EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of The ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of the Meeting of May 6, 2003

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

Member Absent: none

Visitors: Carl Bellone, Susan Correia, Mark Karplus, Frank Martino, Sonjia Redmond, Dvora Yanow, Gale Young

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S (Sawyer/Warriner) to approve.

Wort added a discussion item, an update of WASC activities, as item 12b, changing 12 to 12a. Also added were appointments to the University Instructional Technology committee (UIT) under item 4.

Agenda was approved as modified.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of April 15, 2003

M/S/P (Andrews/Cassuto)

Stoper was profusely thanked for her excellent minutes as substitute secretary.

3. Reports:

A. Report of the chair

Wort congratulated Sonjia Redmond who was appointed Vice President, Student Affairs. He mentioned that there will be a tribute/dinner to Mack Lovett honoring his thirty-five years of service to the University. The dinner will be on May 21 in UU101 and will cost $35/person attending. He urged faculty from CBE and CSc to consider two appointments, one from each college, for the Strategic Enrollment Management Student Experience and Retention Committee. This committee meets once every month on Wednesday.

B. Report of the President

Rees also congratulated Redmond and reported that the search committee had done a marvelous job. All the finalists were extremely well qualified. She reported that the Board of Trustees would be meeting Tuesday and Wednesday of next week. The CSUH Business and Technology building will be considered on two separate occasions, once to name the building after the major donors, Wayne and Gladys Valley, and also in the discussion of Plant and Grounds to approve the “footprint” of the building. The Trustees will consider the issue of student fee increases on Wednesday. In response to a question, she noted that the May budget revise will be published on May 14. On May 20 there will be another legislative day. She will be in Sacramento along with Bob Brauer. Rees mentioned that she had sent out an email to the University community covering
the University position on SARS. She reiterated what she had reported in Senate: no unusual steps will be taken for graduation regarding families or relatives of graduates visiting the US from SARS infected areas. As long as the Center for Disease Control allows travel there is no reason to make adjustments. Wort added that there is a blackboard discussion on the proposed new budget committee. He also outlined the remaining meetings: May 13 and 27 for XCOM, May 20 and June 3 for Senate. The new Senate will be seated on June 3.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

Reichman reported that the Senate will meet this week and a new Senate and new, elected, Executive Committee will be seated on Friday.

4. Appointments and Nominations:

a. M/S/P (Stoper/Reichman) the replacement of Paul Bassen by Jennifer Eagan on the Critical Thinking subcommittee of CIC.

b. Affirmative Action Liaison Officer. XCOM will need to appoint a new AALO. Langan’s term will end this June. Wort spoke with Langan who reported that FDEC will meet tomorrow and he expects them to put forward a candidate. Evuleocha, a member of FDEC added that the meeting date is May 14 rather than May 7. While this leaves XCOM with little time to consider the nomination, Wort felt it could be approved before the end of the academic year.

c. University Honors Program Director. XCOM will need to replace the current director. A letter will be sent shortly to all faculty soliciting nominations. The issue discussed was the number of units to allocate to this function. Currently the function carries twelve units of assigned time but it has carried either eight or twelve in the past. Cassuto received eight units in 01-02 and twelve in 02-03. Cassuto argued for twelve units since the function carries substantial time commitments every quarter including summer. He mentioned some of the main responsibilities of the honors director. Martino argued against this solely on the basis of budget constraints. He noted that 13% of faculty time is devoted to uncompensated release time and, in the current economic situation, something must give. He suggested that the call for nomination guarantee four units of release time in fall and possible additional units as the budget is clarified. Rees asked when the heavy time constraints are likely to occur. She felt it would be fall and spring. Cassuto agreed that these were the heaviest times but that contacts with students and faculty occur all the time. Reichman advocated eight units with twelve if the budget permits. At this point the discussion was sliding toward item 5. Wort suggested we place the nominations of UIT as item 5b and the report of the University Honors Director as item 5a.

5 a. Report of the University Honors Program Director

Cassuto reported on the activities of the program for the past year. Students enrolled in fifty-eight courses for honors credit, thirty-five in ALSS, eight in CBE and fifteen in CSc. The Departments of Philosophy and History were the two departments with the most courses taken by honors students. Forty-five students are currently active in the program. Sixteen honors students were majors in ALSS, nine in CBE, one in CEAS, twelve in CSc, four undeclared and three in Liberal Studies (ALSS). The honors program will have a reception for honors students, honor faculty and guests next week, May 15 in the Bookstore, from 3:00-4:30. Twenty-five students will receive certificates of participation for their work during the 02-03 academic year. He also reported that fifty-two faculty had had at least one student in a class
taking that class for honors credit. The program had two graduates last year, four this year and he expects at least eight next year. Events, besides the reception mentioned above, included a day at the Theatre (Chorus Line) and a luncheon.

Discussion briefly returned to the issue of units for the new director. Cassuto argued that communication with students and faculty occurs on a daily basis. Students need to be informed about the program’s requirements and raise numerous questions regarding applicable coursework. Many of the honors faculty are lecturers who are seeing their first honors student and need guidance with regard to requirements. Cassuto also mentioned that junior faculty may have a problem doing research and publishing since the Honors Program takes about 10-15 hours/week. He will carry it through the summer. Wort ended the discussion by suggesting that the nomination call state that a minimum of four and a maximum of twelve units will be given to the director, subject to budgetary constraints. Cassuto was commended by ExCom for his work in reviving this program.

5 b. Appointments to the UIT

The Chair suggested the following appointments:

- **ALSS:** For the term that expires 6/03, Karina Garbesi has indicated a willingness to continue for a new two-year term.
- **CBE:** For the term of Hadi Bezad that expired 6/02, Craig Johnson is willing to serve for the remainder of the unexpired term until 6/04.
- **CEAS:** For the term that expires 6/03 Li-Ling Chen has indicated a willingness to serve for a new two-year term.
- **CSc:** For the term that expired 6/02, Chris Morgan is willing to serve for the remainder of the unexpired term until 6/04.

M/S (Caplan/Evuleocha) to appoint.

Stoper added that these are difficult positions to fill because UIT meets Thursdays from 10-12. She wondered if the faculty being appointed knew the meeting time. Wort indicated that the nominated faculty knew the meeting time. Garbesi asked when the term of the ALSS representative would expire. Wort indicated that the current term for the ALSS representative would be until June/05.

Appointments were approved

6. **02-03 CAPR 6 Name Change Request by the Department of Public Administration**

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

Cassuto noted that a change, which incorporated the title Public Affairs, would suggest an overlap with both Political Science and Economics. He asked if these two departments had been consulted. Yanow replied that Political Science had been consulted but Economics had not. Stoper added that she had also raised the same question and had done a search on the Internet using the phrase Public Affairs and saw that the closest match to that phrase was Public Relations. Did PUAD really want this association? Yanow answered that the accrediting body for PUAD is NASPA, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration. She added that persons looking for the program in health administration or metropolitan management would not think of looking under the Department of PUAD. Caplan suggested that consultation with other affected departments should be undertaken before the Senate meeting.

Motion passed.
7. 02-02 CIC 14 Retention of Infrequently Offered Courses

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

8. 02-03 CIC 15 Application of MLL 3611, New Chinese Cinemas, to Area C4 for the 88/96 and 96/98 G.E. Patterns

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

Reichman suggested that approval by CIC be automatic for these cases. These should all be grandfathered-in without being considered by other faculty committees.

Motion passed.

9. 02-03 CIC 16 Application of MLL 3831, Experiencing Japanese Culture, to Area C4 for the 1988/96 and 96/98 G.E. Patterns

M/S (Warriner/Garbesi) to forward to the Academic Senate.

Reichman dittoed this case.

Motion passed.

10. 02-03 CIC 17 Proposed new option in Theoretical and Applied Statistics, MS in Statistics.

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

Norton indicated that this was just the old MS degree in Statistics. The department has created other options and decided that the basic degree also be considered an option.

Motion passed.

11. 02-03 CIC 18 Academic Probation for Unclassified Postbac Students

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

12 a. 02-03 CIC 19 Proposed Change in the CIC Policies and Procedures, which adds a Graduate Program Subcommittee

M/S (Warriner/Evuleocha) for approval by the Executive Committee

Garbesi wondered if it might be appropriate to consolidate some of the subcommittees of CIC since there seemed to be quite a bit of overlap. Reichman responded, in part, that this is already a committee, but not of CIC. This proposal moves the committee into faculty governance. Bellone added that the documents always have to go through CIC. Caplan asked if the committee met often. It could be ad hoc. Bellone responded that they met once per quarter. Reichman added that we need a graduate committee to consider graduate curricular issues since 29% of our students are graduate students. Stoper, responding to Garbesi’s question, added that we have this particular structure because we need structured committees with particular expertise to consider particular issues. Andrews made three points. The first was that this committee was a good idea since it will provide a link
to the curricular process. She wondered why the structure of the committee was not specified in the document. Bellone, responding quickly to this point, noted that the structure was on the back of the document. It was agreed that membership should be included in the Policies & Procedures document. Finally, Andrews reminded everyone, in reference to the discussion of the honors program, that graduate advisors work very hard, for just a few units of assigned time, to maintain the graduate programs.

12 b. Discussion of the WASC Process

Bellone announced that the initial meeting of the WASC COT’s (Communities of Teaching) will be held on May 7 at 3:30 in UU 311. Some issues that will be considered by these committees overlap the duties of standing committees. He assured everyone that the university committees have the “trump cards”, in case of overlap. The WASC COT’s will only advise, they cannot make policy. Suggestions from the teams must go through the formal faculty governance process. Reichman expressed his disappointment with the number of COTs. After faculty consultation the WASC committee had reduced the number of committees from twelve to six but we are now back to twelve. Bellone said that WASC seriously grappled with this. Young responded that the WASC-2000 committees often had too many issues to consider. The current WASC committee felt this was the only way to deal with all of the issues. The committees are teamed up to share data and results, which will be beneficial.

No action was necessary.

13. Discussion of the Exact Wording on the Ballot Regarding the Proposed Bylaw Changes and the Addition of Another question Regarding the Elections of COBRA Members, should the Amendment Pass.

Reichman advocated a very simple ballot “Do you approve or disapprove of the proposed changes in the bylaws” and, a second question, valid only if the amendment is approved “Do you approve or disapprove of skipping the nomination phase of the election process in order for elections to be completed in the current academic year.” If the latter failed we would conduct regular elections in the fall.

Evuleocha advocated that the complete information outlining the changes being voted on be included in the “packet”. Stoper agreed, citing California ballot precedent. Garbesi suggested having it on the web since a hard copy was already distributed. Caplan disagreed with Stoper; the voter pamphlet has the full explanation not the actual ballot. Reichman suggested that Excom defer to the Senate Office to decide how many trees to destroy. Consensus was to provide the proposed changes again, with the ballot.

14. Recommendations from the CSU Senate, FAC, regarding the Effects of the Budget Cuts on Lecturer Positions.

Wort , citing the FAC document, indicated that there were various possibilities that are consistent with the CBA. Caplan wondered what we were to do with this document. Reichman responded that this should be shared with the campus community. He asked the Chair to send copies to all department chairs and also provide it to lecturers so they can understand their choices. Stoper added Deans and any other interested faculty to the list of recipients. Caplan mentioned that we don’t want to mislead anyone. Martino indicated some concern with one part of the document. This part suggested that leaves without pay was a right of part time lecturers. He believes this is an incorrect interpretation of the CBA. In fact these requests are not honored for non-entitled lecturers. Entitled lecturers usually do receive approval. Norton
added that, before the CBA, these issues were decided on an individual case by case basis. Leaves could help a department facing tight budgets. Karplus urged that open communication between departments and lecturers be recommended by the administration. Reichman, with insider information regarding the circumstances of the document, urged again that it be distributed to all.

Rees, when asked how she will deal with budget cut, replied that she wants to continue to serve the students but that she cannot do her job of protecting students if she does not have a substantial level of flexibility. Karplus believed it will be difficult for departments to made plans for next year. He reiterated that lecturers do not have full information on the issues covered in this document. He advocated informing and involving lecturers in the budget process. Rees and Martino both indicated that there is very little information to share since the current situation is so unclear.

Stoper suggested the document be sent out to chairs with a cover letter explaining the possibilities. She suggested that the Chair work with the Provost or Deputy Provost to do a cover letter. Martino did not agree. Once the economic situation is clearer, he thought that this set of suggestions might make a lot of sense. Some are useful and some not. Garbesi disagreed noting classes have already been cut and the document is useful. Martino countered that departments should be developing scenarios; as more information is received, scenarios can be refined. Reichman argued that the lecturers themselves can only determine many of the issues. Sawyer pointed out that the scenarios involve cuts of 5, 7 and 10%. The department’s objectives are to protect its programs. As the level of cuts increases different options are likely as Martino has described. Caplan suggested that the information may be more useful at a later date as more information is known. Karplus advocated a letter drafted and sent by XCOM. The Chair disagreed noting the need to work with the Office of the Provost. Warriner noted that her department has many lecturers. This information would be useful for chairs and lecturers to know what options really exist and to ease the situation. Most lecturers do not know that any options exist.

M/S/P (Stoper/Caplan) to have the Senate chair send out a list of suggestions with a cover letter developed in consultation with the Provost.

At this point the Chair suggested adjournment but asked for suggestions regarding items 16 and 17 of the agenda. Both deal with electronic information and voting. Stoper felt that privacy must be maintained in the voting process but generally supported electronic voting. Martino added that it was not complicated to do a double blind voting system. Caplan wondered which standing committee would have voting oversight. Reichman noted that XCOM has always been so designated. Stoper stated that she thought faculty should always have the option of a paper ballot. On that note the meeting ended.

18. Adjournment

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

Respectfully Submitted,
Alex Cassuto, Secretary