Minutes of the Meeting of February 11, 2003

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

Members Absent:  Norma Rees


1. Approval of the agenda

M/S (Stoper/Sawyer) to approve.

Chair Wort suggested adding item, 9b, discussion of e-mail problems in the election process in the College of Science. He also mentioned that three items were time certain, items 6 and 7 at 2:40 and item 8 at 3:00.

Caplan suggested that the e-mail discussion be held immediately after approval of the minutes, as part of the chair’s report, since this item may elicit lengthy discussion. This suggestion was adopted and the agenda was passed as amended.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of January 28, 2003

M/S/P (Sawyer/Warriner)

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

Chair Wort began a discussion of the e-mail problems in the College of Science (CS).

M/S (Caplan/Norton) to delay the election for two weeks to allow the College of Science to make nominations for the Winter ’03 election. One week would be set aside for self-nominations and the second for regular nomination process.

Leung discussed the problem with e-mail elections in the College of Science. In order to reduce spam the College of Science has its own list server. This is not made available to other units of the University. When an e-mail message from the Senate Office arrives at the College Office, the College automatically sends it out to the appropriate faculty. He knows that this was done, at least for the regular nomination process. He does not know if the Science faculty received the message but it is obvious that no nominations were forthcoming from the College.

Reichman commented that he found it very strange that when, as Chair of the Academic Senate, he wanted to send a message to all of the faculty he was unable to do so. Leung responded that two colleges, Business and Economics and Science, originally kept their own lists. Now only Science does so. He suggested that the list should be made available to the Senate Office.
Andrews suggested a special symbol on e-mails sent by the Senate Office. In this way CS faculty would know the source of the message. Sawyer wanted a clear understanding of the dates when nominations are to end and when university-wide voting ends. Andrews wanted to confirm that the original motion permitted only College of Science nominations. No additional nominations from the other colleges would be accepted. Norton felt that the two stages of the nominating process could be compacted into one week. She knew that nominations from the College of Science had been prepared but they were never sent to the Senate Office because the e-mail message was either not received or not read by the CS faculty. Caplan felt that there should be enough time for nominations as a courtesy to the College of Science. Stoper reiterated that the nomination process is a two-step procedure and it will require a full two weeks. The problem, then, is to make sure that the actual election period, which requires an additional period of two weeks, does not conflict with finals week. Wort was concerned that XCOM not recommend voiding the election since this can only be done by a vote of the full Academic Senate. If we modify the election procedures or dates the Senate does not need to be consulted. Reichman advocated informing the faculty by e-mail and hard copy that the current election has been suspended. Voting would resume after the CS nominating period, with a new ballot and a full voting period. Wort continued to be concerned about voting conflicting with finals. Norton again mentioned that the nominating process could be shortened. Wort suggested we run the nominations until the 21st of February and begin the election on the 24th. In this way there would be no conflict with finals week. Andrews suggested that the Senate Office should develop the time lines. There was general agreement with this idea. Caplan amended his own motion to specify that the nominating process end by the 21st. XCOM considered this a friendly amendment. Motion, as amended, passed.

Wort informed XCOM that Karina Garbesi’s suggestions, made at our last Senate meeting, had been received in writing by the Senate Office and referred to CIC.

B. Report of the President

There was no report.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

Caplan reported that there would be a special plenary session of the Executive Committee of the Statewide Academic Senate and the Chairs of the campus Senates on Thursday, February 13.

Reichman reported that there will be a budget summit with campus Senate Chairs and Presidents in March.

4. Appointments:

- SEM Recruitment/Admissions/Financial Aid Workshop- no nomination yet.
- M/P (Reichman/Stoper) to nominate Sonja Daniels, Director of Student Life Programs to replace Evette Castillo on the Senate until a replacement can be elected.
5. Approval of the date of April 22, 2003 for the Annual Executive Committee Administrative Review of Administrative Officers:

M/S/P (Sawyer/Norton) to approve

6. 02-03 CAPR 1 Outside Accredited Programs- recommendations for changes to 00-01 CAPR 7.

M/S (Stoper/Cassuto) to forward to the Academic Senate.

This document proposes to exempt programs that are accredited from the internal five-year review process unless they are denied accreditation.

Andrews began the discussion by commenting that CAPR 1 removes too many faculty from the oversight process for programs with outside accreditation. If programs are removed from CAPR oversight there may be problems.

Reichman was concerned with how a positive outcome in the accreditation process was to be defined. A program could receive accreditation but the accreditation period until the next review might be shortened as a result of problems discovered in the process. Would this be considered a positive outcome by CAPR?

Stoper felt that the existing CAPR document should list information required by CAPR of all reviewed programs. She believed programs receiving outside accreditation could provide that data to CAPR for its own review.

Sawyer commented that CEAS has faced this problem for many years and it tries to fit the documents for both internal and external review.

Caplan was concerned that the new procedure bypasses the CSUH faculty and places decisions in the hands of outside reviewers. He advocated sending the document back to CAPR.

Stoper replied that CAPR had most assuredly considered the issue raised by Caplan and Andrews. Providing information to CAPR is something that could be solved with an amendment on the Senate floor.

Lee, Chair of CAPR, responded to the issues raised by the previous speakers. He pointed out that CAPR considered all of these issues and developed four different approaches to this issue of outside accreditation. By a vote of the members of CAPR the option described in 02-03 CAPR 1 was selected. He also commented that virtually all of the data and commentary required by CAPR is normally included in accreditation reports.

Reichman argued that a typical outside review is more rigorous those conducted by CAPR. He felt that accredited departments/Colleges should submit a copy of the review letter.

Andrews did not feel that the document was ready for consideration by the Senate. For example, the document provides no information about the number of programs affected by this policy. She also argued that compatibility for comparisons between departments would be weakened and that compatibility is important for the annual allocation of tenure track positions.

Lee responded that this was also considered, that departments were asked about this and they seemed to feel that this would not present any great difficulties.

Sawyer felt that the CAPR review process was an opportunity to present the department’s story to the faculty, staff, students and administrators. This would now be lost.

Lee and Martino both reminded XCOM that the accreditation documents are public and can be read by all interested parties.

Stoper argued strongly against sending the document back to CAPR. She felt CAPR had done its job and the document should go forward to the Senate. Any minor shortcomings can be addressed through amendments when the Senate considers the document.

Motion passed with one nay vote
7. 02-03 CAPR 2, Academic Standards- recommendations for changes to 00-01 CAPR 7.

M/S/(Reichman/Caplan) to forward to the Academic Senate.

This document requires programs undergoing the five-year review process to include their methods for assessing the grading policies of faculty. The programs must include annual GPA for all courses in the major and for the major as a whole for the past five years.

Andrews was opposed to this document since its applicability would be limited to those programs that did not have outside accreditation. According to Andrews the argument was similar to the one she had made for the previous agenda item.

Warriner felt that the discussion seemed to imply that high departmental GPA’s are in some sense bad and low ones are good or desirable. The assumption of homogeneity is not necessarily valid in academia.

Lee commented that CAPR was asked to include something on academic standards in the CAPR review process. The objective of 02-03 CAPR 2 is simply to get departments to think about their standards. The document requires a list of measures adopted by departments to uphold academic standards.

Reichman explained that, in his view, CAPR reviews are more process oriented and less outcomes oriented. The intent is to have departments think about their programs and the way they conduct business.

Caplan argued that the current document isolates a small item for assessment rather than the whole program. He felt that this was too narrow a view.

Martino reiterated that accredited programs must also discuss and review their standards. This is not a process limited to departments that do not have outside accreditation.

Motion passed with one abstention and one nay.

8. 02-03 CR 1 Modification of Policies and Procedures for Committee Operation.

M/S/P (Stoper/Reichman) to approve.

9. 02-03 CIC 11 Name Change for On-Line Subcommittee of CIC to Technology and Instruction Subcommittee.

M/S/P (Warriner/Evuleocha)

10. Discussion for use as campus feedback at the CSU Chairs meeting on February 13th

a. #2595 Opposition to funding decrease tied to SFR ratio increase.

Reichman informed XCOM that marginal growth is technically funded at a 18.5 SFR although there is a chronic shortfall in funding. In theory, if FTES increase funding should also increase in direct proportion. By changing the formula the CSU will be tied to a higher SFR and will have difficulty lowering it back to its current level if/when budgetary prospects improve. It’s not a question of SFR, but of the budget decrease being tied to it.

M/S/P (Cassuto/Stoper) to put the CSUH XCOM on record endorsing this Statewide Academic Senate resolution #2595.
b. AS 2594 Student Fees in the California State University; Mitigating Their Effects.

Reichman informed XCOM that this was simply a first reading and much needed to be changed. He believed that the SAS would like to see fee increases tied to serious consultation with the Senate. Another issue that has been raised is to develop a process of fee increases rather than instituting a haphazard change when the legislature has no money. One of the ideas discussed is to have fees tied to catalog rights so that students would be able to plan their expenses. Another idea is to tie fees directly to the number of units taken rather than having set fees for a block of units. Caplan suggested that students may have to pay higher fees when they are over 120 semester units. Also students may have to pay higher fees when retaking courses through academic renewal.

No motion was made.

11. Whistleblower Protection Resolution by CSU Senate.

Stoper asked if it was appropriate to move that this be referred to FAC to work with the administration, CFA, CSEA and other faculty unions.

Reichman suggested that CSUH does not need a new policy, but that we should simply adopt the Office of the Chancellor policy. Each campus needs to set up a policy to periodically inform faculty and staff in some way so that they know how to blow the whistle.

Linfield added that the policy announced to the campus by email last June (appended to the document), was revised slightly. Rather than a designee name, the title of the designee is the Assistant VP Human Resources.

Caplan asked if perhaps a faculty member, like the AALO, should be designated, as well as an administrative designee.

M/S (Stoper/Andrews) to refer this document to FAC with the proviso that the campus defer to the CSU policy

Reichman reiterated that the referral also be limited to how the campus is informed of the policy and who is the contact person. Reichman also mentioned that if the whistleblower does not want to notify the designated campus individual or if the individual accused of malfeasance by the whistleblower ranks above the campus contact person the case could be made directly to the designated individual in the Office of the Chancellor.

Motion passed

12. Policy on “Hybrid” classes, which include both class time and on-line instruction

M/S/P (Caplan/Sawyer) to refer to CIC to be considered by the Technology and Instruction Subcommittee.

13. Pro-forma changes to the bylaws to change all reference to schools to colleges.

M/S/P (Stoper/Norton) to allow the Senate office to make that change.

14. Adjournment

M/S/P (Sawyer/Laherty) to adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted
Alex Cassuto, Secretary