Minutes of the Meeting of March 29, 2005

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

Members absent: None

Visitors: Carl Bellone, John Charles, Karina Garbesi, Mark Karplus, Dave Larson, Dick Metz, Emily Stoper, Joe Zelan

1. Approval of the agenda
   Sawyer noted that #10 has a time certain of 3:40pm and the revised agenda adding the report from John Charles was posted to the web and emailed to ExCom.
   M/S/P (Maxwell/Soares) to approve as amended.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meetings on February 1, 2005 & February 8, 2005
   M/S/P (Norton/Soares) to approve the minutes of February 1, 2005, as presented
   M/S/P (Soares/Maxwell) to approve the minutes of February 8, 2005 with typo fixed by changing 3A, 6th paragraph to read “very much likes.”

3. Reports
   A. Report of the chair
      - The College Allocation Letter was approved by ExCom via email, noting that CEAS lost a position, which Science gained;
      - The Interim Provost has suggested that the Fall Convocation become a “combined” event, having both faculty and staff attend together and asked Sawyer for input from ExCom; Norton agreed that it would be great to have both together to acknowledge awards to both groups; the group voiced its approval of the idea;
      - Upcoming 50th anniversary of the campus; Rees noted that 1957 is the starting year, so 2007 would be our ‘golden jubilee;’ Provost wants to start putting together a planning committee; Caplan noted that at the last Statewide Senate meeting there was a second reading of “Observing the 50th Anniversary of the CSU as a System and Preserving the History of the CSU Second Reading and of Each CSU Campus” (AS-2684-05); Sawyer, Caplan & Opp expressed interest in serving on the CSUEB planning committee; members of the committee would also gather and archive information on the history of the University; former faculty and administrators will be invited to the jubilee events.
      - WASC team finished our capacity report; the Chair thanked all the faculty who participated; visiting team made several positive comments regarding the faculty – committed to teaching and scholarship, thought COBRA and CRUMBS (Committee on Reporting Utilization and Monitoring of Budget Systems) were great tools for faculty participation; they will be back in 12-18 months; need to review and prioritize the 17 report outcomes and provide feedback to the WASC team; thanked Carl Bellone and Gail Young for all their work; Rees noted that the WASC chair stated that this is a very good institution, and reminded the group that some goals cannot be delayed, for example, dealing with student learning outcomes and wanted for all to be clear that this can’t be set aside, and also noted that a lot of the list has already been accomplished;
      - Provost Clark’s “Proposed Timeline for Tenure Track Position Request For Searches in 2005-06” has been our general guideline this year and is getting folded into a new CAPR
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document; as the colleges get their allocations, we need to put the search committees together as quickly as possible so that job descriptions can be written and advertisements can be posted early in the summer; a second round in July is a possibility, depending upon our resources; departments should be prepared for the possibility of a second round; the Provost provided a spreadsheet to show the status of our current searches - we have 16 offers outstanding, 2 declined, and the remainder of the 30 searches are still in process;

- “CSU Presidents’ Commission on Teacher Education to Prepare and Recruit Quality Teachers in Credential Areas” – an email from Carl Bellone, AVP Academic Programs & Grad Studies, noted that the Board of Trustees recommended that faculty Senates review the PTR processes “in order to incorporate criteria acknowledging the contribution of faculty who participate in the preparation of prospective teachers”; Sawyer stated that he intends to pass this onto FAC; Reichman responded that this recommendation was quite controversial at the statewide Senate meeting in March - this came from a president’s task force, and PTR policy is the purview of the faculty. He also noted on our campus, there are no separate PTR policies for each college; Caplan noted that in his committee (TEKR), they enquired whether there were faculty members on the commission and were assured that there were, but the names were not recognized, nor was there memory of statewide senate appointments to the commission; Opp noted that her department is struggling with the issue of what to do with faculty involved in teacher training – junior faculty are not clear how this activity is regarded; Fleming stated that with only the one email to discuss, there isn’t a lot of background to the issue, for what purpose in what category etc.; just would like to understand the charge to us before we pass it onto FAC; Rees pointed out that item #10 on the WASC grid refers to a goal regarding investigating faculty experiences with the PTR process; Sawyer noted that in the WASC exit interview it was recommended that expectations be detailed at the unit level; Reichman replied that the problem is not the recommendation, but the context in which the request comes to us – and mandating that we incorporate certain criteria into the PTR process --- we ought to decline because we already have reviewed our PTR process, and will be researching this issue via WASC; Sawyer will meet with Bellone and the Deans to discuss the process and may come back with a recommendation on how to proceed;

- Sawyer distributed a communication from Mark Karplus, Lecturer Representative to the Senate, regarding increasing the number of Lecturer Representatives on the CSUEB Academic Senate – Sawyer wondered whether it should be referred to FAC; Reichman noted that this could be discussed initially by FAC, but that the Bylaws can be amended by petition as well; Caplan pointed out that the process is found in Article 10, Section 3c and that there are 3 ways to accomplish this;

- The Chair distributed a list of Senate and Standing Committee members which noted continuing members. He asked ExCom to encourage faculty who can be effective to place themselves on the college ballots for Spring Quarter, 2005 elections;

- Invited all to Scholar-Olli, 4-5:30, in the Biella Room, Ken Blady “The Jewish Immigration Experience.” Rees noted that this program is getting its 3rd $100,000 grant; if we wanted to get the $1M grant, we need to bring the 240 memberships up to 300;

- Science Festival is on April 16th.

B. Report of the President

- Tonight is a Lepore Society ($1,000+ donors) event – Scott Stine will be speaking to the group, She noted that this is an opportunity for faculty speakers; next week she and Bob Brauer will be in Washington, D.C. to meet with the Latin American caucus and to walk the halls and meet with legislators; the week after, they will be in Sacramento meeting with legislators; Rees asked that we try to remember to refer to the “university community” versus the “campus” in situations that make sense to do so;
- Reichman asked about the student module of CMS that will be going online with CSUSLO in the Fall; Charles answered that we are about one year behind and are scheduled to launch in January 2006, and scheduled to go online with all modules in Fall 2007; with the delay we feel that we have managed the risk; we have negotiated an exit strategy regarding the shared mainframe; we have one of our staff members at SLO to see first hand how the change goes; Caplan asked what will happen on our campus 2005-06; Sys+ system will be used and supported by CSUSLO, we will need to be busy ramping up for the future while still maintaining the old – everyone will be impacted; it is extra work maintaining both systems.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
- Reichman noted the tenor of the faculty/administration relationship had changed; for the past several years there has been an improved tone between the faculty and the CO; this year, the Chancellor addressed the Senate in a prickly, combative, and disrespectful manner; George Blumenthal, UC rep, also noted the rude attitude of the Chancellor and other members from the CO; disappointment about Roberta Actenberg and the lack of information in her presentation, although she did offer new opportunities for faculty involvement; Board of Trustees meeting – bargaining sunshine proposals – CSU proposed reducing FERP to 2 years, but CSU trustee Hauck’s motion was approved by the BOT to reduce FERP to 0 years; Trustee Hauck is also a member of the Governor’s Save California Commission which raised concern; all of these things affected the mood of the senate meetings and our relationship with both the CO and BOT; resolutions passed – CMS resolution was amended so that any campus could request an impartial cost benefit study – basically to urge postponement; 2010-11 is the anniversary for the CSU system; Patriot Act resolution; improve advising; first reading of the following resolutions; faculty expert banks program; role of pre-baccalaureate remediation; support for the framework of intercollegiate athletics; support of the new SAT; TRIO programs; effect of the changed retirement program. Caplan reiterated the mood of the senate meeting; Spence spent 90% of his time talking about the joint professional doctorate and went on a sort of tirade against the UC; perplexed as to why the attitude change; Rees noted that Marci Greenwood, UC representative regarding the doctorate, has stated that “you just have to give us time, if you could just give us five years”; Reichman noted that using the venue of the Senate to go into a tirade by Spence was very strange; Rees responded that her feeling was that this is a slippery slope and UC admin will fight this to the death. Caplan reported that they passed a resolution to improve quality education citing previous passed resolutions; 6 advising improvements; in many instances, CSUEB is ahead of the policy; asked for a timely report on the suggested improvements; intercollegiate athletics pointed primarily to Division I – that faculty be more involved in making decisions (we already do this); the resolution calls for the Chancellor to encourage all CSU institutions become members and contributors to this group (which is still evolving). Since the plenary, Reichman reported that in terms of the lower division transfer conflict and the mandated common course numbering system (in addition to whatever individual campus uses), CSU has formally withdrawn from the system last week; reasons provided include that the ruling about using descriptors by CSU faculty had changed; another reason is that it has not been effective; the plan now is for the CSU to institute its own course lists and present them to the community colleges; legislation gives us until Fall 2006 to get this done; the descriptors should be done by the same disciplinary faculty.

4. Appointments
M/S/P (Norton/Maxwell) Trumbo (Statistics) to replace Levine on COBRA, Spring 05 and Ganjeizadeh (Engineering) to replace Zong on CAPR, Spring 05.
5. Approval of the Spring Quarter 2005 Election Schedule, originally approved by ExCom via email during the Spring Break. M/S/P (Caplan/Opp) to approve.

6. 04-05 CIC 17, Proposal for Learning Outcomes in General Education (G.E.) Area D4, Upper Division Social Science M/S/ (Norton/Opp) to place on Senate agenda.

Garbesi raised two issues: 1) structure of the learning outcomes presented, preclude inclusion of broadly interdisciplinary courses; Environmental Studies sits squarely in between Social Sciences and the Sciences and with the current criteria, some courses no longer fit into area D4; previously, ENVT courses have been in the Social Sciences class; 2) all the criteria include an oral requirement; this is hard to do with larger classes given that inclusion of oral requirements in learning outcomes implies that their performance on oral arguments will be evaluated (assessed); and, in addition, requiring research to be done in a large (over 50) introductory course makes it difficult to cover essential content areas in introductory level courses; Her department has special research-oriented courses.

Stoper suggested that ENVT faculty try to fit the area whose criteria are easiest to fulfill for that course, as a Social Sciences course or a Science course. Oral issue is not a problem as that can be fulfilled with class participation, all that is required is that you have some imbedded assessment criteria that you grade on, e.g. class participation; Research issue - the most substantial difference between the lower and upper division outcomes is that upper division includes a research requirement; 3-4 pages is enough, but UD needs to have advanced thinking; develop a thesis, look at data, etc. If we want to have upper division be a real advance from the lower division courses, we have to include research.

Reichman noted that there were a few inconsistencies in the document that makes him sympathetic to Garbesi’s concerns. Drop the link between oral and written requirements – make them separate; research is so vague a term, how to understand minimal versus lengthy research; perhaps a change in the wording would be effective; Reichman also suggested elimination “U.S.” in item #4 and suggested that amendments could be made on the floor of the Senate; Larson noted that the language for Humanities General Education Outcomes is inclusive while the language for Social Sciences is restrictive and exclusive; would like to see the language more consistent with Humanities. Paige agreed and added that there was no latitude given to the instructor. Sawyer suggested that interested parties come to the Senate and make comments to the group. Maxwell was a little concerned that the GE proposal requests had already been distributed to faculty before the Senate has approved the outcomes. Soares suggested that someone create the amendments/series of amendments noting that if brought to Senate as is, the discussion would be even longer and probably voted down; Fleming recommended that we try to create a document that would be successful, repeating that we are pressured to forward the document; Caplan noted that if we cannot come to a reasonable document, it will probably be sent back by the Senate; it disturbs him to hear arguments that support creating a higher teacher/student ratio be part of the criteria; we have to be careful that we are not always worshipping on the altar of FTES; Opp noted that there is a lot of quantitative data/research required and that this is too much to put into one class and still teach content; Fleming asked how we can best smooth the progress of the document to Senate. Soares called the question, not passed.

Sawyer called time for item #10.

Further discussion postponed until next ExCom meeting.
10. Report regarding University e-Mail Address Changes (John Charles)

E-Mail addresses will change as we change to csueastbay.edu. “Educause” monitors/manages .edu domains and the overlap of csuhayward.edu and csueastbay.edu will only last one calendar year. By the end of December 2005, all campus domain names need to be changed to csueastbay.edu. Charles reported that this is an opportunity to remove the ambiguity from our email addresses, as we have 79 duplicate first initial/lastname possible emails. The proposal is to have a firstname.lastname@csueastbay.edu format. He worked with HR to create a “preferred” name database so that you can shorten your email address by filling out a form in HR. The proposed implementation date is April 20th, and they would like to get the information out to the campus as quickly as possible.
- Beginning January 1, 2006, emails to @csuhayward.edu will bounce back, rather than being automatically forwarded.
- On April 7th, MI2106, during the lunch hour, there will be a question and answer forum. There will also be a Communiqué, and a mass mail message.
- Caplan asked how other people will know what the new email address is; Charles responded that all notification has to be done by the individual. All internal list serves will be redone by ICS; all outside listserves will have to be redone by the individual.
- It is recommended that people on off-campus lists unsubscribe on April 19th, or before, and re-subscribe on April 20th with your new email address. You won’t be able to send a message from your @csuhayward.edu address to unsubscribe after April 19th.
- Opp asked about Horizon; Charles answered that they are working on that and will have a solution for students by Fall 2005. Charles also noted that another reason to shut off your old address is to avoid spam being forwarded automatically to your new email address.

7. 04-05 CIC 18, Proposal for Learning Outcomes in Quantitative Reasoning, General Education (G.E.) Area B4 (Math 1130, Math 1100 and Stat 1000)
M/S/P (Opp/Norton) to place on Senate agenda.

8. 04-05 CIC 19, Upper Division General Education Learning Outcomes in Science
M/S/P (Fleming/Maxwell) to place on Senate agenda.

9. Approval of the Senate Documents deadline of May 13th (for committee documents needing Senate approval this academic year)
M/S/P (Reichman/Maxwell) to approve.

11. Discussion/nomination of the Affirmative Action Liaison Officer (AALO) for term 2005-07 (possibly in closed session)
Postponed to the next meeting

12. Adjournment
M/S/P (Maxwell/Ginno) to adjourn at 4:01pm.

Respectfully submitted by,
Liz Ginno, secretary