Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, May 9, 2006

Members present: Kevin Callahan, Cal Caplan, Jennifer Eagan, Denise Fleming, Susan Gubernat, Nan Maxwell, Julia Norton, Hank Reichman, Don Sawyer (Chair), Eirik the Great (Soares)

Members absent: Norma Rees, Steve Ugbah

Guests: Carl Bellone, Emily Brizendine, John Charles, Mary Cheng, Susan Correia, Gary Freund, Mark Karplus, Jim Kelly, Jeff Seitz, Melany Spielman

Meeting convened at 2:10 p.m. Chair Sawyer welcomed the group to the first meeting in the Presentation Room. He briefly explained the history of the Senate Office move and the benefit of our committees meeting close to the Office and in a more central location.

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

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting on April 4 and 18, and May 2, 2006
   M/S/P (Maxwell/Susan) to approve the minutes of April 4 as amended
   M/S/P (Maxwell/Fleming) to approve the minutes of April 18 as amended to add Nancy Thompson, History, to the Task Force list
   M/S/P (Maxwell/Soares) to approve the minutes of May 2 as amended

4. Appointments
   No appointments to approve

5. DRAFT 05-06 BEC 6, Staff representative self-nominations for Senate representative 06-08
   M/S/P (Maxwell/Norton) to place 05-06 BEC 6 on the Senate agenda for a vote by the Senate

6. 05-06 CAPR 15, Five-Year Program Review of the Geological Sciences Programs
   M/S/P (Callahan/Caplan) to place 05-06 CAPR 15 on the Senate agenda
   Seitz noted that there are numerous inaccuracies in the document and asked how they could be corrected.

7. 05-06 CAPR 16, Five-Year Program Review for Psychology
   M/S/P (Callahan/Maxwell) to place 05-06 CAPR 16 on the Senate agenda

8. 05-06 CIC 26, Retention of Infrequently Offered Courses
   M/S/P (Soares/Caplan) to place 05-06 CIC 26 on the Senate agenda
   Reichman inquired about what to do if a department could not offer a course next year; Bellone replied that they should bank it. Maxwell noted an incorrect title for ECON 3140

9. B.A. in Human Development:
   • 05-06 CIC 27, Proposed New Option in Early Childhood Development
   • 05-06 CIC 28, Proposed New Option in Women’s Development
   • 05-06 CIC 29, Request for Approval of Discontinuance of the Option in Gerontology
M/S/P (Caplan/Soares) to place 05-06 CIC 27 on the Senate agenda

M/S/P (Norton/Caplan) to place 05-06 CIC 28, Proposed New Option in Women’s Development

Maxwell asked about the status of the Women’s Studies Department and how the new option will fit into the Human Development department. Reichman stated that there are two issues: how the option is “officially folded into” Human Development (unknown term) and whether it will create changes in the Women’s Studies Department. It is not a Women’s Studies Option but a “Women’s Development” Option (change #1 on backup) in Human Development. Gubernat stated that readers might infer that this option will replace some aspects of the Women’s Studies Department. She noted some courses in letters would not come under this; not parallel; would like clarification Eagan stated that it is her understanding that the fate of Women’s Studies was not fully resolved at the CLASS Council of Chairs meeting; there is still some question in CLASS as to how the departmental issues will be resolved. Bellone stated that the committee (CIC) did not discuss the structure of the Women’s Studies department; rather, their discussions focused on the curriculum for the new option. Caplan stated that the relationship between the new option and the department is sufficiently explained in the background information. Reichman stated that Human Development was adding an option, a change of Women’s Studies to Human Development, and changes to the minor all needed clarification. Our procedures do not require modifications to minors to go to the Senate. Gubernat suggested a friendly amendment to clarify the name of the option. Maxwell states that 17 new courses are proposed without discussion of resources to support the courses.

M/S/NP (Caplan/Maxwell) to refer back to CIC

Caplan suggested that the charge to CIC be to clarify or eliminate the first item under #6 and to explain the impact of 17 new courses not requiring any new resources. Maxwell stated that there should be clarification of the relationship between the new option, Human Development, and Women’s Studies. Bellone pointed out the list of discontinued courses. Norton and Maxwell stated that it would be helpful to have a representative from the department and the college present to answer questions. Fleming stated that an important question to consider is whether the proposal is in adequate format to move forward for discussion on the Senate floor.

Reichman stated that the proposal does not meet the criteria to go before the Senate and that there is substantial confusion and unaddressed questions, including library resources needs. He echoed frustration over not having dept/college representatives at the meeting to supply needed information and clarification. Caplan stated that we need to be consistent; both documents go to the Senate or both don’t go. He has observed that CIC has changed its focus in recent years to concentrate on curricular issues and not so much on resource implications. Maxwell again stated that there are too many outstanding questions and issues to make the document ready for the Senate. Bellone noted that if any part goes back, it will affect a $250,000 grant to start Early Childhood on the Concord Campus. Reichman noted that, given that there is a significant grant pending, he suggested that Ex Com approve placement on the Senate agenda on the condition that the department chair and dean or associate dean attend the Senate meeting and make a brief statement about the resources.

M/S/P (Norton/Eagan) to reconsider 05-06 CIC 28

M/S/P (Reichman/Caplan) to place 05-06 CIC 28 and 05-06 CIC 29, Request for Approval of Discontinuance of the Option in Gerontology, on the Senate agenda on the condition that the department chair and dean or associate dean attend the Senate meeting and make a brief presentation to make certain the documents are understandable.

10. B.S. in Recreation:
• 05-06 CIC 30, Proposed New Option in Hospitality Management
• 05-06 CIC 31, Proposed New Option in Leisure Management
• 05-06 CIC 32, Request for Approval of Discontinuance of the Option in Environmental Recreation and the Minor in Environmental Recreation

M/S/P (Norton/Fleming) to place 05-06 CIC 30, CIC 31, and CIC 32, on the Senate agenda.

Reichman asked that the minutes reflect that both the Chair of the department and the
Associate Dean are present. His concerns include the cover document of CIC 30, and that there is no discussion about resource implications. Further, Executive Order 602 delegates authority to campus presidents to approve certain programs only in cases when the first two digits of the aegis code are the same as the department. Because this option has a different aegis code than the departments, technically, this new option appears to require approval from the Chancellor’s Office. Reichman added that the new option appears to be a shifting of a new program into an old major. While the new option in hospitality management is probably a good thing to have, it does appear to be an entirely new program as well as bringing to a close to the old Recreation program. Reichman favors an open discussion about whether the campus community believes this is a good program to start.

Spielman stated that for the past 25 years in the CSU there has been a move away from a sole focus on parks and recreation toward including other leisure activities. She stated that the Executive Order to which Reichman referred was developed to avoid territorial battles between colleges, e.g., CBE and CEAS. However, there is no conflict between CBE and CEAS regarding this option. Spielman stated that she does not want to start a new program, but rather expand a major that has existed at CSUEB for many years. The industry has expressed a desire that training in both leisure and hospitality be provided for students. Spielman checked with the Chancellor’s Office and obtained confirmation that the name Leisure and Hospitality can be used. Eventually, the department would like to move toward a degree.

Gubernat stated that the discussion last year focused on the question of whether the department was making a name change only or changing the program and that the answer was that it was a name change. It appears that one of these options will become a major and that this is a fait accompli.

Soares stated that Spielman conferred with members of CBE and he is excited about the option. There is an overlap in some of the courses such that some courses will be offered through CBE. Soares stated that the background document states that existing resources will be used, but asked for clarification about how the option will be offered without new resources and what impact, if any, this will have on accreditation. Spielman directed the body to the discussion in the document of the use of existing resources in the library and the need for additional ones. In addition, recent 3999 course offerings demonstrate that there is a market for the program and that enrollment has increased over 200%. Online offerings have also increased FTE. Spielman stated that CEAS has committed to three new tenure track positions.

Maxwell stated that when there was no interest in CBE for such an option, Sue Sunderland took the initiative to pursue it in CEAS. Although there are letters of support for the option, Maxwell questions whether that constitutes adequate consultation and recommends that in the future the undergraduate curriculum committee should review such proposals.

Norton stated that the path Spielman used is one that Statistics has also followed in the past and that starting an option is a reasonable and cost effective way to assess demand and move into a major, should that prove marketable.

Provost Kelly stated that, while he agrees that things should be done by the book, other campuses have followed this same path. Meeting target enrollment is critical at this point and we would be remiss not to capitalize on this when there is such a high demand. It is very unlikely that CBE will be able to take on new programs for the foreseeable future.

Reichman commended Spielman for an excellent job of addressing questions about the program. As he now understands it, there are additional resources that are being allocated or shifted to this program and that there appears to have been adequate consultation with CBE. Reichman suggested that the department go to the CO and propose the new degree because a degree will better serve students. Reichman reiterated his belief in holding open discussions with the campus community about potential new programs and asked about accreditation issues. Spielman stated that faculty size is a determiner in accreditation and that there have not been enough faculty to pursue accreditation, although many large institutions do not pursue accreditation by choice. Gary Freund added that accreditation is usually pursued by institutions that are the size of CSUEB.
11. Discussion and feedback regarding the draft Accessible Technology Initiative Work Plan

Mary Cheng is working systemwide on making technology accessible to people with disabilities, which is mandated; discussed the Executive Order 926. Because the pace of technology moves so quickly, it is important to stay abreast of issues so that people with disabilities are not prohibited from accessing technology. Currently, the CSU is governed by Section 508 of the California Government Code. Campuses are required to procure, design, and/or develop materials proactively such that there is an infrastructure of access from the outset; it affects how we teach with technology and what we buy. Cheng discussed Universal Design Principles Applied to Learning (UDL); Sonoma State has received a 3-year federal grant to teach new faculty to teach and adhere to UDL standards. Cheng discussed the draft work plan (13 pages) for training faculty and suggested that time be allocated to read and discuss the materials she distributed in order to provide feedback. The final work plan will be sent to campuses this summer.

The chair stated that the body will read the documents and he will initiate an email conversation in order to solicit feedback, since there is not adequate time at this meeting. Reichman noted that the ASCSU has begun discussions on this as well. Cheng noted that there are many potential implications, including getting textbooks ordered earlier. John Charles mentioned Black Board baseline compliance levels. Caplan asked where funding will come from; Cheng responded that there is no easy answer and discussions will happen at the Presidential level.

12. Annual Report from the Concord Campus Advisory Committee (Basu)
Postponed until the next ExCom meeting

13. Annual Report from the Honors Coordinator

Stevina Evuleocha reported that many students have become aware of the program through events held on campus and elsewhere. One challenge is making the distinction between the Honors Program and graduating with honors. This quarter, the program is graduating five students; one of these represented CSUEB at the Research Competition. They could not attend the Honors Conference this year, as it was too close to Winter classes; did not get the Alumni Grant that was proposed. Evuleocha expressed gratitude to Provost Kelly and President Rees for their support of the Program. The Program is in need of a space since CLASS took over the Honors Program’s space last year. There are still needs for assigned time and resources. In fact, CSUEB ranks among the lowest in funding ranking of Honor’s Programs in the CSU system. Linda Beebe is not as available to give staff support to Honors as in the past, so staff support is also requested.

14. Discussion of Technology Survey Questions and Results (John Charles)
postponed until the next ExCom meeting

15. Reports

A. Report of the Chair
   The Provost has offered the Senate an endowment of $30,000 to recognize outstanding faculty, not to compete with the Outstanding Professor Award. Sawyer anticipates that FAC will be referred the task to create a policy on the use of the endowment.

   M/S/P (Caplan/Norton) that the Chair sign to accept the endowment on behalf of ExCom.

B. Report of the President
   - No report

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
   - No report

16. Adjournment

M/S/P (Caplan/Reichman) to adjourn

Respectfully submitted
Denise Fleming, Secretary