Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 6, 2007

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

Members absent: Calvin Caplan, Dianne Rush Woods

Guests: Carl Bellone, John Charles, Ola Dokun, Jennifer Eagan, Mark Karplus, Mike Mahoney, Xeno Rasmusson, Don Sawyer, Terri Swartz

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Maxwell/Murphy) with item 10 moved to item 12.

2. Approval of the minutes from the meeting on October 30, 2007 (not yet available)

3. Reports

A. Report of the Chair

- Cloud Nine by Caryl Churchill will be performed on campus November 9th, 10th, 16th, and 17th at 8PM, and November 18th at 2PM.
- There will be a reception for students who have served or are serving in the US Military and their families on November 16th, 4:30 – 6PM. Staff and faculty who are veterans are encouraged to attend.
- Henry Gilbert will speak at the Anthropology Department Colloquium on November 15th, 4:30 – 6PM.
- The Academic Planning Task Force continues its work including several surprising helpful and encouraging Economic Development Roundtables at which employers echoed the educational priorities of the faculty. These included basic skills, foundational general education, and the value of diversity. They also spoke to the strengths and advantages of graduates who already have experience in a professional working environment. The APTF will hold several town hall meetings primarily for faculty, though all of the campus community may attend. The meetings will be to gather feedback on the issues and work done so far by the Task Force. A draft report will be prepared by early December. The Town Halls will take place on the Hayward Campus on November 13th and 14th at noon and on the Concord Campus on November 14th at 4PM in conjunction with the Contra Costa Advisory Committee.
- FAC held a special meeting to work on the Appointment and Review document. The document should come to Excom by the end of the quarter.
- At this point there is nothing new for the Excom agenda next week, so there will be no meeting. If anything pressing comes up it will be circulated via e-mail. Excom will then meet on November 20th and 27th, followed by a Senate meeting with very full agenda on December 4th. That agenda will include several new degree programs for approval.

B. Report of the President

The report was given by Provost Mahoney.
- This morning the LA times reported that due to the decline of state General Fund revenues and the potential for a $10 billion budget shortfall in fiscal year 2008-09, the Governor has requested all state agencies and education to submit a plan for a 10 percent General Fund budget reduction. Richard West has written a response.
- The CBE Dean search is proceeding well with candidates for phone interviews established. It is expected that this search will be complete by the end of this quarter.
- The CLASS Dean search is also proceeding well with candidates for phone interviews to be established soon. It is expected that this search will be complete by the end of this quarter.
- The CEAS Dean search is not proceeding quite as quickly, with fewer applications received, though some are still trickling in. The committee will convene next week.
- The DCIE search committee will convene this Friday. It is anticipated that this search will be completed in Winter quarter.
- The AVP of ORSP search had a later date for consideration of applications. It is hoped that the committee will be convened this quarter.
- The search for University Librarian will not start this quarter. The committee will be elected as part of the Fall Senate/Library elections. Myoung-ja Kwon will stay through June 30th, 2008.
ExCom meeting on 11-6-07

- The first meeting of the University Undergraduate Advising Council will take place Friday, November 16th at noon in UU 311. About 60 people are expected. The meeting is open to the entire University community.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators
- Committee meetings take place tomorrow followed by the Plenary on Thursday and Friday. The guest speaker will be Jack Scott. The main topics will include the graduate business fee and a response to Access to Excellence. The full agenda is available online.

4. Appointments
- Susan Gubernat to replace Dennis Chester on Fairness for Fall
- Michelle Tellez and Min Sohn, Nursing, as representatives to the Student Health Advisory Committee (confirmation of previous email approval)
- Confirmation of prior email approval of Ellen Woodard, Lecturer in Geography and Environmental Studies, to the Assigned Time Task

M/S/P (Maxwell/Opp) to approve

5. Approval of the new Final Lists for the Fall 07 Elections
M/S/P (Maxwell/Rush-Woods) to approve. It was noted that Joy Andrews’ title should be added for consistency.

6. Staff Senate Representative Nominations, for election by the Academic Senate
M/S/P (Opp/Maxwell) to place on the Senate agenda as a BEC.

7. 07-08 CIC 3, UDGE application of HIST 3622 to Area C4
M/S/P (Maxwell/Murphy) to place on the Senate agenda. EDGE should be UDGE on the document.

8. 07-08 CIC 4, UDGE application of ES 3120 to Area D4
M/S/P (Maxwell/Murphy) to place on the Senate agenda.

9. 07-08 CIC 5, CIC Subcommittee Memberships, 2007-2008
M/S/P (Rush-Woods/Maxwell) to approve with the addition of Xeno Rasmussen for one of the CLASS vacancies on the Subcommittee on Basic Skills Requirement Appeals.

10. AA-2007-28 Transforming Course Design
Transforming Course Design is an instructional scheme created and advocated by the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT), an independent non-profit organization dedicated to the effective use of information technology to improve student learning outcomes and reduce the cost of higher education. One of NCAT’s premises is that a high percentage of all college enrollment is focused in a few large gateway courses. NCAT believes that these courses can be redesigned following their model for efficiency (and quality). It was noted that all evaluation of existing redesign programs has been done by NCAT itself. It is unknown if the claimed cost savings take into account the cost of server space, etc. One possible motivation for implementing course transformation for the CSU is to justify additional academic technology funds requests to the legislature. Our campus currently has an individual transformation project in Human Development. The RFP here allows for each campus to submit ≤ 4 “high impact” courses to be considered for transformation. High impact courses are those that have significant numbers of low grades (D, F and W), high enrollment, and faculty willing to work on the project. From all campus submissions the CSU will select at least 2 for transformation by an intercampus team. It is anticipated that Tom Carey (Visiting Senior Scholar in the Chancellor's Office and Professor of Management Sciences at the University of Waterloo) will run the systemwide program. Remedial courses may be considered for transformation. A list of the top 100 courses by enrollment was distributed. Biology courses (and possibly all the science lab courses) were under reported because the “average class size” included labs. It was suggested that it would be useful to have the pass rates for these top 100 courses. There were questions and concern regarding some of the criteria. For example, why are only low pass rate courses being considered, and why individual faculty interest rather than departmental buy-in? The implication appears to be (without evidence) that course transformation will improve pass rates. The need for departmental support was emphasized in light of the fact that there is a strong possibility that if a course is selected then departments will experience substantial pressure to utilize the transformed course materials on all campuses. In support of the program it was noted that freshman who are struggling to pass specific gateway courses (including remedial mathematics, biology, and others) might benefit from the redesigned courses. It is hoped that this program can be used to do something positive for students and help them succeed. It was suggested that remedial mathematics and perhaps some introductory science courses would be the best candidates. The Provost intends to provide all department chairs the opportunity to propose courses for redesign via an e-mail solicitation. It is anticipated that some faculty may choose to contact their sister departments on other campuses to
coordinate efforts/proposed courses. It was felt that everyone should be given an opportunity to suggest courses. The provost thanked Excom for its input.

11. Acceptable Computing Use Policy (John Charles)

John Charles gave some background. The original policy was approved in 1998 and the current document is updated to take into account technology developments since that time. In particular, Section 3.3 “Prohibited Use: Obscene Matter” is entirely new. The wording in this section was taken from the CA government code and has been reviewed by legal counsel. There was concern about the use of the phrases “unethical” and “unprofessional” as vague, and the use of acronyms such as CENIC in item 5.0. There was specific concern about wording in Section 3.5 stating “… no inherent right to privacy …” which contradicts earlier statements. It was suggested that adding something like “in this context, there is no inherent right to privacy” with the context being in case of an investigation. It was noted that the whole section is in the context of an investigation, but CIO Charles will check with legal council regarding making the statement more explicit. Currently feedback is being sought from campus constituents such as UIT, the Provost’s Council, Excom, and the Senate. The document will ultimately go to the Chancellor’s Office HR Department as all such acceptable use policies must.

The next item for discussion was the e-mail and IM retention policy. Motivation was given by CIO Charles. It was explained that electronic documents need to be stored appropriately for use in e-discovery and that the University must have policies for the management and storage of e-documents in an appropriate record retention repository. Such policies must stand up to scrutiny in the courts. It was pointed out that e-mail systems were not meant as document storage systems, rather as communication systems and that this policy will only affect e-mail stored on the campus servers, not on faculty desktops. There is also the growing problem of storage demands and the associated costs. It was suggested that Excom consider whether e-mail should be used for communication or as an archive and the need to develop processes to distinguish between valuable and non-valuable electronic documents. Several specific problems were raised such as retaining template messages that are used regularly and it was communicated that such specific requirements could be accommodated. The motivation for the policy was questioned. Is it financial, legal, or something else? It was suggested that the cost savings might not take into account the added cost in time and computing support required if all faculty were to use remote access regularly. A distinction was drawn between business and administrative use of e-mail and faculty use. It was suggested that such a policy would impact faculty members’ ability to work with their students and professional communities and that faculty could not perform the duties required of them in support of the university mission with these restrictions. It was generally agreed that 3 months was far too short for faculty work which includes student recruiting, communication with students before, during and after a given quarter, as well as professional communication with collaborators all over the world.

There was a general agreement that if this goes into effect in one form or another there will be a strong need for a slow and well thought out transition including training for faculty on using remote access. It was suggested that if the problem could be solved by limiting server space and thereby requiring faculty to “police” their own usage, that might be a better option. Finally, it was explained that this is an IT policy, not a Senate policy. It was emphasized that this discussion and the serious concerns brought to the table reflect the concerns of the broader faculty community.

Discussion of a document on recommendations for hybrid and online courses schedule notes was postponed.

12. Business Graduate Fee (discussion, for feedback to the CSU)

Background information was provided by Hank Reichman. The Statewide Senate and SJSU Academic Senate have passed resolutions calling for a broad discussion of the proposal including the idea of differential fees in general while Humboldt State’s Academic Senate has passed a resolution in opposition to the fee. It appears that, in general, business faculty at the state level are in support while other faculty are opposed. The new Ed.D. degree provides a precedent for differential fees, though in that case the fees were mandated by the legislature and were based upon the fact that the Ed.D. is a higher level degree with a higher level of education required. It was noted that any changes in salary structure are subject to the CBA. It was pointed out that this discussion needn’t result in a “yes” or “no” decision by Excom. In addition, Excom might consider referring to FAC, CIC, or CAPR and/or having a debate/discussion with the full Senate. Clearly the topic has the potential to be divisive. Some useful and relevant information not in any of the documentation was provided. For example, the additional funds will be distributed as follows: 25% to financial aide, 10% to campus president for campus use, 65% to business colleges to address issues of support. Also, it was pointed out that individual campuses can choose to opt out.

The arguments in favor included the lack of competitiveness of instructional positions in the CSU for qualified business faculty. AACSB accreditation requirements for faculty qualifications and currency are extremely difficult to meet within the standard CSU workload structure. AACSB was described as a sort of “gold standard” of approval and that students select (or don’t select) business schools based upon their AACSB accreditation status. It was pointed out that the increased fee would improve the educational opportunities of all students in CSU Colleges of Business, not just those paying the higher fees, and that this would impact accreditation qualifications. It was reported that CSU MBA students expect to make
an annual salary of $126,000 five years after completing their degree. It was pointed out that a graduating nursing student can expect to make $100,000 per year and yet these students are being subsidized rather than asked to pay additional fees. Additional statistics provided included that 21% of our students get some type of financial aid, 81% of CBE students think AACSB accreditation is important, 79% think it is crucial to their success in the market place, and 58% think the price of the MBA should be raised to maintain accreditation. In response to concerns that some students would be unable to afford the increased fees, it was explained that 2/3 of MBA students are fully employed and 1/3 get fee reimbursement. It was also pointed out that even with higher fee, a CSU MBA would still be the least expensive from among CPEC comparison institutions.

Questions and concerns included the relationship between fee increases and an overall appearance of privatization. It was pointed out that all programs face difficulty in recruitment and retention because of workload and other factors and that all programs would benefit and recruitment and retention would improve from the types of support this fee might provide to faculty in business. These included extra quarter for pay, summer stipends for research, and early career research programs. It was also pointed out that many programs have special needs and requirements and that this could lead to more programs requesting differential fee structures. There was concern that this fee increase might have a disproportional impact on minority enrollment. Perhaps this would be addressed by specific outreach efforts. Students were concerned that the CSU consistently proposes raising student fees if more funds cannot be found from the state. The option of seeking external funds from the private sector or elsewhere was mentioned. Because there was no justification or explanation for the specific amount of $210/unit, there is the appearance that not all information has been provided or, perhaps, insufficient research had been done. Increasing student fees should be a last resort, and it was not clear from the information provided that all other avenues had been explored. The question of who should pay, the taxpayer or the students who benefit from a given program was described as disingenuous in light of our regressive tax structure and overall underfunding of education.

The Board of Trustees wants to hear back from campuses about the proposed fee. It is not necessary each campus come out in favor or against, or even that a resolution be proposed with a reporting of x% in favor and (100 – x)% against. After some discussion about divisiveness and efficacy, it was decided that the proposed fee would be included on the December Senate agenda as an informational item. It is possible that by that time more information will be available from the Statewide Senate regarding statewide support or opposition. It was proposed that Interim Dean of CBE Terri Swartz would give a brief presentation in support of the proposed fee. There was some concern that no presentation would be given in opposition. The Board of Trustees will take action at its January meeting, at the earliest.

13. Faculty access to course rosters (continuing discussion)
Postponed due to lack of time.

14. Adjournment

M/S/P (Glass/Maxwell)

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Glass, Secretary