misunderstanding. However, he was very concerned with the use of the words “achieving consensus”. By nature universities do not have consensus and this should not be a requirement of a successful accreditation process. He also worried that the draft seemed to usurp faculty governance. In particular he pointed to the numbered points from pages 5-7 of the draft. Some of these points are really faculty governance issues. For example, point #6 related to the PT&R process is something that is already determined by faculty approved procedures. Reichman also commented on some of the wording from page 4 which made it seem that the campus was not welcoming. The changes made in the new draft were an improvement. Returning to the numbered points he pointed out that #2 is something controlled by the State Legislature rather than the University.
Bellone responded that the PC would be willing to change the phrase “achieving consensus” to “foster an ongoing dialogue”.

Stoper continued to express concerns. In particular she was worried that the term align, in the context of learning objectives, sounds like it is an issue that will ultimately be decided centrally rather than by individual departments.

Bellone responded that this is not the intent of WASC, that WASC respects departmental autonomy. Andrews stated that she appreciated the work done by the PC but she could not support the document. Why, she asked, did WASCPC concentrate virtually all its efforts to a discussion of student assessment while the WASC worksheet does not emphasize this issue? She also suggested we not use terms and language we either do not understand or agree upon in the draft. Andrews also felt that there seemed to be a conflict between current budgetary limitations and the increased faculty, and, possibly, administrative time required to accomplish the objectives in the draft. Finally, she asked who determines if our assessment has been successful after we finish doing it?

Aline Soules likened the assessment process to zero-based budgeting; one starts at point zero and creates a shell to use for evaluation.

Reichman asked why the PC was proposing the creation of twelve committees. The WASC handbook has four sections, why not create four committees to respond to the issues raised in the handbook? He also commented that he did not understand what the twelfth committee was to do. Bellone responded that the twelfth committee would be providing email information to the committee. In past accreditation visits a room on campus was set aside and documents provided the WASC reviewers in that room.

Reichman asked why this was not simply described this way in the draft instead of using all of this unnecessary jargon.

Andrews returned to her main point: why are we taking one small part of the WASC handbook and ballooning it into the entire process?

Stoper felt we were making progress but we are not there yet. She favored a vote by email after XCOM digests information in the new draft, and any additional changes which are still to be made. Wort suggested that we could meet again on Thursday rather than voting and commenting electronically.

Evuleocha preferred to vote now, to go through the document page by page and make the changes we felt were appropriate.

Reichman felt that Bellone’s comments were reassuring but also felt the normal order of business is to not approve documents until we see the final copy. He supported Andrew’s assertion that twelve committees are not really necessary. Finally, he commented that XCOM role is consultative rather than deterministic.

Bellone felt that a new document incorporating the suggestions made at this meeting could be prepared and sent to XCOM by Thursday. He also agreed with Reichman that a vote was not necessary.

Rees commented that all processes will follow and respect the practices of faculty governance. She also felt that the draft should substitute the word review rather than approve whenever the actions of administrative and faculty bodies are mentioned.

Stoper commented that the role of student outcome assessment is overblown in importance in the draft. There are many other issues of importance to the University which seem to become secondary, or are not mentioned at all, in the draft.

Warriner, ever the English Professor, commented that she had tried to do a word count of certain words used in the PC draft, including the words embed and align. She felt the use of this language was inappropriate, and strongly suggested that we need not parrot the words and phrases that are used by WASC.
Strait stated that in the WASC handbook assessment is at the core of all that is expected of an accreditation review. Rees related the changes in accreditation that have occurred in her administrative career. The original process was oriented to the inputs of the university; this was the key to accreditation. The accreditation process has moved a full 180°; rather than inputs the orientation is almost exclusively to output via assessment of learning outcomes. 

Jones added that assessment must consider racism at the University. He advocated assessing the impact of our teaching on minority students. Stoper supported Jones by advocating other that issues such as retention and graduation rates of different ethnic groups be considered as an important assessment of the University’s performance. Student assessment of learning is not the only issue to consider. Martino added that in his opinion one of the issues of student learning assessment is the analysis of student retention and graduation rates.

M/S/P (Caplan/Cassuto) to extend discussion to 4:10.

Caplan raised two points. First, does the draft allow us to look at the issues we need to examine? Second, does the draft look at the strengths and weaknesses of the University and how we address the major issues on campus? Wort advocated not meeting again. He suggested we send our comments and concerns to Bellone via email within the next two days. Stoper reminded XCOM that there was a motion on the floor that needed to be retracted.

M/S/P (Stoper/Evuleocha) to table.

12.b Annual Reports for Inclusion in Board of Trustees Agenda Item on Academic Planning and Program Review.

Wort suggested that Spence’s memorandum be forwarded to CAPR for discussion and comment. There was universal agreement to this action.

13. Adjournment

M/S/P (Caplan/Cassuto) to adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted
Alex Cassuto, Secretary