CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE of the ACADEMIC SENATE
Approved as corrected

Minutes of the Meeting of September 28, 2004

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: B. Brauer, C. Bellone, S. Clark, S. Correia, M. Karplus, M. Leung, J. Lopez, M. Morales (Pioneer Reporter), J. Zelan,

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Caplan/Norton).

2. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair
      -Lauded the Freshman Convocation as a great event and he offered congratulations to Sally Murphy and her staff and to Sonjia Redmond and Student Services for their great work;
      -Reminder that the groundbreaking for new SBE building is this Thursday, 3:30pm, please attend; that the Library annex opening ceremony is October 5, at 12noon, at the fountain; and that Al Fresco is scheduled for October 6, should be fun and he has become an expert hot dog chef;
      -Announced that Sonjia Redmond has provided posters about Al Fresco and the Campus Calendar of Events to increase attendance/student activities (call Student Life for a copy of the posters);
      -Noted that there have been 3 staff self-nominations to run for Senate representative (according to the recommended procedures in 03-04 BEC 10- Staff representation on the Academic Senate).
      M/S/ (Caplan/Maxwell) to send this to the Senate Agenda.
      The nominees are Linda Beebe (G.E. Program Coordinator), Joseph Corica (Acting Co-Coordinator, Access Services, Library), and Mike Walker (Buyer, Procurement & Support Services). Caplan asked who elected the representative to the Senate; Sawyer replied that the document had established that the Senate would elect the representative. Maxwell asked that their department and their rank/job title be placed on the ballot as we do with faculty elections.
      Motion passed.

   B. Report of the President
      -Noted that October 6 is also the groundbreaking ceremony for the new University Union addition (scheduled for 3:00pm); October 5 is the Library Renovation Opening, noon, in the fountain square.
      -Reported that there is good and bad news about the latest enrollment figures; good news is that we are very close to a 30% increase in first time freshmen, but the bad news is our enrollment has dropped significantly in graduate students as well as seniors. We had our largest class of graduating seniors last year. Clark added that we are continuing to enroll students throughout the academic year to address the issue, and currently we are 2.5% under target. We have also had a 15% drop in international students (identical with the nationwide loss of international student enrollment), and this has also had a significant impact on our budget. We are doing well with transfer students and will continue to try to admit transfer students to address the enrollment issue. Rees added that our enrollment target was raised slightly due to the returned budget from the governor; nationwide, college enrollment has been dropping, too. The sticker shock factor ought to be fading away soon as well;
      -Reported that Clark has implemented an expedited process to hire the 30 new tenure-track faculty positions. It is a lot of work doing all those searches.
      -Caplan asked have we made plans if we need to return money if we do not meet our enrollment target; Rees answered that we have never had to give any money back, but this is the first year that the
Legislature has stated that they would take it back; so, will they do so? We won’t know until we don’t meet our enrollment target. Reichman asked Clark if he knew how the shortfall in FTES will affect our course requirements/budget; Clark responded that he has asked the Deans to analyze the data; they have been given the means to meet the demand, and since there has never been a case when Winter or Spring enrollments have been larger than Fall’s, our efforts this quarter gain even more importance. There is a continuous assessment being made of where we stand.

C. Report of the Statewide Senators
- Reichman reported that they met on Sept. 9-10; significant action item was around student fees. The Trustees have been studying the issue and negotiations between the BOT and the California State Student Association broke down over students absorbing 33% versus 25% burden of the cost of their education. The Statewide Senate had passed a resolution that essentially said that since the CSU Compact sets up fee increases over the next three years that the BOT ought to hold off on this item until closer to the end of the three years. Rees noted that at the coming BOT meeting on Oct. 28, they will be talking about the proposed budget to be sent to the Governor for his January use and the fee policy item will be on the agenda for that meeting.

D. Addendum to Chair’s report
- Sawyer wanted to add to his report and reported that he had received an email inquiry regarding the SBE dean search; he asked for input from ExCom regarding the questions in the email regarding FERPers; 1) can a FERPer participate in the search for a dean position; answer is that they can if they are on active employment status during the period of the search; 2) are FERPers allowed to make nominations and sign a petition for the search committee; if they are on active employment status during the time period of when the nomination, petition signing, and voting, is going on, then they can participate. Soares reported that the College of SBE’s policy is that they have an election to decide on an individual basis if a FERPer has the right to participate on an annual basis.

3. **04-05 BEC 1**, Standing Rules of the Academic Senate

   M/S/ (Reichman/Caplan) to send to Senate.

   M/S/P (Caplan/Norton) to amend the document (line 34 – change to “Nominations may be made or withdrawn at any point in the voting process except during a vote in progress”).

   Main motion passed.

4. Administrative Review Schedule

   M/S/ (Fleming/Ginno) approve the schedule and to forward to FAC the 3 highlighted names for their review, since those titles were not mentioned in the revision of the Appointments & Review Policies & Procedures. Rees corrected Colombatto’s title to “Director of Marketing Communications.” Gubernat added that Marilyn Silva is now the Associate Dean, College of ALSS. Reichman suggested that, since it will go to FAC for review and that there is an imbalance of reviews, that ExCom move Jay Colombatto’s review to 2005-06, instead of 2004-05, to alleviate the urgency of the FAC review.

   Motion passed with corrections noted.

   Reichman asked that when FAC reviews this calendar, that they consider adding new reviews to a year with fewer reviews when possible, considering the placement in terms of the workload, if that is consistent with policy.

5. Fall Quarter University-wide Election Schedule

   M/S/ (Soares/Caplan) to approve.

   Opp asked that this document be in line with the previous by scratching Jay Colombatto’s review

   Motion passed as amended.
6. **Appointments**
   M/S/P (Caplan/Soares) to aggregate the appointments.
   - Linda Smetana (TED), to replace G. Rodriguez on CAPR for Fall 2004.
   - Li-Ling Chen (TED), to replace S. Gonzales on CIC for Fall 2004.
   - Bruce Trumbo (STAT), to replace E. Levine on COBRA for Fall 2004.
   - Phil Duren (TED), to replace J. Mitchell on CCAC through 2005.
   - Ellen Woodard (GEOG), to replace J. Primus on CCAC as 04-05 Lecturer Representative.
   - Don Wort (MGT&FIN), to replace G. Krickx on CCAC for 2004-06.
   - Gary McBride (ACCTG), to replace C. Johnson on UIT for 2004-06.
   - Reappoint Joanna (Chong) Lee (MKTG), to SEM-Integrated Marketing Committee for 2004-06.
   - Norman Smothers (MKTG), to replace S. Ugbah on UAD-Faculty Liaison Committee for 04-06.

7. **04-05 BEC 2, DRAFT – Nominations for the Layoff Committee 2004-05**
   M/S/P (Caplan/Opp) to send nominations to Senate. Maxwell asked that 2.4 be fixed to add “Economics.”

8. **04-05 BEC 3, Revision of the Academic Senate Distribution Policy**
   Sawyer noted that in this period of budgetary difficulties, the Senate Office needs to reduce its duplicating costs, workload in the office, and non-essential distributions. The highlighted changes are moving from paper to electronic distribution.

   M/S/P (Reichman/Norton) to send to Senate.

   Karplus suggested that BEC documents going to the Executive Committee be placed on the Senate webpage before the meetings; Sawyer reaffirmed that we are trying to move from paper-based to electronic distribution. Pertinent documents will be available to administrators.

9. **04-05 BEC 4, Bookstore Advisory Committee**
   M/S/ (Maxwell/Opp) to send to Senate.

   Caplan asked if there were any limits on who can serve; Sawyer replied that there were no limits. Reichman remarked that the action requested should specifically indicate not only that a committee would be formed, but how it would be constituted, which would mean simply moving that information from the background information. He added that the background information should indicate that the committee would meet once “annually” and not just ONCE (which ought not to be capitalized) and that we may want to allow for more than one meeting per year. Rees reported that this issue came up at the Foundation Board meeting wherein Sandra Ehrhorn repeated her request for an advisory committee; Rees recommended that one or two student representatives be added to the committee to round out the committee and add to its value to the Bookstore. Student reps would be appointed by AS Board. It was agreed that these changes could be made on the Senate floor. Lopez added that providing opportunities for non-tenured faculty is good.

   Motion passed.

10. **03-04 COBRA 1, Annual Report**
    Sawyer noted that this was the topic of discussion at the University Budget Summit last year, but it did not have the time necessary to go through the process of acceptance by the Senate. This will close the loop and get it into the Senate records. Reichman suggested that an “Action Requested” be added to the document.

    M/S/P (Norton/Opp) to accept the report and send to the Senate.

11. **03-04 COBRA 2, Recommendations of Distributions of Cuts in the 04-05 CSUH Budget**
    M/S/ (Fleming/Maxwell) to forward to the Senate

    Rees asked about the procedure of sending a memo addressed to her to the Senate. Reichman agreed that it seems that the Senate does not have a role with the document. Caplan agreed and noted that standing committees make their recommendations to ExCom, then to the Senate. Rees remarked that the members of COBRA were members of BAC and as a part of the President’s advisory group, not a Senate committee.
There is an ambiguity with COBRA in that it has a dual role. Lopez, COBRA chair, agreed that the confusion with the committee role and reporting procedures were an issue. Maxwell noted that according to the COBRA annual report’s charge of the committee, that it is supposed to recommend to the Academic Senate budgetary processes, and that it seems appropriate to have it send its recommendations to ExCom/Senate, versus the BAC which is not an Academic Senate committee. Caplan noted that, if this was the recommendation from the faculty members of the BAC, then we can send it along to Senate as an information item versus an action item. Rees agreed with this and added that this might help complete last year’s process. Reichman added that this would also provide senators with a forum to ask questions and provide suggestions to the President.

Motion was modified to send to the Senate as an “informational item only” and change to “From: the faculty members of the Budget Advisory Committee”. Motion passed.

12. 03-04 CAPR 6, Communication Five-Year Review
M/S/P (Norton/Caplan) to send to Senate.

13. Further Discussion related to the Search for the Dean, CBE
Sawyer reiterated the process to date, for the record: The President asked that the Executive Committee act as the Search Committee for the CBE Dean until the Search Committee could be elected. ExCom reviewed the ad for the position, conferring with the faculty of the college, and made some revisions. The final draft of the revised ad was approved by the Executive Committee by email vote on September 20, 2004. The Chair of the Senate then presented the revised CBE Dean position ad to the Provost (on 9-20-04) and it was accepted. Sawyer reported that in his recent meeting with the Provost he was shown the new advertisement. Rees added that once the search committee is formed and meets that they will have the opportunity to revise the job announcement; only the latest version will control the search process. Soares thanked the group (including Rees & Clark) for getting the announcement revised and placed in a timely manner.

14. Bylaws Revisions
Sawyer noted that an ad-hoc committee was formed last year to give further study to possible revisions to the bylaws and the members are Norton, Caplan, and Reichman. Norton reported that she had taken a close look at the bylaws and noted areas which needed improvement; she also noted that Reichman had the good idea of asking a professor emeritus (W. Reuter), to complete the committee. Caplan noted that this committee ought to bring its suggestions to ExCom. He advised that Standing Committees not be bypassed in this process. Norton mentioned that there is a process for faculty to suggest revisions outside of faculty governance committees.

15. Systemwide LD Transfer Pattern Project appointments/discussion
Sawyer noted that the appointments process is going forward and gave the timeline. Reichman remarked that the idea was to make this a faculty process. Clark remarked that he hoped that departments would take this seriously, and that the representative would have the confidence of their department to represent them on a statewide basis. Systemwide, once the Chancellor’s Office gets the list of names, they will be reviewing that list to appoint a “lead” person for each discipline.

17. UIT – Faculty members reporting to ExCom
UIT is an administrative committee that has faculty representation (4 currently). The concern is that UIT develops academic policy and has a role in the development of new technologies on campus which affect faculty without Senate approval (appropriate faculty input); ought ExCom to establish a formal line of communication between ExCom and UIT. Caplan noted that it would probably be easiest to ask a member of ExCom serve on the UIT who could bring relevant items to ExCom’s (and subsequently, the appropriate standing committee’s or the Senate’s) attention. It was noted that an annual report would be too late.

It was asked that ExCom members think about a reporting mechanism and send it to the Chair.

18. University Club versus University Advisement Hub
Maxwell asked to amend the agenda to ask a question about the change of the University Club into the University Advisement Hub/Welcome Center. Rees replied that the Foundation owns the building and that
the University Club is defunct. Clark noted that once he was apprised of the debt of the University Club, he asked about using the facility as a welcome center for the period of two years as a part of our recruitment project. Doing this would allow him to not use classroom space. It is not seen as a permanent fix. Maxwell reported that Facilities is canceling reservations made for the facility right now. Reichman noted that it seems to be a reasonable way to utilize the space at the beginning of the quarter as a welcome center, then allowing faculty events to be scheduled afterwards. He also noted that it was unfortunate that this campus does not have a permanent faculty club to help faculty develop collaborative relationships with other faculty and noted that this is something that ExCom may want to review. Rees pointed out that when the facility was a “faculty club,” the Foundation lost a lot of money; the Foundation spent a lot of money trying to make it a viable resource, but that faculty did not want to use it – and ate at their desks. She will investigate why reservations are being cancelled as no decision has been made on how it will be used in the future. Rees also stated that the building is not a state-owned building, it is owned by the Foundation. Paige remarked that although she doesn’t know whether or not this campus needs a faculty club, one reason that the previous club failed is that it was not an inviting place. This provides us with the opportunity to rethink the idea. Opp noted that, with the help of the students, we will have a new annex to the Student Union to use soon and that faculty use it a lot to meet and socialize. Clark noted that the bigger picture he saw was that if we can create a welcome center/space to help recruit/retain students, perhaps this will trickle down to the University budgets elsewhere. Reichman urged that we talk about the current situation in terms of what would be best for this campus.

19. Adjournment.
M/S/P (Caplan/Paige) to adjourn at 3:59.

Respectfully submitted by
Liz Ginno, secretary.