Mrs [180x747]CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY [72x714]OFFICE OF THE [72x703]ACADEMIC SENATE [128x670]Approved as corrected

Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 17, 2006

Members present: Cal Caplan, Denise Fleming, David Larson, Nan Maxwell, Susan Opp, Mo Qayoumi, Henry Reichman, Eric Suess, Steve Ugbah, Dianne Woods

Members absent: none

Guests: Emily Brizendine, John Charles, Fred Dorer, Jennifer Eagan, Tom Hird, Laurie Isenberg, Mark Karplus, Alden Reimonenq, Don Sawyer, Arthurlene Towner

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Larson/Caplan) to approve the agenda, as amended to add 06-07 CIC 2 as item 5a and a discussion on Smart Classrooms as 8a

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting on 9-26-06
   M/S/P (Caplan/Larson) to approve the minutes of the meeting on 9-26-06, as corrected

3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair
      - Reichman announced the following events: the Major Minor Faire will be held on October 17; the Fall Job Faire will be held on October 19; a reception for new and retired faculty will be held at President Qayoumi’s home on October 17; CLASS is sponsoring a Jewish culture and history series, with the first of three events, a free showing of Free Zone, being held at the University Theatre on November 1. Nancy Fishman of the San Francisco Jewish Center will introduce Free Zone and Dr. Reichman will facilitate a discussion following the film.
      - Reichman reported on the search for the Assistant Vice President of Enterprise Activities; the first candidate was on campus October 16; there were no faculty present and Reichman urged faculty to come to remaining visits.
      - The schedule has been firmed up for the Vice President of Planning and Enrollment Management; the Executive Committee is scheduled to meet with the candidates from 11:30-noon. Charles stated that there are four excellent candidates coming to campus and reminded members that a feedback sheet was prepared and distributed by email.
      - The proposed commencement schedule was discussed. Opp asked if there has been sufficient analysis to confidently schedule both 1 p.m. and 5 p.m. ceremonies on the same day. Caplan stated that in the past, a single ceremony was completed by 10:30 a.m. and that the single ceremony gave a sense of community. Reichman stated that there is frequently not an adequate amount of parking for a single ceremony. President Qayoumi hopes that there can be a single commencement at some point as this is most impressive; however, given the venues and logistics, including parking, this is not currently viable. Caplan suggested one main event with separate college receptions; this would not allow names to be individually announced, but would be preferable to separate ceremonies. Ugbah reiterated that we are trying to promote a sense of community; separate commencements do not allow for this. He urged one large commencement followed by small college ceremonies. Maxwell stated that last year, some from CBE stated that the significance of the event was lost when names were rattled off rapidly. Fleming said there are merits in both commencement plans; the rationale for whatever decision is made should be communicated clearly with students and faculty. It was noted that faculty turnout is essential, and something should be in place to encourage that, for example a quota of at least 3 per department. Woods stated that at UC Berkeley, the large university commencement was voluntary, with intimate ceremonies held at each college or school. Dorer stated that, in his experience at CSU Bakersfield, it was important for students to walk across the stage and shake the President’s hand; however here there is no forum large enough and there is the risk of...
students leaving before the ceremony is completed. Suess said it is important to communicate the loss of parking space as a factor in the decision; as enrollment increases, the logistics will become even more challenging. Reichman stated that an off-campus venue may be an idea for the future.

- Reichman introduced the topic of the 10 year old copyright policy; the Provost has suggested specific language to be added; since it is old, a general review of the complete document is in order. It was noted that Aline Soules in the Library is an expert in that field.

M/S/P (Caplan/Maxwell) to refer the review of copyright policy to a subcommittee that includes members from Committee on Research and Faculty Affairs Committee, as well as Aline Soules from the Library. Reichman will make the referral.

- Reichman stated that there will be no Executive Committee meeting on October 24th; the next meeting will be on October 31, with a possible Senate meeting on November 7th (or 14th).

B. Report of the President

- President Qayoumi reported that Anne Taylor has taken the position of Director of Government and Community Relations; Ms. Taylor has worked for State Assembly Member Johan Klehs.
- The President has held six Town Hall meetings; he is heartened by the discussions and participation and urges faculty to attend.
- Qayoumi reported that he attended a meeting at the Chancellor’s Office to discuss enrollment; systemwide, enrollment is up approximately 1%. Northridge and Fullerton are leading system growth; SFSU and Sonoma are also experiencing increased enrollment. Monterey Bay has the highest drop in enrollment (5%); CSUEB is down approximately 4.1%; Dominguez Hills’ enrollment has declined about 3.9%. The Chancellor’s Office (CO) will use the 2% rule, i.e., campuses with more than a 2% drop below enrollment targets will have to pay the money back. Qayoumi believes that CSUEB may be able to reach the 2% cut-off and thus avoid paying money back. The President indicated that he wants the CO to recognize that we are interested in growth and are positioning ourselves to grow. The President stated that the only certain path to growth occurs through increasing the number of entering freshmen; transfer student numbers remain flat. We are looking at ways to make this easier through online courses and collaboration with community colleges. We will be holding courses at Las Positas and the President and the President is holding discussions with several other community colleges, including Chabot, De Anza, Laney, Cañada, and others. We will look at developing a standard MOU and will need input about programs and types of faculty and student support that will be needed to make these successful; exploratory model right now. Opp asked if there is any possibility of offering courses in conjunction with high schools? Qayoumi said there is, especially in the tri-valley area as well as other locations such as Lawrence Livermore Lab, the NUMI plant, So Fremont Industrial area, etc. Many of these plans are still at the conceptual level, but will be brought forward as they evolve.
- Richard West visited the Concord Campus for the first time last week and remarked that it is beautiful, but difficult to get to; he toured the former Naval Facility, and it is hoped he can get a piece of it at the South end near the BART station, for Concord Campus use. These are ideas that we are discussing. Caplan stated that scheduling is a paramount consideration at the Concord Campus because of traffic.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

- Caplan reported that Statewide Senate committee meetings and the CSU conference will be held this week in Los Angeles. We have a team going there.
- Reichman reported that campus senate chairs will meet with statewide senate chairs. The 46 member Strategic Planning Statewide Steering Committee met yesterday; the committee discussed the six major themes for strategic planning around the system. They will be further refined online by the committee and open to the general public. Reichman will share the materials he was given with Ex Com and possibly members of the Senate. The next stage will be campus conversations around the six themes to provide feedback.
4. Appointments

M/S/P (Caplan/Maxwell) to appoint Cathy Coulman as the Student Affairs member on the CCAC, 06-08 and Erica Wildy to Honorary Degrees Committee for Fall

M/S/P (Ugbah/Caplan) to approve the membership of the Task Force on Online Instruction: Tom Bickley, Library; Tom Cadwallader, Criminal Justice; Nan Chico, Faculty Development; Gary McBride, Accounting; Melany Spielman, Hospitality; Dianne Woods, Social Work. Added Reichman to the list. Initial meeting set up for Friday the 27th. John Charles was selected by the President as Presidential Appointee to the Task Force.

M/S/P (Maxwell/Woods) to appoint Rodolfo Galan to replace Iliana Holbrook on the Language Task Force; Grace Munikata of Art to the Bookstore Advisory Committee for 06-08; Gary Li to UIT 06-08

5. 06-07 CIC 1, GE Application of Courses

M/S/P (Maxwell/Caplan) to place 06-07 CIC 1 on the Senate Agenda

There is a correction in the course title for 3120; it should read Climatic Change.

5a. 06-07 CIC 2, Appointments to CIC subcommittees

M/S/P (Fleming/Larson) to approve the nominations for CIC Subcommittee membership, 06-07

Dorer noted that Roseann Hogan has suddenly retired. They are working on filling the position; short term strategies are being developed. CBE will bring more nominations; other necessary changes were noted regarding vacant positions and changes of responsibility. CIC will revise their policies as needed.

6. 05-06 CAPR 23, Five-Year Program Review for Theatre and Dance

M/S/P (Caplan/Larson) to place on the Senate Agenda

7. Facilitating Graduation; Information item from CIC

There were no questions or comments about the draft recommendations from CIC for facilitating graduation; they were accepted.

8. Consultation regarding the process for creating IT service level agreements for colleges and administrative units and discussion on Smart Classrooms

-Charles reported that it’s important that instructional technology investments are coordinated both unit-wide and campus-wide in order to achieve institutional goals and objectives, so we are implementing a new structure; “centrally coordinated / locally directed.” IT resources are part of one large team, even if physically in a “local” space. The key is to not duplicate services or pay for services more than once.

IT is learning from experiences with CLASS and CEAS as prototypes last year; how to leverage resources and move toward a proactive stance in helping local units develop priorities and achieve goals and objectives. They want to have an IT plan for local level service agreements or MOUs. They are not assuming that the current local team is the correct staffing in the next 5 years. IT is rethinking appropriate staffing levels and determining skill sets that will be needed in the future. To that end, IT is working with the Provost Council, UIT (which includes some faculty) and IT staff at local levels. They do not want to duplicate services or equipment, but to consolidate where possible. IT would like a structured way to get advice from faculty, as this is an incremental process. This is a transition year; there is a goal date of July 1, 2007, to have new structures in place.

Woods asked for an example of a new structure. Charles stated that a yearly, rather than quarterly review plan for units would be an example. Institutionalize the plan, yet guarantee local priorities in a proactive process. Opp asked how the new IT plans will affect teaching, Smart
Classrooms, and the support that is needed if a faculty member is teaching in a building that is outside of their college. Charles stated that local teams will still support local units, although there will probably be some support from elsewhere. In most cases who you call would not change. He welcomes feedback. Reimonenq added that his IT team is part of a larger (invisible) team. Art has several labs and they depend on IT support. If a local person can’t do it, they get a person from the larger team; CLASS has benefited from this approach. Opp rephrased her question and asked if “local” meant local to the college or local to a physical building. Charles indicated it was probably both; the classroom services central line will send someone; and also noted that faculty feedback is important, to help get it right.

Maxwell said that most of the technology problems are in non-smart classrooms; who do I call? Other problems involve faculty not being able to get technical assistance if the classroom they are in is not served by the IT staff member they usually contact. This problem is an effect of the centralized scheduling system. Before, CBE classrooms were serviced by the CBE tech. Charles replied that part of their goal is improvement.

Woods suggested having a survey of faculty needs and experiences with IT, as she has also had the experience of going to smart classrooms and encountering secure systems that were not accessible, or a cable was missing.

Reichman advised that normally the route for faculty input is via the Senate but in this case, faculty input should be accessed through deans and department chairs, so all are apprised of problems.

Caplan hopes there will be equipment consistency in smart classrooms throughout the system so that adjuncts or folks unfamiliar with new rooms will recognize the equipment; right now there are too many different configurations. He reiterated the need for obtaining help regardless of the time of day.

Charles stated that there is a list of ideas regarding smart classrooms that has been gathered from those involved in centralized scheduling, as well as a list of certain classrooms which faculty have reported as needing to be “smart”. Additional consultation to validate the priorities via the chairs/deans is planned.

Opp asked how far the upgrade money will go and suggested improving classrooms that support the most classes. Charles said that there will be 15 new smart classrooms and that failing equipment will be upgraded in 7-8 existing classrooms.

Dorer asked what fraction of classrooms are smart classrooms. Charles said that approximately 30% are smart and that the additional funds will boost the number to about 40%. He predicted that in approximately four years, all classrooms will be smart and we will have a budget to continue to deep them working/updated. Dorer noted that a consistent way to replenish equipment and a financial plan are needed, which takes work to implement.

Woods said she appreciated the change to smart technology at the Concord Campus; the technology there is quite easy to use; consistent between rooms.

Reichman encouraged smart thinking to eliminate hidden costs such as limited use for large classes and additional technology taking up space that would lower the seating capacity of a room thereby limiting class enrollment.

Suess asked if there is any update on what constitutes a smart classroom and how to engage students; also inquired about $100 laptops for students. Charles said the Chancellor’s Office has issued a baseline standard, validated thru campuses. He also noted the new smart classrooms will have wireless capacity.

Suess asked about the new email server; is Novell disappearing? Several members asked what the new server is and how the decision to convert to it was made. Several members had received emails telling them of moving to the new exchange server without prior warning. Charles said that the university is converting from Netscape to the Microsoft set of collaborative tools for Workplace Productivity in order to share calendars, documents, and other advanced collaboration tools, including a new email and calendar system. The process is top-down, beginning in the President’s office. They are relying on the local teams to get the information out. A web site is being created to include documents, state the benefits of the change and
answer frequently asked questions. He noted that we are moving aggressively to the new system. Charles promised that training for the new system was on the horizon.


José Lopez reported on the new doctorate in Educational Leadership. The legislature now allows the CSU to offer the independent doctorate in Educational Leadership for practicing K-12 or community college leadership and to improve student achievement. Additional points in the mandate include significant partnership with the K-12 community in the development of the program as well as a target for degree completion (including dissertation) within three years. CSU has a three-year timeline for phasing in the programs, beginning in Fall 2007; CSUEB plans to offer the program in the summer or fall of 2008. Since 2003, CSUEB has been involved in a Joint Doctorate in Educational Leadership with SJSU and UCB. Three faculty members of Educational Leadership, the Associate Dean of CEAS, and a consultant (Jody Servatius, CEAS) are working on the program. There is a search in progress for the coordinator of the doctorate as well as a draft of a program delivery plan. There are plans to go before the Senate to ask for a resolution of support. There will be several panels in place, including one for policy and curriculum. Lopez plans to report to ExCom quarterly.

Reichman stated that the program will have to undergo reviews by WASC, the Chancellor’s Office, and our own campus approval process. It will be important to communicate early and often with campus community and let everyone know that there will be a complex and detailed proposal forthcoming. Fees will be set at the UC doctoral level. Statewide, the issue of library resources has been raised.

Reimonenq said that since there will not be any start-up money for the program, that may be the cause of some rancor as resources are moved to develop courses and create assigned time. Reichman noted that the funding model of relying on a UC fee structure will likely work over the long haul, but in the short term, that revenue may not be sufficient to cover start-up costs.

Caplan suggested that a BEC resolution be developed by members of Ex Com in collaboration with representatives of Educational Leadership, rather than referral to CIC and/or CAPR. FAC will also need to be involved at some point, as it will involve workload issues. Caplan suggested that a group or Task Force explore the issues surrounding implementation of the doctorate.

M/S/P (Caplan/Maxwell) to appoint a subcommittee of the Executive Committee, consisting of Caplan, Fleming, and Larson, to work with Lopez and Brizendine to formulate a resolution for the Executive Committee to consider.

10. Accessible Technology for Persons with Disabilities

There are 3 priority areas: web accessibility, instructional materials (central to faculty) and purchasing. CIC Technology & Instruction Subcommittee members are going to training on October 30-31. It is important to note that advance preparation is needed, not waiting until the student is in the class. Late textbook orders are a problem; often students will not get their interpreted/scanned materials until the 7-9th week of classes, which is unfair. It was suggested that some texts might have to be standard for classes with late-appointed lecturers. Training was needed so all faculty would be apprised of the new law and sensitive to the issues. It was suggested that the first step be that a memo be written to all faculty outlining these problems as a “heads-up” and urge faculty to do everything they can as soon as possible. It was also suggested that interviews by Jean West be made available for training, as they were eye-opening. Cal suggested that we needed a clear procedure, including the resources offered. Raising awareness immediately was the current concern. Opp noted that she read about the expense and how long it takes, so she called the publisher and asked if e-books were available. If not, she wouldn’t use the book. She would like more faculty to put that kind of pressure on publishers.

M/S/P (Ugbah/Woods) to authorize the chair to send a memo to the faculty on this issue.

11. Adjournment

M/S/P (by general agreement) to adjourn

Respectfully submitted,

Denise Fleming, Secretary