Minutes of the Meeting of April 15, 2003

Members Present:  Dee Andrews, Cal Caplan, Stevina Evuleocha, Karina Garbesi, Julia Norton, Hank Reichman, Don Sawyer, Emily Stoper, Alison Warriner, Don Wort

Members Absent:  Alex Cassuto, Norma Rees

Visitors:  Carl Bellone, Bob Brauer, Emily Brizendine, John Charles, Stanley Clark, Susan Correia, Mary DiSibio, Mark Karplus, William Langan, Michael Lee, Michael Leung, Penny McCullagh, Dick Metz, Saeid Montanalli, Bill Reuter, Arthurlene Towner, Bruce Trumbo, Gale Young

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda – M/S Caplan/Sawyer.  The Chair proposed adding an item before #16 about a lecturer plan suggested by Statewide Senate Chair Jackie Kegley. (16a.) At the request of the President (before the meeting), the Chair proposed that Item 11, BAA 1, be postponed until she could be present. The agenda was approved with the changes.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 8 –These minutes were not yet available.

3. Reports.  There were no reports.

4. Appointments
   - Luther Strayer of the Geological Sciences Department was appointed as the faculty representative on the Strategic Enrollment Management Workgroup on Recruitment, Admissions and Financial Aid.
   - Carl Stempel was appointed to replace David Larson on the Senate for Spring Quarter.
   - No nominations were made for the WASC Planning Committee and Outcome Teams.
   - Diana Balgas was appointed to replace Sonja Daniels on the Senate for Spring Quarter (Student Services rep.)
   - William Langan was appointed to replace Paul Bassen on the Senate for Spring Quarter.

5. 02-03 CAPR 1 amended – Outside Accredited Programs.
   An amended version of the proposal was distributed at the meeting. M/S Reichman/Caplan to place on the Senate agenda.
   The amended document did not contain an “Action Requested” line, so Reichman suggested one:
   “that the Academic Senate 1) approve items a-h, and, for the 02-03 cycle, any CSUH program with outside accreditation must send a representative to appear before CAPR, by arrangement with the CAPR chair, and 2) approve the proposed changes to amend 00-01 CAPR 7.”
Stoper noted that Items a-h needed to become a permanent part of the CAPR procedures (00-01 CAPR 7) in the “Change to:” section on this document and offered to advise the Senate Office with specific wording. This amended document basically requires accredited programs to submit to CAPR documentation of a successful accreditation review and to briefly summarize aspects of its accreditation review needed by CAPR for its planning and resource functions, and to amend 00-01 CAPR 7, Policies and Procedures for Five-Year Reviews and Plans, in order to make these changes applicable in future years.

Members of ExCom felt that the new document corrects all the problems with the original version. In response to questions, CAPR Chair Michael Lee said that accredited programs could request a different timetable to bring the CAPR review in sync with the accreditation timetable, with an interval as long as 10 years between reviews. He also assured the committee that accreditation reviews do all that our campus reviews do – and more.

Representatives from the College of Education and Allied Studies, which has several accredited programs, indicated that although the amended document requires more work of them, they find it acceptable.

The motion passed unanimously as amended.

6. 02-03 FAC 4 Proposed Revisions to the Promotion, Tenure, and Retention Policies and Procedures Document
   M/S Reichman/Norton to place on the Senate agenda.
   Deputy Provost Stanley Clark indicated that the President and Provost believe that the proposed new Section 3.2.2.c of the PTR Document, barring a College Dean from writing a letter of evaluation for a candidate seeking promotion to a higher rank than the dean holds, is in violation of Articles 15.2, 15.19 and especially 15.33 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Section 15.33 mandates “administrative reviews” as a part of every performance review. Dr. Clark stated that he understands that the meaning of the CBA is often unclear, but that the President would not approve the proposed change if the Senate passes it. FAC Chair Bruce Trumbo said that the committee saw a clear potential for a conflict of interest for a dean who may at some future date have a faculty member that he had turned down appear on a department or college PTR committee judging his own promotion case. He raised the issue of whether this was an important enough matter to ask the Senate to pass in the face of the President’s intention not to implement it. Reichman opined that since the President has final approval, then the action has “administrative review” from the President in any case, whether or not the dean reviews it. There was therefore no violation of the CBA. Stoper’s view was that this was a matter for the Senate, not ExCom, to debate and resolve. The motion passed.

7. FAC’s Response to ExCom referral Concerning Post Tenure Review.
   ExCom reviewed FAC’s recommendation that no action be taken on the proposal by a faculty member that faculty members with unsatisfactory post tenure reviews should not be eligible for extra quarters with pay and concurred with FAC.

8. 02-03 FAC 5 – Approval of Revisions in FAC Policies and Procedures
   M/S Sawyer/Reichman to approve.
   Stoper proposed an amendment (seconded by Warriner) to the proposed addition to Article V, Section 4, striking the second “regular” from the sentence “The chair of a regular subcommittee must be a regular member of the faculty.” The effect would be to permit lecturers to chair subcommittees. Stoper argued that it would be inappropriate to bar lecturers, who are permitted only the most minimal role in faculty governance, from even chairing the subcommittee of FAC concerned with lecturer matters. FAC Chair Trumbo
stated out that lecturers are in a vulnerable position and should not chair committees that actually draft documents. It is also preferable to have the chair be a member of FAC so that reports may be given on the subcommittee at FAC meetings. Warriner and Garbesi saw this as paternalistic and pointed out that a lecturer who feared repercussions need not agree to be chair. Warriner felt that the current chair, a lecturer, is doing an excellent job.

The amendment passed.
Stoper proposed another amendment, also seconded by Warriner, striking the word “tenured” from a proposed change to Article V. Section D1, which would have required that regular faculty members serving on the Lecturer Subcommittee be tenured. Reichman felt that the sensitivity of the issues required someone with the stature and experience of a tenured faculty member. Warriner argued that tenured faculty members are already overburdened and non-tenured faculty members can do just as good a job and already are doing excellent work. She felt that the judgment of who would serve best could be left to the discretion of FAC, which appoints the subcommittee’s members.

The second amendment also passed, by a vote of 5-4.
Andrews proposed a third amendment, seconded by Stoper, to retain the current language, under Article V, Section C, concerning the membership of the Outstanding Professor Selection Subcommittee. The proposed change would have barred the previous year’s winner of the award from serving on the committee. Trumbo explained that FAC had been concerned that that person might hear some talk about the previous year’s deliberations. Reichman pointed out that it has been the informal practice for a number of years for the previous year’s winner to serve on the committee. It is part of the honor associated with winning.

The third amendment also passed.

The main motion passed.

9. WASC Update – Plans for Preparatory Review
Carl Bellone, Associate Vice President for Curriculum and Graduate Programs, called for volunteers by the next day to serve on the various WASC committees, which will get organized and develop a focus on key objectives for the remainder of the year.

10. Proposed creation of Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA) (Discussion postponed until the April 22 ExComm meeting at 3:00)

11. 02-03 BAA 1 Incorporating the CSU Plan To Increase the Percentage of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty in the California State University - postponed

12. 02-03 BAA 2 Survey of Regular Faculty and Lecturers
M/S Stoper/Evuleocha to place on the Senate agenda.
Reichman commented that the way the questions were worded seemed to call for yes/no questions rather than answers on a scale from 1 to 4. Stoper disagreed, seeing the wording as appropriate, but wondered if questions should be the same as on past surveys, in order to get longitudinal data. Langan explained that there had been only one previous survey and it went only to junior faculty of color, so this broader survey, with a broader purpose, needed to have different questions. Norton asked why not do the survey on the web? Langan replied that he had been advised that this was impractical. The motion passed.

13. 02-03 BAA 3 Improving the Retention Rate For African-American Students
M/S/P Reichman/Evuleocha to approve creation of an ad hoc committee on this subject.
14. 02-03 BAA 4 Improving Procedures to Facilitate Diversity Efforts of Faculty Search Committees  M/S Evuleocha/Reichman to place on the Senate agenda. Reichman commented that he might make an amendment on the Senate floor to require early submission of position announcements. The motion passed.

15. CMS Resolution
M/S Reichman/Norton to place on the Senate agenda.
Reichman explained that the Statewide Senate may pass a similar resolution, calling on the Trustees to suspend further implementation of the Common Management System until certain conditions are met. Vice President Richard Metz of Administration and Business Affairs inquired what “suspend further implementation” means. John Charles noted that “version upgrades” are called “implementations” in CMS. Reichman replied that modifications and upgrades of existing software are not considered “implementations” under the sense of this resolution. Caplan pointed out that this was only a resolution, not a policy document. The motion passed unanimously.

The Chair announced that, since we were out of time, the remaining items will be considered at next week’s meeting if time allows.

16. Student Fees in the CSU: Mitigating Their Effects. Discussion of the CSU Senate Resolution *

17. E-mail voting option in University-wide Elections with current election procedures

18. Electronic Voting for University-wide Elections


The meeting was adjourned at 4 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Emily Stoper (substituting for Alex Cassuto)