CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

OFFICE OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE

Approved as corrected

Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, February 26, 2008

Members present: Calvin Caplan, Julie Glass, David Larson, Nan Maxwell, Sally Murphy, Susan Opp, Mo Qayoumi, Gretchen Reevey-Manning, Henry Reichman

Members absent: Dianne Rush Woods

Guests: Carl Bellone, Linda Dalton, Jan Davis, Karina Garbesi, Stan Hebert, Craig Ishida, Mark Karplus, Myoung-ja Lee Kwon, Mike Mahoney, Kent McKinney, Sonjia Redmond, Don Sawyer, Jodi Servatius, Lee Thompson, Arthurlene Towner

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Murphy/Caplan) with Item 8 moved to the end of the agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes from the meeting on February 5, 2008 (Feb 12th not yet available)

M/S/P (Caplan/Opp)

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

Excom was reminded about the Faculty Convocation on Friday, 2/29, starting at 4:30 in the New University Union Multipurpose room. The 06-07 Outstanding Professor, Michael Hedrick, newly tenured faculty (2007 and 2008), newly emeritus faculty (2007, 2008) and faculty having achieved 25 years of service (2007, 2008) will be honored. There will be a gala reception following the program which will include a presentation by Dr. Hedrick.

B. Report of the President

There is no new information on the budget situation. The President is meeting with the colleges and unions to discuss the status of the budget. A “budget convocation” is planned (in the next month) to which the entire campus will be invited. There will be a presentation in general terms about the situation and its implications. Currently the Governor’s budget includes no distinctions among programs and no priorities.

Chief Jan Glenn-Davis, University Police Department, gave a presentation about campus safety. She also distributed a document titled “Keeping Yourself and Your Classroom Safe: A Faculty Resource”. Chief Davis’ presentation included campus safety processes, measures and planning. Recommendations included: programming the UPD direct emergency number, (510) 885-3333, into cell phones (it was noted that calling 911 from a cell phone does NOT result in the call being routed directly to UPD Emergency), participating in safety and evacuation drills, developing a personal safety plan, not calling UPD for information in the case of an emergency, gathering information from “All-Mail” email, the CSUEB Homepage, Blackboard, My CSUEB, Electronic Marquees, etc., or by calling 885-2000 for taped emergency information. In the case of an emergency, she asked that you do not hang up on the UPD responder unless directed to do so. It was noted that the campus is not yet set up with a mass communication system. A first responder training will occur on 3/26/08 followed by a campus simulation/drill in April or May. Also in the works are student programs designed to help prevent an incident. A useful film “Shots Fired” was shown at a Chancellor’s Office event which was very informative and may be used for campus training. The Chief was invited to present at the next meeting of the Academic Senate. In addition, she was encouraged to distribute regular notices to the community about campus procedures. Everyone was reminded that new students, faculty and staff are on campus each quarter so regular notification is essential.

Stan Hebert reported on the possible move to Division II. Some history was given: In December, 2006, ASI leadership indicated to the President an interest in moving to Division II. The president authorized a feasibility study which was completed by a Chancellor’s Office consultant at no cost to the campus in February, 2007. It was determined that the cost of
initiating a competitive Division II Athletic Program would be about 1.5 million dollars. This would require a new student fee starting at $20/student/quarter and going up ultimately to $35/student/quarter. As a next step, ASI voted to support an alternative consultation process. The process was re-started in January, 2008 by Student Affairs with ASI. The consultation process included speaking/meeting with 49 student clubs and/or informational sessions. The consultation was comprehensive and intensive. It was made clear that the move to Division II would require a new student fee as described above. There were many questions asked and answered including whether CSUEB would have a football program (no), whether some sports would be lost, what the scope of the programs would be, etc. Athletic Director D’Angeles generously answered questions. The process secured 900 signatures in support of the change, and more signatures are coming in. The process also secured the support of 14 student clubs and organizations representing 700 students. In consultation, students were not only focused on fees. They were interested in creating a “vibrant campus village” and wanted to know what Division II athletics could do for our campus. AVP Redmond stated that she felt very comfortable with, and was supportive of, the process. The consultation process officially ended on 2/22/08. Since that time, ASI has passed a resolution opposing the alternative consultation process. It was noted that ASI was, however, closely involved in the process as it was taking place and that the ASI board had voted to move to alternative consultation. It is not clear what the implications of their opposition to the process will be. Some on the ASI board want to have a student referendum on the proposed related new fees. It was pointed out that the last referendum garnered only 300 or so votes, while the alternative consultation process consulted with approximately 1500 students. ASI has not come out in favor or against the change to Division II.

It was mentioned that Excom discussed the move to Division II at its meeting on 2/5/08. At that meeting it was suggested the KPE faculty should be involved in the decision making process since KPE is the academic program in which Athletics has historically been housed. It was thought that the department should be provided with all information including fiscal information so as to develop a “department position.” It was noted that there is currently an academic aspect to the athletics program, with student athletes earning academic credit and grades for their participation. It was hoped that this characteristic, and the accompanying expectations, would remain.

Members of CFAC (The Campus Fee Advisory Committee) will vote on the new fee, but it is unclear whether they will view the vote as a vote on Division II or on the consultation process. The Senate Chair sits on CFAC but noted that if there is strong sentiment among the students on the committee, that it wouldn’t look good if the faculty and administrative members of the committee opposed the student vote leading to a majority decision that was not supported by a majority of the student members. He noted that the Alternative Consultation process is about student fees, not about the reason for those fees, i.e. Div II. It was noted that $1.5 million in IRA fees would go to the Division II program including student scholarships. The campus funds of $1.5 million would be one time expenditures on facilities, etc. It was pointed out that we are the only CSU that is Division III.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

There will be meetings next week. The final draft of Access to Excellence will go to the Board of Trustees as an informational item at their meeting in mid March. Disappointingly, there appear to be very few changes in this draft.

The Chancellor’s Office is threatening significant cuts to the Statewide Senate budget. Some believe that the cuts would destroy the ability of the body to continue functioning. It might, for example, result in no Senators in their first or second year being able to serve on any committees. The budget threat may lead to a confrontation between the faculty and the Chancellor’s Office.

4. Appointments

There are none.

5. Approval of the Administrative Review date of April 1, 2008

M/S/P (Caplan/Maxwell). It was pointed out that April 1st is the first day of Spring quarter. The Senate Office will put out the usual call for confidential feedback.
The Academic Planning Task Force and the resulting Academic Plan (AP) were praised. As a next step, the President’s Cabinet was provided with documents including the Academic Plan, the 7 Mandates, and each college's own strategic plan and asked to come up with actionable items (“outputs”) that were inline with the provided documents. The result of that process was a document distributed via e-mail to Excom that included extensive lists (unprioritized) of Outputs, Processes, and Inputs.

A presentation was given that outlined the resulting document. The 7 mandates were reshaped into a pyramid focusing on results vs. process. It was noted that potential priorities could be divided into categories Continuing, Emerging, Future and Exploratory. The Chair stated that he found this next step “troubling” and that the resulting document appeared to contain a list of random ideas that were not necessarily consistent with or even related to the ideas expressed in the AP. He stated that the AP was an action plan that included priorities, noting from Page 30 of the AP, “Some elements of this plan must be given priority for implementation and funding, including especially the “bulleted” items in “An Academic Plan for the Future” (Part III) and “Communities for Teaching and Learning” (Part IV)....” Several key items from the AP that appeared at first glance to be absent from this current document were support for students, advising, the SCAA, student life, curricular innovation, GE, WAC, technology support, faculty development, faculty support, increasing the number of TT faculty, etc. The AP had 8 “areas of distinction” and this document appears to have “cherry picked” a few. This specificity, it was thought, would alienate faculty readers when presented to Councils of Chairs. The list felt exclusionary to many. It was pointed out by the Provost that this was the first pass at such a document and that it is being brought to Excom for comment and suggested additions and revisions. It was noted that the document already includes many items and that adding to those items wouldn’t address the problems with the document or the process. The difference/distinction between output, process, and input was not clear to some. It was feared that, should the current document be circulated, there would be strong push back and/or hunkering down to protect territory. If this document is brought to Councils of Chairs it was thought it would be a lost opportunity to engage the larger community in the AP and to garner support for its vision for the campus. A suggested next step was to have Department Chairs given a similar task to that given to the President’s Council. This should/could be done without presenting them with the document under review at this time. They would be given the AP to read, digest, and distill, and then meet (perhaps including AVP Dalton and/or Provost Mahoney) to come up with suggestions for priorities and implementation from the academic side only. It was acknowledged that the current attempt was sincere and perhaps effective and useful for the non-academic units, but would meet with opposition from the academic side for the reasons outlined above. It is hoped that faculty will be given a chance to react without any preconceived ideas (as given in the current document). The goal is to give the faculty a chance to “catch up” with the process carried out by the President’s Council in order to give the best possible unsullied feedback.

This discussion will continue at the next meeting of Excom at a time certain with a set time limit.

7. Teaching Evaluations for Online Courses

Postponed

8. Planning future Senate agendas

Postponed.

9. Sharepoint

Postponed.

10. Adjournment

M/S/P (Maxwell/Caplan)

Respectfully Submitted,

Julie Glass, Secretary