Minutes of the Meeting of February 8, 2005

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

Members absent: Julie Norton, Barbara Paige

Visitors: S. Basu, B. Brauer, C. Bellone, S. Clark, S. Correia, M. Karplus, J. Kelly, R. Metz, A. Towner, G. Young, J. Zelan

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Caplan/Opp) to approve.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting on February 1, 2005 (not yet available)

3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair
      - Final list of nominees – please carefully look over the list; send corrections to the Senate Office by tomorrow morning if possible.
   
   M/S/P (Soares/Gubernat) to approve the list with the appropriate corrections.

   - Vice President Burt has created a campus ad hoc Endowment Policy Drafting committee (a university advancement initiative); included on the committee will be Sawyer, Larson, Leung, Burt (chair), Metz, Travis, Mc Bride, and other departmental chairs; Rees remarked that the endowment of chairs project will be a big piece of the university-wide policy the committee will consider; will enable endowments and partial endowments to be clearly understood.

   - Double counting of courses, state code and GE (history/poli sci, etc.) issue; Cassuto was present at the meetings; GE Subcommittee defeated it 0-4-4 at its 1/24/05 meeting and at the 1/31/05 CIC meeting the proposal was defeated by a vote of 1-6-1. This puts closure to the referral document from last year.

   - There have been questions regarding the Range elevation policy and procedures with regard to lecturers; ambiguous language, the clarity of the document, and concerns of differences between transition in ranks between lecturer and tenure-track faculty; Sawyer is referring this to FAC, asking them to review the document; Dean Towner offered that the policy for going from range A to range B has a lot of “or” statements that are very confusing and it is hard to delineate what is really required by the faculty. Reichman offered that it wouldn’t surprise him that the range elevations will be bargained this year and may affect whatever policy has been decided upon and asked if it be appropriate to wait until we have a new CBA; Clark noted that, similar with the current CBA, bargaining will probably not address the criteria language and thought that the referral would be appropriate.

   - Transition of Dr. Wallace to leadership of Enrollment Services – the review committee for Strobel met anyway to discuss the faculty’s willingness to provide support for Dr. Wallace; trying to open the lines of communication; perhaps an ad hoc advisory group would be useful; the Provost and Dr. Wallace are happy to meet with anyone who wants to offer help; Wallace is also meeting with the Council of Chairs of colleges; the SEM committees are in abeyance; Clark noted that they will be presenting a report next Monday and anyone who has ideas/comments is welcome to communicate with them; the hope is that the ad hoc advisory group will provide regular feedback. Reichman noted that the committee is comprised of elected representatives and very much likes the idea of participating & assisting in the review of functions of ES. Clark opined that regular feedback and faculty perspectives could be a regular, rather than one-time, thing.

   - Last year, COBRA and the Layoff committee (UCL) provided recommendations to the President regarding retaining the current budget with declining FTEs; Sawyer thanked the Provost for sharing the 2003-04 Campus SFR handout with ExCom and stated that Clark will give an update of where we are now and at the end of the year; the handout shows
information on SFR here relative to the system, which allows us to plan as appropriate; Clark thanked the faculty yet again and noted that it will be interesting to see the numbers for 2004-05 and, if we meet our target, it will be a tribute to our faculty; 2004-05 target was 11,814 – the analysis of Spring 05 indicates that the yield of 11,735 is the worst case scenario (.69%), with credit to the college deans to do everything possible, to offer enough sections in Spring 05 – as of last week we are offering 13 additional sections than in Spring 04, which is remarkable; there will be constant monitoring of enrollments and the funds are there to offer more sections; we are beginning to gather data not collected before so that we can understand trends; Bellone presented data on international students where enrollment declines were, almost exclusively, in the graduate levels, and declines in areas that are predictable (computer/telecomm) and other areas where there was a deliberate scaling down (Educ); Enrollment Services is working with other university units to provide the necessary numbers to analyze the info better.

- Professor Stanley J. Clark – Sawyer gave a very moving speech of appreciation providing highlights of Stan’s (nicknamed “Assassin” by his tennis colleagues) wonderful history on this campus – the group gave a standing ovation. Clark provided 10 reasons that he is not retiring, to dispel rumors, and expressed his appreciation for all the wonderful people he has worked with over the years at CSUEB and urges our support of the new interim Provost. Clark has requested that he exit without a reception, on his own terms, and no gifts.

B. Report of the President

- Rees had no particular news, but offered to answer questions. Caplan inquired about the Pioneer Heights funding of $3.5M. Metz replied that the money already exists. Sawyer inquired about preliminary discussions with students who have asked for ways to talk about better methods of communication between students and administration.; Rees noted that she has discussed with Dr. Redmond a number of issues which the students could be of enormous help and therein can feel a stake in the future; Rees has received a lot of email, letters, flowers, etc., both pro and con, and has tried to answer them all; has asked Monica Pacheco for assistance with letters from alumni; - Tomorrow Rees will be talking with the chair of the WASC committee and would like to say that the ending of the WASC process is the beginning of the University’s planning process for the next decade.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

- Caplan reported that committee meetings are this Friday; Reichman reported that the Fiscal and Government Affairs committee will be meeting with 20 new legislators next Wednesday. They will also meet with the legislative higher education committee members, senate education committee members, and staff.

4. Appointments

No appointments.

5. WASC Report to ExCom

Carl Bellone and Gale Young – WASC accreditation process; visitation will be next month; the dates will be on March 16-18 (Finals week); there may be a reception the night of the 16th; on Friday the 18th there will be a close-out session; there will be a visit to our Singapore and Moscow programs; give Gale any comments on the WASC VISIT TO CSUEB schedule as soon as possible; the visiting WASC team will spread themselves across the campus and will visit with various faculty and administrators, at their will; everyone should put those dates on their calendar; the Draft Organization for WASC - Educational Effectiveness Chart was reviewed. This chart outlines CSUEB’s suggestions to WASC for their investigations, but they will decide their own course. The Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education was also distributed; if you are interested in joining in any of the groups, please contact her.

Bellone reported that he and Sawyer have talked about how the process fits into the faculty governance process and that Standing Committee chairs are listed on the chart; Sawyer noted that he intends to provide a letter to the Senate outlining the issues coming forward from WASC and outlining the committees that are reviewing them, the timelines, etc. in order to provide a snapshot of the process right now; Reichman reaffirmed his concerns
about the relationship between faculty governance and the WASC process. Some of the comments on the draft chart included:

- #5 – ongoing task of CAPR to monitor the process;
- #6 – guide, if it can be done cheaply;
- #7 – Campus Climate – concern of using something that is not yet approved (i.e. 7 Principles of Good Undergraduate Education);
- #10 – “the new university commitments” – we have no idea of what that means, any discussion/change in PTR procedures need to be made by an elected committee;
- #12 & 13 – “departments” will be deleted from these items so that it basically refers to successful searches; Clark added that the point is to identify the practices not departments.

Young remarked that the Faculty COT and other COTs heard evidence that there was a need to understand what the PTR document reflects -- what were people’s experience throughout the process; did they feel mentored, did it promote their own scholarship and teaching; some analysis of documents; there was a sense that faculty are asked to do things that are not valued in the PTR process.

Basu said his experience has shown that goals need to be clear. He was also concerned about open-ended suggestions; Maxwell agreed that openness was a concern and added that a comparison with other universities (benchmarking) could be useful. There is a lot of anxiety around the process, but there are not a lot of denials; Opp disagreed about the openness and thought that looking for certain things would leave out noticing other things; allow people to speak about the process; likes the idea of focus groups/survey. Caplan served on COT and believes there is more disconnect between the perceptions of faculty and how it unfolds; not as much a problem with the document but with interaction with faculty; not a wholesale changing of the document, but how it is applied. Reichman noted that in his experience, misperceptions are not consistent across the board; when Young remarked “heard voices in the Senate but COTS decided,” Reichman interjected that this is a Senate issue, decided by elected representatives.; it is not the business of non-elected bodies to make any decisions about PTR unless voted by the Senate, the constitutional elected body of the faculty. The Senate should decide what the study is and how it’s done.

Young remarked that the Chair of the PTR subcommittee of FAC, Eileen Barrett, is reviewing the issue right now. Sawyer offered to meet with the PTR subcommittee and communicate the concerns of the ExCom.

Bellone remarked that, during their visit, the WASC committee will also make comments on the charts and activities listed, and may re-prioritize.

Caplan repeated Reichman’s opinion that it’s the Senate’s job to start the study, give its blessing, not to stop it.

It was agreed that there will be a WASC Report at the next Senate meeting.

6. Feedback regarding the upcoming ballot for the Amendments to the Constitution and Bylaws

Fleming asked if we were going to have discussion on the floor to amend the grouped changes; Sawyer responded that he will ask the Senate if any of the housekeeping changes are issues and need to be separated out – otherwise they will be kept as a group of changes; the substantive changes will be voted on separately.

7. Adjournment

M/S/P (Maxwell/Opp) to adjourn at 3:42pm.