The EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of
the ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as amended

Minutes of the meeting of February 24, 2004

Members Present: Cal Caplan, Denise Fleming, Liz Ginno, Karina Garbesi, William Langan, Julia Norton (Chair), Norma Rees, Hank Reichman, Jeffery Seitz, Steve Ugbah, Alison Warriner, Donald Wort

Visitors: Carl Bellone, Bob Burt, Stanley Clark, Susan Correia, Mark Karplus, Myoung-ja Lee Kwon, Sonjia Redmond, Michael Strait, Robert Strobel, Joe Zelan

1. Approval of the agenda
   (M/S/P) Warriner/Garbesi. Clark asked to add print class schedule vs. electronic; Norton replied that she would address that in her report. Remove items #6, which was taken care of by Stan Clark earlier in the week and #7, as the Chair of FAC was not available to come to the meeting.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting on February 10, 2004
   (M/S/P) Warriner/Fleming. Norton asked that under item 11, WPAF be defined as “working personnel action file” the first time it is listed.

3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair
      -Norton went to the statewide senate chairs meeting and all of the senates are thinking of ways to save money; ideas will be collected and distributed; she also attended the TEKR meeting and will forward the reports to Caplan; 2/20 went to a statistics meeting and spent 3 hours working on how to archive journal articles and the Elsevier issue; 2/25 is the African American Scholarship fundraiser ($35) from 6:00-9:00pm in the UU, and you can buy tickets from Ugbah.
      -Printed schedule—Clark summarized the issue—he attended the last UCL (Layoff) meeting and the issue of the March 1 deadline for the class schedule arose; with so much uncertainty surrounding the budget, department chairs are having a hard time completing their work by the deadline; Clark was asked if we could go to an online schedule vs a printed one; he consulted with Bob Strobel and the college deans, and all were supportive of the idea. They determined that significant time would be saved by having only an online schedule; the impact on students was considered and all felt that the students would benefit by having an online schedule of classes as well. The deadline for an electronic schedule would be May 1; we also will save staff time. Norton remarked that from her experience most students prefer to go online anyway; all agreed. Seitz noted that this is really good news. He then asked about the note that Stoper was supposed to send out regarding the clusters and Bellone answered that the note is almost ready to go out.

   (M/S/P) Langan/Wort moved to approve the move to electronic schedules as soon as possible. Caplan asked if transfer students and counselors use the printed schedules; Strobel replied that the use of the printed schedules are decreasing every year and the change should not prove to be a barrier to these groups. Reichman asked about the archiving of these electronic schedules; Strobel replied that it would be easy to archive the last 3 terms; Garbesi
remarked that we ought to print out each quarter’s schedule of classes to be archived in the
University Library.

-Student rally at noon tomorrow in the UU; please bring your class or come if you can.
-Wort asked if the other campuses are making tenure-track positions a priority; Norton
replied yes, and that no one is looking at laying-off tenure-track faculty.
-April 6 will be a Senate meeting with Faculty Trustee Kathy Kaiser and Bob Cherny,
Statewide Senate Chair, will be there as well; there will also be a 3pm meeting with them in
the Library that day.
-Task Force on Graduate & Post-baccalaureate Education in the CSU has published a
report; if you are interested in reading it, email Norton.

B. Report of the President
-Saturday, 2/21, there was an all-day conference on Mental Health and Wellness focusing
on multicultural perspectives. It was the 4th such institute organized by Melanie Spielman;
very good;
-the bonds are in trouble;
-Riordon, the Governor’s Education Secretary, will be here on Thursday, 2/25, to meet
with campus officials and Rees will be providing him with the CSU assessment of the
teacher education program (the only system to do so); Caplan added that the report also
provides individual campus assessment;
-Rees commended Norton on her involvement with campus activities and general support
for the university and hopes more will follow her lead.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators (AS,CSU)
-Caplan reported that he was appointed as a representative to the CSU Budget Summit;
Beverly Young reported on a new executive order which defines candidates for multiple
subjects and stipulates that they will need to take the approved CA exam; this is different
from single subject competency; Fleming remarked that this is for candidates who start their
program after July 1; Council on Teacher Education meets this week; Caplan commented
that it’s better, as more faculty have had input into it; Reichman noted that it was a product of
“no child left behind” and the requirement that all teachers have competency in their field(s).
Rees commented that the issue of whether CTC will have control of curriculum is the
concern. Seitz added that there was also a requirement that you be well qualified, too, which
may end up requiring that you have a degree in the field. Caplan stated that ‘highly
qualified’ means passing an exam.
-Reichman reported that AS,CSU ExCom met with Bill Hauck, a longstanding trustee
with influence in business and government; we’re hoping to gain more flexibility in dealing
with our budget cuts; March 10-12 is the next statewide senate meeting; and he will be
meeting with COLD in Palm Desert.

D. Report of the ExCom representative to ASI
-Ugbah will attend the rally and meeting tomorrow.

4. Appointments
-Nick Baham will be serving on the African-American Student Retention Subcommittee. His
replacement of Reimonenq on this subcommittee was approved on by an email vote of
ExCom ending on February 17th

5. Report from 03-04 Search Committee for the G.E. Coordinator for 2004-06
-Bellone reported that they met and are working on it.
6. Discussion of the Ad-hoc Lecturer Subcommittee
   -Norton reported that Wort has agreed to serve on the committee instead of Storrer and she
   agrees to serve on it as an ex-officio member.

   (M/S) Ugbah/Warriner to approve the formation of an Ad Hoc Lecturer Subcommittee of
   ExCom and to have the same members as the FAC subcommittee except as reported.

   -Caplan asked if this subcommittee is replacing or serving in parallel with the FAC
   Lecturer’s Subcommittee; Norton replied that this would be different; Reichman asked if we
   could add a question about the adequacy of our evaluation of lecturers; treated as a friendly
   amendment. Caplan asked if this needs to go to Senate; as an ad hoc committee of ExCom,
   the answer is no. Wort noted that this does not mean that FAC could not convene their
   lecturer’s subcommittee; we feel that we need some input on lecturer’s issues and need to
   take the extraordinary step to obtain the input we need.

   Motion passed unanimously.

7. Diploma Issue
   -Concern about some wording being dropped on diplomas; Strobel has informed Norton that
   this was a very preliminary discussion and they would not implement anything without
   bringing it to ExCom for input. Reichman commented that his transcript, not diploma, was
   used for job applications, asked to hear Strobel’s reasoning Clark added that he would be
   asking Strobel about cost of staff time versus priorities. Strobel gave a brief history and
   noted that the office has lost 10 FTES and is trying to balance the value of something versus
   cost. He also mentioned that most of the work is done at the last minute, when there is a
   stress factor. The diploma is a ceremonial document and that the more information on the
   diploma, the smaller the print and the less is read; careers change over time, so details might
   be detrimental to some; and all the pertinent information is in the transcripts which is the
   official student document. Strobel said that he started the consultation process about this
   proposed change. Caplan asked what the arguments were for keeping it on the diploma;
   Strobel replied that because it does provide the information of the student’s
   accomplishments. Garbesi remarked that the passion about the process was the perceived
   lack of discussion not the actual content on the diploma.

8. Presentation and discussion on a "Fundraising Priority-setting Process" (Burt) (3:10)
   -Burt reported that they expect to complete the fundraising campaign for the business and
   technology center this summer ($2,000 short of $9.5M). After this effort has ended, they
   wanted to figure out what the fundraising priorities ought to be (reviewed the handout
   provided). Private support is what makes any university great. Need objectives and
   priorities so that they know what to tell donors about maximizing their gifts; align and focus
   University Advancement resources/staff on major gifts; create a vibrant ‘culture of
   philanthropy’ on campus to help campus employees to think of who to contact; want to raise
   $14M over the next six years; we are at the bottom of the CSUs in terms of investment and
   return; need to prioritize fundraising planning; need to be able to communicate the impact or
   effect of donations for donors; decide what is appropriate for private support; looking for
   single gifts or multi-year pledges of $10,000 or more; Burt then went through the proposed
   fundraising proposal process, description and timeline. The call for proposals would be
   announced in March and results would be reported at the Educational Foundation Board
   Dinner in August and then broadly reported on campus and the community.
- Reichman remarked that he liked the idea as a whole, but has a serious concern about the process because it violates the principles of shared governance as there is no opportunity for faculty involvement; the review team is comprised only of administrators; there is no method for the faculty, elected or otherwise, to make their feelings or priorities known; the timeline exacerbates the problem as most of the work to be done is scheduled during the summer. He also thought that the call for proposals should go to all faculty, rather than just the administrators. Norton agreed and asked that there be a representative faculty body; Seitz asked if faculty could be incorporated into the review team; Burt responded that the review would be done within the Strategic Review body; Rees pointed out that not all of the proposals will come from academic units and that all units need a voice; Caplan remarked that he would prefer to have faculty included in the review team versus creating another reviewing body. Reichman commented that the review team is already comprised of 11 and adding more would make it unwieldy. Garbesi voiced concern about skewing the balance of university activities through private funding; Rees noted that it would be a good idea to canvas the other CSUs which are successful in fundraising and see what has happened at the different campuses; Burt noted that alums are not the biggest donors usually, and that any fundraising activity needs to be balanced. He believes the key to the skewing concern is receiving great proposals. Reichman noted that the process is set up to address some of Garbesi’s concerns and that donors usually give to their passions (i.e. Steve Silberstein’s donation for a free-speech monument to UCB). Ugbah noted that the Chancellor’s Office had asked us to do fundraising a few years back; and regarding item 6, we could plug in ExCom as the entity to provide representatives to the review team. Seitz asked if we would be looking for donations from foundations as well as individuals; Burt answered yes and that they will have someone devote their time to individuals and another person devote their time to foundations/associations/businesses.

9. Elsevier discussion reopened (MIT Resolution sent to ExCom via email)
   - Ginno reported that the Library committee (LFO) has not met yet and will report back.

10. Adjournment
    (M/S/P) Ugbah/Warriner to adjourn at 4:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

Liz Ginno, secretary