Minutes of the Meeting of March 4, 2003

Members Present: Dee Andrews, Cal Caplan, Alex Cassuto, Stevina Evuleocha, Julia Norton, Norma Rees, Hank Reichman, Don Sawyer, Emily Stoper, Don Wort
Members Absent: Jennifer Laherty, Alison Warriner
Visitors: Carl Bellone, Robert Burt, Susan Correia, Mark Karplus, Frank Martino, Richard Metz, Michael Schutz, Joe Zelan

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S (Sawyer/Caplan) to approve.

Professor Tom Acord’s letter, sent to Wort, Andrews and Reichman, suggesting a charge to FAC was placed as item 12 on the agenda.

Agenda was approved as modified.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of February 11, 2003

M/S (Caplan/Stoper)

Reichman requested the phrase without additional information, attributed to him, be stricken from the record. Stoper asked that an introductory sentence or two be added to agenda items 6 and 7 which explain the documents for those who read the minutes but do not have the document. The secretary agreed to add those to the minutes. Norton asked if the official designation of the College of Science would be CS, as cited in the minutes. Martino suggested CSc. This will be used until an official designation is suggested from the College of Science. Norton also asked if there were enough individuals to count the ballots. Correia said three members of XCOM have volunteered. Counting will take place on Thursday, March 13 at 1:30.

Minutes were approved as modified.

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

Chair Wort reported that he had e-mailed a copy of Cal Poly SLO’s anti-war resolution to each of the members of the Executive Committee.
Professor Sherman Lewis has requested time at the first meeting of the Academic Senate in the spring to speak on plans for the 580-extension corridor. Rees informed XCOM that a committee of the city of Hayward is working on this. That committee includes Bob Brauer and it seemed pointless to allow one person to address the Senate without having others speak on the issue as well. Stoper felt this was not the business of the Senate and should not be approved. Reichman agreed and added that there was no resolution for the Senate to consider. The Senate should not invite persons to present their point of view on issues that do not concern the Senate. He felt that Lewis could draft a resolution and submit it to ExComm, or make a motion on the floor that could be considered by the Academic Senate. The Senate will not circulate his paper. The discussion was concluded by requesting that the chair convey XCOM’s views to Lewis.

Wort raised the issue of tenure track allocations for 2003-04. According to University policy chairs develop proposals in the fall, Deans and the Provost review the proposals in the winter and CAPR prioritizes allocations in the beginning of the spring. Normally final allocations are made at the end of the spring after further discussions with the President, Provost and Deans. The first CAPR meeting of the spring is April 3rd.

Reichman commented that it is unlikely that proposals can be made to CAPR by this date. If this were to be postponed until the April 17th meeting of CAPR the prioritization by CAPR could not be made until the 29th of April. Wort suggested it might be possible to call a special meeting of CAPR for April 10th. Given the tremendous uncertainty surrounding the budget for the next academic year, Reichman felt that it would be better to delay the process until the later dates. May’s discussion between the President, Provost and Deans would be held after that. Rees agreed that the budget uncertainty would delay decisions this year and added that they will make their best guess about new searches in June and some allocations may have to be retracted as a clearer picture of the budget emerges. Reichman concluded the discussion by advocating an April 17th date for CAPR and placement on the Senate agenda in May.

Stoper sent a letter to Wort asking that FAC consider the issue of requiring average department student evaluations be included in some way in the PTR procedure. She argued that there was no policy requiring this or any procedure to establish a mean for a department of a college. Martino commented that evaluation results are routinely sent to departments by Assessment & Testing. Reichman felt it might be useful to have a university wide or college wide average. Stoper argued that the PTR committees should be given the average evaluations.

M/S (Stoper/Reichman) that FAC explore the idea of including the department means for student evaluations in each candidate’s dossier. Schutz suggested that this might lead to over-reliance on a simple numerical scale.

Motion failed by a vote of 4 ayes, 5 nays.
B. Report of the President

Rees asked that item 8 be considered now, with Robert Burt in attendance, to inform the campus that the new building will be named after the donors who provided one-half of the total amount of private donations needed to build the building. The building will probably be named the Wayne and Gladys Valley Business and Technology building. The name must be approved by the Board of Trustees of the CSU.

She reported that she had sent a packet to American Association of State Colleges and Universities nominating Dr. Cecil Pickett as distinguished alumnus of the year. Pickett, a graduate of CSUH, is a research biochemist who is CEO of Schering Plough Corporation’s (SGP) Pharmaceutical Laboratories. He was recently named one of the fifty most influential African-American scientists in the U.S.

WASC proposal was received with rave reviews. Sawyer reported that our version may be used as a model for future reviews by WASC.

Rees stated that she knows little about next year’s budget. She has met with many groups on campus including the council of chairs from each college and the library. The Board of Finance meets every week to discuss issues. The Legislative Analyst reported that, in her opinion, the CSU is actually getting more money rather than less. Rees felt we must support the governor’s budget for the CSU since it represents the best of what can happen. Stoper asked if there were plans for a Golden Handshake. Rees answered that it is on the opening list of cuts. However the proposed new Golden Handshake will be more flexible than the one that was proposed and rejected by the Chancellor this year. Schutz asked what we are comparing the governor’s budget to when we are asked to support it. Rees responded that the LAO budget proposal was much worse for the CSU. Also the Republican Caucus, while agreeing with the governor’s cuts, felt that the cuts did not go far enough. Schutz asked if there were any time lines for information and decisions about allocations and cuts. Rees responded in the negative. Caplan wondered if any current faculty searches would not be honored. Rees responded in the negative but added that normally some authorized searches do not result in a faculty hire. She suggested that any that are not successful this year be primary candidates for authorization next year if the department still wishes to hire.

The speakers for the two spring events have been selected. Senator Tom Torlakson will be the commencement speaker and Johan Klehs will be the speaker at the honors convocation. She has not requested any honorary degrees this year (first time).

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

Caplan reported that there was a special plenary session on the budget. Nothing noteworthy was concluded.
Reichman reported that the Senate created a Budget Advisory Committee. Will have their first meeting March 7. Jacquelyn Kegley testified before the legislature on the student fee issue. The issues are quality vs. access. She reported that the Academic Senate reluctantly supported fee increases to maintain quality & access in the CSU.

4. Appointments:
   - SEM Recruitment/Admissions/Financial Aid Workshop- no nomination yet.
   - M/P (Stoper/Reichman) to nominate Michelle Buda to replace Carol Castignozzi on CAPR for the spring.

5. 02-03 CAPR 3 Ethnic Studies Five-Year Review
   M/S/P (Reichman/Caplan) to forward to the Academic Senate.

6. 02-03 CAPR 4 Amendment to 00-01 CAPR 7, Policies and Procedures for Five-Year Review and Plans, concerning the submission of documents
   M/S (Cassuto/Caplan) to forward to the Academic Senate.
   
   This document proposes changing some wording to require programs to submit their Self Study, Draft Plan, Outside Reviewer Report, Response and Amended Plan (if necessary).

   Stoper suggested there was some confusion with the proposed wording. She suggested that there was a simpler way to accomplish this and that this should be considered again in committee. She would help to write the referral.

   M/S/P (Stoper/ Caplan) to refer document back to CAPR.

7. Deadline for submissions for the 02-02 Academic Senate.
   Submission deadlines were handed out at the meeting.

   M/S/P (Caplan/Evuleocha) to approve.

8. Naming the New Business and Technology Building.
   Already discussed in the Report of the President, 3 B.

   M/S/P (Andrews/Cassuto)
This document sets the proportional representation, by colleges and the library, on the Academic Senate and the Standing Committees for the year 2003-04.

The document was handed out in the meeting. Reichman made two observations. First, he noted that the number of tenure track faculty at the University continues to decline. According to the figures presented we have lost 11 tenure track faculty in the three years presented for comparison purposes (1999-00 to 2000-01 and 2000-01 to 2001-02). Reichman also wondered how the rounding was done. Correia responded that the highest fractions were rounded up to total the required amounts. Caplan reminded XCOM that Statewide proportional representation was changed this year to guarantee at least two senators from each campus. He suggested we do this here. Stoper responded that the Statewide Senate had increased the number of seats in order to do this. Also, we have at-large elections which change the actual representation in our Senate. Reichman added that the new representation on the Statewide Senate was done to add one Senator to the Maritime Academy. The Senate felt that each campus needed two Senators so that they could discuss issues with each other. This is not necessary on home campuses where discussion can take place more easily. Wort commended Correia on a job well done. This was echoed by other members of XCOM.

10. Discussion of the procedure for nomination of the Spring Executive Committee replacement at the next Senate meeting.

M/S/P (Reichman/Stop) to take nominations from the Senate floor. Once nominations are closed the Senate will have a ballot. If one candidate receives 50.1% or more of the votes the election is closed. If not, and there are three candidates, the lowest will be eliminated and there will be a runoff between the top two vote getters.

M/S/P (Cassuto/Stop) that in the event that there are more than three nominations and no candidate receives more than half the votes on the first round the top two candidates advance to the runoff.


M/S (Reichman/Stop) to send to the Academic Senate the document supporting the Bond Act of 2004.

Wort began by suggesting that we may be able to sign up without an official resolution of the Senate. If a resolution is necessary the Chair will draft one. Rees felt this was unusually early to begin this process. Reichman responded by referring to the last bond proposal. Many groups supporting the bond passed their resolutions too late to be recorded.

Motion passed.
12. Letter from Tom Acord asking FAC to develop guidelines for outside consultants in the search process whenever faculty are involved in that process.

M/S (Reichman/Andrews) to refer Acord’s letter to FAC.

Reichman, as one of the recipients of the letter, began the discussion. He cited the recently concluded search for the Dean of ALSS where an outside consultant was employed by the University yet there were no guidelines for the exact role of the consultant. He added that there was no faculty document governing the approval of, or the limitations to, the use of outside consultants. He felt it would be helpful to have some guidelines. Reichman felt that FAC should review the issues and set policies. Andrews agreed with Reichman and Acord. Rees felt that guidelines would be enormously helpful since search consultants have been used only twice at CSUH. FAC must determine which positions the guidelines would apply to, especially distinguishing between academic and non-academic positions. Reichman added that there is a general policy document for all searches where faculty are involved. Acord’s letter suggests revisions in the policies. Also Acord suggests that we develop a “best practices” manual. Rees commented that CSUH has hired search consultants twice. She suggested writing a manual based upon two examples will be challenging. Metz added that these firms were hired and functioned according to the contracts that were signed between the University and the consultant. FAC should consult with the two individuals in ABA most involved in this process: Rick Thompson and Janis Linfield. Martino added that the contract may be signed with a firm but we are really hiring an individual to help in the search process. Andrews suggested that the issue is not who does it, but when they should do what they do. For example, are the consultants to be part of all of the deliberations of the search committee? The policy part that is developed by FAC would be small, but the guidelines are likely to be much more extensive.

Motion to refer was passed.

13. Adjournment

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

Respectfully Submitted,
Alex Cassuto, Secretary