Minutes of the Meeting of February 1, 2005

Members Present: Calvin Caplan, Denise Fleming, Liz Ginno, Susan Gubernat, Nan Maxwell, Julie Norton, Susan Opp, Henry Reichman, Donald Sawyer, Eric Soares

Members absent: Barbara Paige, Norma Rees


1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Fleming/Maxwell). Sawyer added item #9, Discussion of Bylaws and Constitution Ballot, passed with one nay.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting on January 4, 2004
   M/S/P (Opp/Maxwell) to approve.

3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair
      - Thanked the group for their help in preparing for the last Senate meeting, the planning made a huge difference in making it an effective meeting; Caplan, unanimously supported by the rest of ExCom, thanked Sawyer for his firm and collegial chairing of that meeting and making it an effective and well run meeting.
      - Opening of the Learning Commons at 12noon 2/2/05; Clark noted that in this current year we had to cut over $5MIL in the budget and in doing so had to cut hours of the library. Myoung-ja Lee Kwon and Roger Parker worked together to develop a shared working environment; it’s a marvelous response to meeting student needs in tough economic times.
      - Congratulations and thanks to all who made the Homecoming week a wonderful experience; it was well attended and he had the honor to present the $200 award to the scholarship winner; all of our teams won their events.
      - Upcoming events – Scholar-Olli lectures; Sawyer provided newsletter and membership flyers as well as details on two in February.
      - University Jazz Band Ensemble will be playing at Yoshi’s on 2/28/05 at 8 and 10pm; net proceeds go to the music scholarship fund; Norton and Rees added that there is good food and it is a lot of fun.
      - Handout regarding the Academic Dishonesty Form - Clark asked that ExCom consider approval of his recommendations to change the SS# item to NetID, and, after the “Department Chair’s acknowledgement,” to add the “Dean’s acknowledgement.”
   
   M/S/ (Soares/Caplan) to approve those two changes to the form.

Maxwell asked why adding the dean’s acknowledgement; Clark replied that occasionally we receive incident reports from faculty that could be legally problematic; the Deans have been informed of these areas and some problems could be eliminated, as well as providing the deans an avenue to see what is happening earlier in the process. Soares supported the issue because there have been times when the Fairness Committee has noticed that the deans have not seen the report early enough in the process. Reichman noted that it helps in keeping the dean and students aware of dishonesty issues/policies.

Motion passed.

   - Proposed Timeline for Tenure Track Position Request – the Chair has given this to CAPR to review and has charged CAPR to integrate this into our process. Norton noted that CAPR is very much in favor of the timeline and they would like to add a couple of things – adding a report of the Provost in Fall Quarter and adding COBRA into the process. Clark
noted that the handout includes lists of separations, round 1, and round 2, but that the resignations sheet is missing; 14 individuals listed & 15 positions identified; the resignation is the difference. Opp asked where we stack up regarding previous separations; Sawyer responded that this is June 30 to the present time. Clark noted that the data has been provided before. It depends on how far back you go. This model is to address the erosion of tenure-track positions; We cannot permit further erosion of the regular faculty, to the point that the Budget allows. Looking at the FTE target and resources available, round two deliberations would encompass the historical review of lost positions, programmatic needs, etc., and whatever else you need to use to rebuild the base, as budget permits. Rees noted that we have never caught up and this is part of an attempt to make up for some past losses over the 8 year period and allow us to inch forward as best we can; reminder that the only new money in the budget is for enrollment growth. Reichman noted that you need to factor in the FERP issues – when they actually leave, etc. Clark replied that this is part of the consideration of Round 2; start-up costs, release time, etc., and the Council of Chairs would address these issues; we need to address the issues and differences, not build it into the formula.

- Dr. Keith Boyum, Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and Mr. Allison Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support, visited this campus regarding CSU Graduation Throughput; we were well prepared and they were impressed with us; Clark reported that Boyum’s comment was there is no shortage of creative minds on this campus and Jones commented that we have provided model ideas for other campuses. There was a clear message that we would advance issues IF FUNDED. We were the 4th of 8 institutions they were visiting.

B. Report of the President
- We have been receiving questions from students regarding the name change; the FAQs page is in the process of being updated to let students know that the students graduating and also students currently enrolled will have the choice of their degree to be from either CSUH or CSUEB. Opp noted that that is a great idea and was the only concern she has heard lately. Rees noted that Ray Wallace is looking into how to implement this. Kelly noted that his office has received its first call from a graduating student who wanted their diploma to have CSUEB on it instead of CSUH.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
- Caplan reported that there were comments by West & Reed; budget – there was an increase in the CSU budget, due to enrollment increase funds only; Right now the Governor’s Budget upholds the “compact” - question over whether the governor’s compact funding is floor or ceiling is unknown; applied doctorate independent from UC needs to come with funding, which they can’t or won’t commit; Spence will be leaving in June – no plans to replace him yet per West; Spence was asked about issues facing CSU – development of a smooth path to degree; limit on resources/reduced classes; doesn’t think that online education can correct overcrowding issues and is not a panacea; transfer issues & articulation - common patterns for majors. Rees noted that every community college district is run by its own Board, so approval of this issue statewide will be difficult. Resolutions: 1) Service of Lecturer Faculty on Campus Academic Senates; 2) Response of the California Performance Review’s Proposed Mandatory Community Service Graduation Requirement (voluntary basis); 3) Authority from the Legislature for the CSU to Grant Professional Clinical Doctorates. The Master Plan prevents us from offering professional degrees (Audiology is the one in question, as UC doesn’t offer it). - Reichman noted that two other resolutions passed: 1) a strong resolution on the Reaffirmation of Academic Freedom – Senate Bill 5 response; 2) Academic Freedom for Students (non-academic student complaints). Three resolutions were introduced: 1) Implementation of CMS Administrative Student Module (implementation on a voluntary basis); 2) Support for the Authority for CSU to Grant Independent Professional/Clinical Doctorates; 3) Observing the 50th Anniversary of the CSU as a System and Preserving the History of the CSU and of Each CSU Campus. Other resolutions of interest: 1) on the Patriot Act, 2) CSU archives. All resolutions can be read at: http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/records/resolutions/2004-2005/01-05_resolution_packet.pdf

Compact budget being proposed minus $7M. Mr. Allison Jones, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Support, testified before the Little Hoover Commission (reviews governor’s proposals) on combining CPEC with other organizations and putting both under the new Office of Higher Education and Financial Aid (see http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhcdir/reorg/GRP1.pdf); this threatens the appearance if not the actual work of an independent body, such as CPEC and the California Student Aid Commission, by placing it directly under the governor. CSU is seeking through the legislature some kind
of bill that requires reporting all outside employment by faculty and administrators (some complaints that it should be bargained, not legislated.) Improving advising as part of an ongoing campaign to facilitate graduation – may end up creating best practices report on the issue as receiving new resources to support the idea will not be forthcoming. Karplus asked about the resolution on Lecturer Faculty on Campus Academic Senates – do you see this as encouraging discussion on this topic; Reichman noted that this was to get all academic senates to discuss the issue further. Sawyer invited Karplus to talk with him about this.

4. Appointments:

Bruce Trumbo reappointed to COBRA for Winter 2005;
Terry Soo-Hoo to replace Chen on UIT for Winter 2005;
Phil Hoffstetter to replace Garbesi on UIT for Winter/Spring 2005;
Catherine (Kate) Reed (TED), to replace Chen on CR for Winter 2005.

M/S/P (Caplan/Ginno) to approve the appointments aggregated.

5. **04-05 FAC 3**, Proposed revision to the Constitution and Bylaws

Sawyer thanked Correia for preparing the documents for FAC as well as thanks to the members of FAC for their due diligence working on the issue in order to meet the election deadlines.

M/S/ (Caplan/Fleming) to place on the Senate agenda.

Reichman noted that he will ask to change wording on page 20 on the floor of the Senate. Fleming asked about page 30 - CIC Graduate Subcommittee; Bellone explained the background. Soares asked why are we changing lines 9-10 on page 18; Reichman replied that we are one of very few campuses that restrict senate offices from being held by statewide academic senators; some campuses have reported that it can be very helpful to have a CSU academic senator in an on-campus leadership role as well (an example is when Sac State had a new campus president); felt that eliminating the restriction would provide us with more flexibility. Caplan voiced his concern about narrowing the membership on the ExCom.

Motion passed.

6. **04-05 CIC 12**, Rotation of General Education (G.E.) Clusters

M/S/ (Fleming/Maxwell) to place on the Senate agenda.

Opp asked about timing – when are decisions made; Stoper noted that it ought to occur during Winter Quarter (a call the previous Spring, for Fall deliberations). Caplan asked about a document which identifies 3a (or 4a) degree thematic integration; Murphy noted that this is mainly for continuing clusters; Caplan asked if this kind of information can be made available to the applying departments; Stoper noted that some of this is part of the call to faculty for clusters. Reichman asked about the weighting of the criteria; Murphy noted that the most important criteria is 3c/d. Caplan noted that any priority ought to be written and provided to those applying so that it is a level playing field.

Motion passed, with one abstention.

7. **04-05 CIC 13**, Learning Outcomes for Courses Meeting General Education (G.E.) Performing Arts and Activities Requirement

M/S/ (Maxwell/Opp) to place on the Senate agenda.

Soares asked why the learning outcomes are not delineated. Bellone replied that activities learning outcomes are quite different, the criteria for the outcome is 40% activity.

Motion passed.
8. Discussion of EO 926 (Mary Cheng/John Charles)

Charles pointed out specific items in the statement, starting with page 3. The CSU believed that it was not required to follow the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and subsequent ADA act in that it didn’t have to go back to retrofit websites/pages, etc., only new creation after June 2001. The new Executive Order 926 states that the accessibility requirement does apply to the CSU and that we need to comply with the law (specifically Sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; the guidelines document has yet to be approved.

Cheng provided a couple of examples; accommodation includes timeliness to materials. A deaf student needed a video streaming transcription which ended up taking 3 weeks to obtain. She also asks that faculty consider posting written notes, look at the most practical solutions available. Clark remarked that this is, of course, an unfunded mandate; in the George to Jones memo dated 12-2-04, a suggestion that the CSU Senate needs to provide priorities of what is manageable to implement ASAP versus what is not, noting that faculty need to look at it carefully. Opp asked about the student’s responsibility/timelines. Coming in the first day of class would be difficult. We need lead time; Cheng responded that they work with the students as well; often “staff” is listed in the schedule, which makes early contact difficult. One of the easiest ways to accommodate students is to post the syllabus on Blackboard as soon as possible, so the book would be known. Fleming noted that she tends to send out an early email to students, before class has met, with a list of books for the class, and includes the disability statement in the syllabus; she will add the statement to her email as well; it was suggested that faculty training needs to occur on this issue so that we know what accommodation looks like in practice; students often wait until they’re struggling before they let faculty know that they need specialized services. Caplan noted that there needs to be a clear communication from SDRC as to what faculty responsibility is, what offices they can contact, etc. Soares reported that he has a 70-year-old blind student in his class, who has software for himself (Soares had no knowledge of the handicap, but he saw the cane and asked); Soares is concerned about the physical access as well – say, in Robinson Hall where there is no handicap access.

9. Discussion of Bylaws and Constitution Ballot Draft

Sawyer introduced this – we will be discussing this next Tuesday. Caplan asked about the background information. Sawyer noted that the vote for housekeeping changes will be all or nothing. Reichman noted that we may want to add as part of the heading “deemed by Academic Senate.”

10. Adjournment

M/S/P (Maxwell/Opp) to adjourn at 3:47pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Liz Ginno, secretary