Members Present: Dana Edwards, Kris Erway, Karina Garbesi, Armando Gonzales, Dave Larson, José A. López (Chair), Nancy Mangold, Saeid Motavalli, Don Sawyer, Bruce Trumbo, Don Wort

Members Absent: None

Visitors: Bob Brauer, Stanley Clark, Terrence Kelly, Dick Metz, Norma Rees, Dave Travis, Gale Young

1. Agenda approved with no additions. M/S Sawyer/Motavalli

2. Approval of the minutes of the November 19, 2004 meeting

   Approved as corrected. M/S Garbesi/Sawyer

3. Report of the Chair

   López began by discussing the progress and accomplishments of the COBRA Committee during the past year, which largely consisted of planning and information gathering. He stated that the objectives for the Committee during the current year are significant, and thanked the Committee members for their willingness to contribute to the Committee’s work. With the adoption of Committee Goal Statements and the formation of the ad hoc Committees, the efforts of COBRA will be more specifically focused. López introduced Terry Kelly of the Philosophy Department, who is replacing Larson on COBRA.

4. Goals—Ad Hoc Committees’ Progress Reports

   Garbesi and Erway discussed plans for the ad hoc Committee on developing standard budgetary reporting. Garbesi has been preparing a spreadsheet of what kinds of information COBRA will need from the various campus units. López suggested that this list be reviewed by someone with accounting expertise before being finalized.

   Wort has met with Clark to discuss ideas on developing a campus recovery plan and will meet with individual vice presidents on campus for identification of the needs of their specific areas. Rees commented that after the WASC reporting process is completed the campus will have a strong basis for University-wide
recovery planning. López and Sawyer have met with CAPR to discuss coordination of the efforts of COBRA and CAPR, and will continue with this goal. Coordination with WASC will be discussed by Gale Young as part of Agenda item 4.

López distributed a list of proposed questions for COC Members and the appropriate Library representatives regarding faculty involvement in the budget development process in the Colleges and the Library. These questions will be provided in advance to the COCs and to the Library representatives, who will address these questions when they meet with COBRA. López asked which individuals should be invited from the Library, since the Library does not have a COC. Edwards suggested that the Library Faculty Organization, comprised of all Library faculty members, be invited, or perhaps a set of representative members of this group. López and Edwards agreed to discuss this issue further. Discussion then commenced about the process for receiving input from the COCs. Should all Chairs be invited, or just a representative number? Sawyer stressed that the fundamental question is how the COCs provide input to the Deans. Mangold suggested providing the questions to the COCs for feedback, and then inviting individual COC members to meet with COBRA. López indicated that the questions are provided for the purposes of preparing for the meetings, not for feedback prior to the meetings. Larson said that not all COC members are likely to attend, but that some may provide feedback to COBRA even if they don’t attend. Garbesi suggested the COBRA try to meet with all COC members if possible. Would others on campus be able to attend? López said that COBRA’s meetings are public and anyone can attend if they wish. COBRA will reserve the Biella Room in the Library for these meetings if it is available.

Trumbo suggested that the COCs also discuss additional funding concerns besides faculty hiring, such as departmental supplies, resources for the Library, major equipment, and other resources. Motavalli added that IRD funding might also be discussed. Sawyer felt that it will be important to find out how the Chairs are involved in the overall College budgets and what processes take place in the determination of funding decisions that support the goals and objectives of the Colleges. Garbesi felt that the broader issue of how Chairs are involved in developing the vision and setting priorities for the Colleges must be discussed. Mangold suggested that more general questions, such as “What is your budget process?” and “What is the consultation process?” might better address these larger issues. López stressed that it is important to remember our scope and timeframe. Edwards felt that some of the questions will have to be restated somewhat to be relevant for the Librarians’ input, and will work with López on doing so. Wort suggested adding to question 4 in order to inquire about the Deans’ flexibility regarding FTE targets in the Colleges. López will revise these questions and distribute them to COBRA for feedback.

Mangold suggesting providing a 1 hour meeting time for each group. It was agreed that this was a good plan.
5. Report of WASC by Co-Chair, Gale Young

López discussed the need for COBRA to understand the resource implications of the WASC process, and introduced Gale Young, WASC Co-Chair. Young expressed thanks for the opportunity to address COBRA. Sawyer congratulated the WASC team for their “outstanding report.” Young brought attention to the last three pages of the WASC Conclusion document, which discusses Academic Quality, Campus Climate, Support for Student Success, Faculty Learning Community, Culture of Evidence, and Coordinated University-wide Planning. She stated that the relationships between the WASC groups and faculty governance will be critical to the success of the process. She felt that the report reflects on and analyzes CSUH’s educational effectiveness, in discussing both achievements and limitations. The areas discussed in the Conclusion are “the most important things CSUH can and should do.” Regarding Academic Quality, Sawyer expressed thanks for monies provided to Departments while they are under review, citing the example of $32,000 provided to two Colleges this year. Rees discussed a meeting earlier in the morning with a Social Work accreditation official, in which outcomes assessment was discussed. Several programs are tied to specialized assessment with specific learning outcomes. Clark stated that assessment and time to degree are two of the major focuses of the Board of Trustees. Young discussed faculty involvement as pilots in best practices activities. Clark mentioned an upcoming statewide conference on educational assessment. One faculty member from every College on campus will receive funding for attendance.

It was recognized that the workload implications and the funding for the WASC process are major concerns. Rees said that the campus has to complete the WASC process with the resources it has, and that new resources are not provided for this purpose. Sawyer acknowledged the work of the WASC group that created the Campus Climate survey, and discussed the 7 principles which have gone before the FAC and will go before the Academic Senate. Kelly asked what the workload implications might be for the retention of new faculty, and López discussed the heavy workload of a new faculty member in his Department. Clark stated that the CSU has, since 2000, conducted a faculty recruitment survey, and that the Deans have been provided with this data. The Legislature has been focusing on assessment, and assessment activities can have very positive real results. Young stated that WASC is focused on academic quality, regardless of the current budgetary situation. Sawyer wished to bring attention to the “doing good things in tough times” statement in the WASC report which acknowledges this situation. López extended an invitation for Young to work closely with COBRA in the future.

6. New business

Due to time constraints, there was no new business.
7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:59 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Edwards, Secretary