CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of The ACADEMIC SENATE
Approved as corrected

Minutes of the Meeting of April 8, 2003

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

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S (Cassuto/Stoper) to approve.

   Reichman asked that a discussion item on CMS be added to the agenda. It was added as item 9B, and item 9 was renumbered 9A. Sawyer asked to add an item to appointments: appointments to CSUH WASC planning and COT committees. Norton asked that another item be added to appointments: spring CSc replacement to CIC.

   Agenda was approved as modified.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of March 4, 2003
   M/S (Andrews/Sawyer)

   Andrews requested that the minutes be amended to delete most of the sentence from item 12 attributed to her on the last page of the minutes.

   Minutes were approved as modified.

3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair

   Chair Wort reported that Sherman Lewis’ request to add an item to the agenda discussing Smart Growth will be delayed until a later date. There will be a meeting sponsored by the Black Faculty Association and the National Education Association entitled “Black Faculty and Staff and the CSU Campus Climate” in the Biella Room on Friday April 11. He reminded the faculty that President Rees has sent a budget letter to the university community by email discussing the latest developments. He welcomed Joanne Schwab, the new staff member in the Office of the Academic Senate. He also welcomed our new XCOM member, Karina Garbesi. Finally, he reported that Michael Lee, Chair of CAPR, had informed him that CAPR 1 has been amended and will be coming back to XCOM next week.

   B. Report of the President

   Rees was not present. Redmond reminded the faculty that student elections were going to be held soon. She urged faculty to ask students who have shown strong leadership qualities to
consider becoming candidates for office. She also asked the faculty to urge students to vote in the election.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
- Reichman reported that there was a meeting last week of the Statewide Academic Senate. Budgetary issues dominated the discussions.
- Caplan reported that the SAS was very interested in SB-81. This bill would control and even mandate curriculum regarding Teacher Education. The SAS would like to become involved in lobbying against this attempt to legislate curriculum.
- Wort added that there were meetings of the campus Academic Senate Chairs last week in Long Beach. Some of the issues discussed at that meeting will be brought to our own governance committees in the near future.

4. Appointments:
- SEM Recruitment/Admissions/Financial Aid Workshop- no nomination yet.
- M/P (Norton) to appoint Arnie Stoper to CIC for the Spring.
- M/P (Warriner) to appoint Sharon Green to CIC for the Spring.

Sawyer discussed the need for broad university involvement in the WASC process. He reported that there are two general areas where recruitment of committee members is sought. The first is Evidence Committee. The second the six Campus Outcomes Teams (COT). According to Sawyer around 45 individuals from the university community will be asked to populate these committees. No actual appointments were proposed for these seven committees. A timeline will be available next week. Some of these involve summer work. Lecturers may be appointed to these committees. WASC representatives will be at XCOM next week.

5. Approval of the Proposed Spring Quarter Election Schedule.
M/S/P (Cassuto/Stoper) to approve.

6. 02-03 FAC 3 Changes to the Librarian Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policies and Procedures Document
M/S/P (Stoper/Cassuto) to forward to the Academic Senate.

7. 02-03 Proposed Revision to the Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policies and Procedures Document
Martino has asked to be present for the discussion of this issue, particularly the changes made to 3.2.2.

M/S/P (Stoper/Cassuto) to postpone discussion of this item until Martino returns.

8. 02-03 CAPR 5 Philosophy Five-Year Review
M/S (Warriner, Norton) to forward to the Academic Senate.

Stoper began the discussion by asking how the tenure track position requested in the document fits into the department’s primary role as a provider of courses for G.E. Langan
responded that they have more than forty majors and these students are very interested in the areas to be taught. Stoper then asked if the emphasis or focus of the religion area would be Eastern Religions. Langan responded that a person trained in Eastern Religions usually has a background in religious studies as well. There was some discussion of future tenure track allocations in the Department of Philosophy.

Reichman turned the discussion to format, commenting that it seemed to him that the format of the review forwarded to XCOM was different from the format of past years. Lee responded that this was not the case; that the format was taken from last year’s CAPR and the requirements in 00-01 CAPR 7. Lee responded by briefly describing the process involved: CAPR receives a substantial document from the department or program and compresses this into a much briefer document summarizing the strengths and weaknesses of the program and its recommendations. Stoper asked if this was no longer necessary since the Office of the Chancellor only requires learning outcomes. Lee felt this was not quite the case although assessment is now the key element. In the case of Philosophy, the department did not have an assessment plan when the five-year review process began. They now have a tentative plan but this will not be reported on until the next five-year review. Sawyer commented that 180 units are now the minimum required for graduation; departments need to report if their unit requirements exceed 180 not 186 which was the graduation requirement in the past. Caplan asked why nothing was presented for item 5 of the self-study report (comparison with the number of units and offerings of other universities, particularly UC and CSU systems). Lee responded that the outside reviewer had made many suggestions for revisions that were going to be incorporated into programmatic changes by the department CAPR asked Philosophy to do an amended plan and they did. They excelled in some parts so in this case, the omission was not a critical flaw and would not have changed the review.

Program was recommended for continuation with modification, specifically the submission of a five-year plan. Responding to a further comment from Andrews, Lee clarified the issue by informing XCOM that the department had submitted the five-year plan but it was not ready when CAPR made its recommendation. Andrews suggested this be added as a clarifying footnote. There was agreement to this point. Stoper returned to the issue of programmatic comparisons with other institutions. Lee believed CAPR was not concerned with this since changes were being made to the program as the review progressed. Stoper felt this still should have been done since it could be done using the web in a short period of time. Trumbo expressed concern and frustration with the lack of communication between the committees and XCOM. Committees work very hard to produce documents, which are then picked apart by XCOM. Committee members feel a lack of appreciation by XCOM.

Reichman commented that the primary role of XCOM is to ensure that documents are presented properly; substantive issues are the purview of the Academic Senate. He added that XCOM surely appreciates the work of the committees. Wort, speaking for XCOM, thanked all the chairs for their diligence and assured committee chairs that XCOM has high regard for the work of all of the committee members.

Motion passed unanimously.

9.

A. Proposed Creation of Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA).

No motion was initially presented. Instead, XCOM began discussion of the concept. Wort began this discussion with an expression of concern that the President would like to be
present for these discussions. He proposed cutting the administrator review meeting (closed to the public) in half to discuss this proposal in an open meeting with the President from 3:00 to 4:00 on April 22. There was no objection to this.

- Reichman opened the formal discussion by reminding XCOM that this proposal grew out of deliberations at our summer retreat. XCOM felt some urgency to increase meaningful faculty involvement in the budgetary process. All members of the President’s Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), some members of XCOM and CFA participated actively in the discussions. We invited the chair of San Diego State’s faculty budget committee, Gordon Shackelford, to discuss faculty involvement at SDSU, and to explain what documents would be most relevant for faculty understanding of budgetary issues. Shackelford has been chair of his campus budget committee since its inception in the early 1990’s. Reichman also commented that the Trustees of the CSU have encouraged faculty involvement in the budget process at the campus level, as have the SAS and Chancellor Reed. Reichman felt that the current budget crisis is an important reason for more faculty involvement. Finally, he informed XCOM that the proposal cannot be approved by the Academic Senate, but must be approved by a majority vote of the instructional faculty since it changes the bylaws. He then mentioned that we could gather signatures from 5% of the faculty to propose an amendment. Once this is accomplished we would need to put the amendment on a ballot to the faculty. He added that CAPR was being eliminated due to lack of faculty to populate committees.

- Norton added that BAC is a good committee but information is received too late to make a careful recommendation. Rees has asked faculty advice to help with the budgetary process. The group that formulated the current proposal felt that this was a way of providing her with more meaningful input and also a way of educating the faculty.

- Reichman pointed out that the 2002-03 Long Beach State budget, spiral bound and very complete with expenditures and salaries, was printed in January, 2002. This budget report is distributed widely to the campus community. We do not have this kind of information presented to us as faculty or staff who need to know about the budget. Warriner thanked Norton and Reichman and felt this was a really good idea. However she worried about its effect on CIC, since CAPR would be eliminated and some of its responsibilities transferred to CIC. Stoper agreed that we do not have enough information right now but she, too, had serious reservations about this proposal as presented. She agreed with Warriner about the serious implications to CIC’s workload and worried about the possibility that this might discourage faculty from running for this committee. She reminded XCOM that a study had been done during her tenure as Chair of the Academic Senate. Many sister campuses were well ahead of us in budgetary involvement. The proposal to create a budgetary committee died because it was felt that the work involved would be overwhelming at that point. She also felt that the most successful budgetary committees were those where the faculty was embedded into the administrative process and had an ongoing responsibility. She felt that this worked best on growth campuses where there was new money to be spent.

Cassuto felt that this was the opportune time for a new committee. We should not continue to abrogate our responsibilities in the budgetary process. We have a responsibility to the campus to provide our input and recommendations to the President. He concurred with Reichman with respect to the reasons why CAPR was being eliminated, adding that COBRA needed to be populated with senior faculty. Less senior faculty could serve on newly created subcommittees of COBRA and CIC to lessen the workload on the committee members. There are difficult decisions ahead and we should make it clear to President Rees that we are willing to help her. We can be a good resource for her.
Garbesi felt that SDSU’s process is very much a faculty process. Recommendations were then presented to their Academic Senate.

Andrews suggested that CAPR could continue to function as a committee on planning and review, separate from CIC. There was substantial concern expressed with the proposal to eliminate CAPR. Lee, for one, was concerned about the tenure track allocation process. Andrews responded that this function could well go into the new committee but she reiterated her sense that we should add a new committee rather than replacing one committee with another. Langan added that the five-year review process has changed from review to planning. Old method was always a backward looking process. This could be done in CIC or in CAPR as now constituted. Planning would be part of the budgetary process. He advocated keeping four committees. Should the five-year review be transferred to CIC or to a subcommittee of COBRA? He had no preference, but he felt that the budget committee has become the most important committee, when constituted on other campuses. He reiterated the point that we need to make a major change. Five standing committees are hard to staff.

Reichman felt that the proposal was not so much to eliminate CAPR but to create a budgetary committee. As long as planning is not linked to the budget process, the reviews and plans can be logically moved to CIC. The implementation that is proposed would keep CAPR as a committee for the next year; we may decide to keep CAPR after the next year. He disagreed with Stoper on the issue of integration of faculty and administration. CSULBS and SDSU have Presidents who are very favorable toward faculty. Integration is an evolutionary process. Our administration is one that has valued faculty participation. We need to extend this to the budgetary process. The new committee members will have a steep learning curve. Starting from ground zero, it will take time for the committee to gain respect as members learn about our process. He was also perfectly willing to keep five committees since that is not the issue. The issue is having a viable budgetary committee.

Trumbo argued that the budget is the most important element in decisions. Effective decisions will require work. Harking back to Cassuto’s comments he wondered how many senior faculty are more than four years from FERPing. He felt we ought to make this committee our number one governance priority, setting aside some other issues that have lesser priorities. Garbesi added that we must have adequate time and resources to have an effective committee. We should share statewide expertise with our own faculty. Sawyer felt the time for action is now. He hoped there was a critical mass of faculty to serve on this committee. He suggested that this committee would serve as a conduit to advance major faculty issues. He also argued that the five-year review process is important and advocated keeping CAPR as a committee in the future. Caplan expressed concern that one small group of faculty have been working on this issue for a number of months while the rest of the faculty is unaware of the proposal. He advocated not pushing ahead too quickly until the faculty is informed.

Reuter summarized the issues. For decades our faculty has tried to get budgetary input. Power is where the money is. He watched President Rees asking for input and it being given in scattered ways. The faculty hasn’t had the background to give more. It’s time to step up. Stoper concurred. She felt the committee will be faced with a huge amount of work and she wants to make sure the effort is meaningful. We need to have the cooperation of the administration. We need to negotiate the structure of the committee with the administration. Reichman wanted to make the proposed change as soon as possible. He would not be adverse to keeping CAPR and creating COBRA. As far as documents are concerned, all the documents we will request are in the public domain. He agreed that we would be better served if the administration cooperated with our plan. He would like to see the committee
formed and elected before the summer vacation. Trumbo suggested a special Academic Senate meeting on a Thursday; Cassuto suggested this be a general faculty meeting. Evuleocha suggested the faculty be informed in as many ways as possible. McCoy understood Caplan's reservations but felt the time was ripe. He reminded XCOM of the Sonoma State case where sections were to be cut due to a lack of funds. Further inquiry into the budget revealed that the funds were there and the cuts were not made. Warriner reminded XCOM that the Senate has a Blackboard site now and that would be a good place to inform and discuss. Wort expressed his opinion that the ideas that evolved in this meeting were good, but he also advocated keeping CAPR. COBRA should be established as soon as possible, with full support of the faculty and with full disclosure. He was, however, reluctant to bypass the Academic Senate. Reichman suggested a course of action. Keep CAPR, get the signatures for COBRA, and, once that is done, have a special ballot on this issue. Also suggested was a campaign to explain the advantages of this new committee by writing op ed pieces and other articles and letters in the Pioneer. The final agreement was to get the signatures necessary to place this change on a special ballot.

_The remaining items on the agenda were postponed until the next meeting._

17. **Adjournment**

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

Respectfully Submitted,
Alex Cassuto, Secretary