Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting of May 18, 2004

Members Present: Cal Caplan, Denise Fleming, Liz Ginno, William Langan, Julia Norton (Chair), Hank Reichman, Jeffery Seitz, Donald Wort

Members Absent: Karina Garbesi, Norma Rees, Steve Ugbah, Alison Warriner

Guests: Carl Bellone, Stanley Clark, Susan Correia, Chief Janeith Glenn-Davis, David Larson, Anna Powers, Sonjia Redmond

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Ginno/Caplan) as amended.
   Caplan asked to add Central Scheduling of classrooms – will add to Norton’s report. AALO Report moved to the end.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting on April 27, 2004 (May 11, 2004 not yet available)
   M/S/P (Langan/Caplan) to approve.

3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair
      • June 1 is the Budget Summit (1-2:30, Biella Room; Senate meeting 2:45-4pm); Reichman asked that we have reports done in written form (Norton has requested this already) because of the other event happening (Angelides, Huffington, etc.);
      • Cuts to the Senate Office budget – Norton was asked to submit a proposed budget with a 15% cut. Could be a paperless office next year;
      • Spring Elections results: Lecturer representatives to Senate are Mark Karplus and Mike Schutz; Student Services representative to the Academic Senate is Rebecca McCormack; Student Services representative to CAPR is Michelle LaCentra; Student Services representative to CIC is Rosanne Harris;
      • Caplan’s question re: who is responsible for providing for malfunctioning equipment during lectures in “Centralized Classrooms”; Clark suggested that we bring this issue to John Charles’ attention so that it can be discussed at UIT – was so M/S/P (Wort/Caplan). It was also suggested that Strobel and Welsh be invited to that meeting.

   B. Report of the President
      No report

   C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
      Reichman reported that he was appointed the Chair of a Standing Committee of the CSU Academic Senate; he will chair the Fiscal and Governmental Relations Committee. Caplan applauded Reichman’s accomplishment and remarked that this attests to Reichman’s hard work.

   D. Report of the ExCom representative to ASI
      No report.

4. Appointments
   UIT Science representative needed; Norton will nudge for the other openings.


   M/S/P (Wort/Fleming) to send to Senate.
6. **03-04 CAPR 3, Special Major Program, Five-Year Review**

M/S/P (Fleming/Wort) to send to Senate. It was remarked that there seems to be a decline in the number of students and wondered about the impact on resources. Bellone answered that fewer students means less extra-work for faculty; not dramatically advertised, since it involves more work; students might be happier with major choices offered now. Langan remarked that these students seem to be the brightest and hard working, and agreed that it is good that we offer this program.

7. **Annual Report, Affirmative Action Liaison Officer (AALO)**

David Larson provided a printed draft report and thanked Langan, the previous AALO, for nominating him to the role of AALO and answering inquiries. Larson reported that CSUH launched 23 tenure track faculty searches and successfully hired 15 with 3 searches still active (60% women, 40% male). Wort asked about FDEC Achievements #5 which comments on devising new measures to diversify lecturers; Larson replied that this refers to reaching out/outreach to those outside the university, and that budget constraints made that a lesser priority this year. Clark noted that legally we need to continue to make efforts to diversify the pools of lecturers (as well as faculty).

M/S/P (Langan/Caplan) to commend Dr. Larson and the Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee (FDEC) for their work, and to accept the report as provided.

As the number of faculty searches diminish due to present budget constraints, Larson suggested that the AALO get a reduction to one course release time next year (reducing the WTUs from 8 to 4), for reasons of fairness and equity – and suggested that perhaps, in the future, release time for the AALO ought to be on a sliding scale, as searches increase again. Langan stated that this suggestion was a significant step and commended Larson for the suggestion.

M/S/P (Langan/Reichman) to reduce the AALO WTUs to 4, and to refer to FDEC a charge to create policy/procedures for a sliding scale of release time: searches.

8. **Change of Department Name (Glenn-Davis, Chief of Police)**

Vice President Redmond introduced Chief Janeith Glenn-Davis who has asked the President to change the name of the department from Public Safety to University Police Department. Chief Glenn-Davis submitted the request on May 5th and has asked for Executive Committee comment on the proposed change. Public Safety is usually used to denote an entity which oversees/houses a variety of services (fire, environmental health and safety, etc.). Many Public Safety departments are also staffed by non-sworn personnel; the CSU has police officers because of the standards set in California (training, experience, etc.). (Security officers are required to have a minimum of 4 hours training versus police officers who have a minimum of 664 hours of training). The advantage of the change in department name to University Police Department is that it more clearly defines the responsibilities and role of the department and the perception of the higher qualifications of the officers. Langan noted that 20 years ago it was deemed too harsh and was not a popular term. The climate has changed. Seitz noted that it seems a very reasonable request, as the badges, patrol cars, labels etc. are “university police.” It was noted that Parking Enforcement is a
separate unit/division. Functions often cross for the officers, but not for the employed students and Community Service Officers.

M/S/P (Caplan/Ginno) that ExCom concur with the name change.

9. **03-04 FAC 7**, Changes to the Bylaws of the University Faculty, and **DRAFT BEC-10**, Proposed alternate method for obtaining Staff Representation on the Academic Senate

M/S/P (Caplan/Fleming) to send to Senate.

Norton offered the draft BEC-10 to provide a solution to have staff representation to the Academic Senate, rather than eliminating it. Reichman noted that we need to define what “staff” means, i.e. MPP. Wort noted that there are other campuses that elect staff representation in the manner offered; Fleming noted that the representative would not be elected by its electorate. She didn’t think cost should be a defining factor. Anna Powers offered that Staff Connections could possibly appoint, but cannot hold elections. Human Resources and ICS may be able to work together to create a staff database. Reichman noted that there are multiple bargaining units involved. Langan agreed about defining staff properly and including “not represented by other groups”. Seitz noted that at worst this is a stop-gap policy that offers representation now and can be changed in the future. Caplan suggested that until some method of representation is created, the information role of the Senate staff person(s) ought to be sufficient. Langan remarked that it is a legislative body for a voice of the faculty, and therefore the Senate can elect the staff member.

M/S/ (Wort/Langan) to amend the motion to include background information to reflect ExCom discussion. Motion passed with one abstention.

Reichman recommended that the background to BEC-10 be fleshed out and more thorough before sending to Senate. Langan supported the suggestion and suggested that we remove “and Auxiliaries” and add the MPP as excluded from the definition of ‘staff.’

10. **03-04 FAC 8**, Changes to the University Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and Procedures Document

M/S/ (Fleming/Reichman) to send to Senate.

Wort remarked, and Reichman seconded, that the document may need to be divided into two motions, 3.1.3 and then 4.2.2.a.

Wort noted that the references to 3.1.3 are useful, but he doesn’t approve of the early promotion proposal. He believes that the faculty committee should decide. Clark noted that in the cover letter that in section 3.1.3 ought to read “University Promotion and Tenure Committee” not “Promoting” under (3); but noted a bigger issue is 4.2.2. He will be meeting with the University PTR committee next week and asked for clarification on 4.2.2.a and 9.3 Criteria – page 19 (in the University PTR Policies and Procedures document) as the criteria seem to differ. 9.3 seems to indicate primacy to instructional achievement and 4.2.2 says either. Wort noted the primacy of instruction and the requirement of “evidence of extraordinary” achievement ought to be defined by the departments on an individual basis. Reichman could see the inconsistency and Clark’s concern, but thought it should go forward to the Senate. Langan said that 9.3 is not necessarily logically inconsistent, but that language may need to be changed. Clark stated that if it can be mis-read, and its purpose is
a guide to faculty, then the language should be cleaned-up. Caplan added to FAC’s charge to make sure they review all sections that have to do with early promotion. Reichman argued against sending it back to FAC and voiced concern about not sending it to Senate for open discussion. He thought it unfair to send it back for an issue we didn’t ask them to consider. Fleming thought it was best not to waste Senate time on something that we know is flawed. Debate continued on the subject of perceived inconsistency and whether to send it back to FAC.

M/S (Caplan/Langan) to refer back to FAC.

Langan also suggested that the referral to FAC include the request to also provide substantive background information for the change to 4.2.2.a and for taking a look at the seeming inconsistencies with 9.3. Motion passed.

11. Adjournment

M/S/P (Fleming/Langan) to adjourn at 4:06pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Ginno, secretary