Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, January 6, 2009

Members present: Jennifer Eagan, Karina Garbesi, Julie Glass, Susan Gubernat, Rita Liberti, Sally Murphy, Susan Opp, Mo Qayoumi, Henry Reichman, Jeffery Seitz

Members absent: Jane Lopus

Guests: Carl Bellone, Bob Burt, John Charles, Linda Dalton, Mike Mahoney, James Mitchell, Don Sawyer, Terri Swartz, Arthurlene Towner

1. Approval of the agenda
M/S/P (Murphy/Liberti) to approve.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting on 11-18-08 and 11-25-08
M/S/P (Gubernat/Eagan) to approve the minutes of 11-18-08.
M/S/P (Seitz/Liberti) to approve the minutes of 11-25-08 (one abstention).

3. Reports
   A. Report of the Chair

   There will be a free Winter Fiction Reading by Dorothy Allison on 1/15 at 7PM in the Biella Room. This event is part of the Distinguished Writers Series. Keep your eye out for a possible change in venue.

   Everyone should have received an e-mail reminder about registering for AlertMe (CSUEB emergency alert system). This is a free service that will help you keep in contact regarding threats to the University.

   08-09 cFAC 1 (08-09 Subcommittee memberships) needs to be revised as follows: Asha Rao to replace Cesar Maloles on the Outstanding Professor Subcommittee and David Stronck to replace Jim Zarillo on the Promotion, Tenure Retention Subcommittee.

   M/S/P (Garbesi/Liberti) to make these replacements.

   Trustee visits are tentatively scheduled for 2009 as given below. There will likely be an opportunity for Excom to meet with the visiting trustees. These visits are part of their regular rounds of visiting campuses.
   2/5: Margaret Fortune
   2/18: Debra Farar
   3/3: Carol Chandler and George Gowgani
   4/7: Peter Mehas

   It was suggested that, if time permits, the trustees might meet with representatives from the campus unions.

   B. Report of the President

   Things were quiet on the budget front over the holidays. Preliminary enrollment numbers for Winter Quarter look strong as compared to last year even with the elimination of some low enrolled courses. Because of Winter quarter starting on a Monday there were some difficulties with receiving and processing payments. Adjustments will perhaps be made next time this issue arises.
Environmental Impact Forums for the Campus Master Plan were quite helpful. Comments and questions will be incorporated into the documents that go to the Board of Trustees. CSUEB is working with the Chancellor’s Office to prepare the plan for consideration by the Board of Trustees which will hopefully occur at its March meeting.

During November and December the Cabinet worked on a set of Values and Guiding Principles for the budget. These were brought to UPABC. There will not be an across the board approach, rather ideas were sought as to how to protect instruction and create a budget that will protect the mission of the institution. The Cabinet did a great job working together. They looked at the base budget and what was known about potential cuts. The cost of instruction for the base FTE target as well as mandatory/fixed costs (benefits, risk, energy) were taken into account. For what was left over, consideration of every division’s requirements to function were considered. An overall budget plan was developed that will be shared with UPABC at its meeting on Friday 9 – 10 (or 11) for comments. It is important to protect instruction, follow the contract in all dealings with lecturers, and to protect staff positions when possible. It is not clear whether entitled lecturer positions will be threatened. It was noted that only 1.0 lecturer instructional base reductions count as a layoff.

There was a question about looking into the effects of eliminating courses that were under enrolled in December. For example, there are some gateway classes in English with long waiting lists but no new sections can be opened without the cancellation of other lower enrolled courses. There was concern about the impact on students.

It was noted that the CEAS Dean search was cancelled due to procedural issues. Jodi Servatius has agreed to stay in the position until June 30th. There have been preliminary discussions between the Provost and the President regarding the most prudent time to begin another search.

C. Report of the Statewide Academic Senators

December meetings of most of the standing committees were cancelled or via phone. The plenary in January has been condensed to 2 days for budget reasons. This situation is of concern to a number of those on statewide senate.

4. Appointments

M/S/P (Murphy/Eagan) to appoint Lynn Eudey to replace Bruce Trumbo on the Senate for Winter Quarter.

5. Approval of the Winter 09 Election Schedule

M/S/P (Garbesi/Murphy) to approve.

6. 05-06 CIC 12revised, GE application of previously approved GEOG courses to the list

M/S (Seitz/Garbesi) to place on the Senate agenda. The document corrects the original document because some courses that were approved by CIC didn’t make it onto the Senate document.

The motion to place on the Senate agenda passed.

7. 08-09 CIC 16, Guidelines for General Education Prerequisites and Suggestions for Prerequisites for Upper Division and Graduate Courses

M/S (Murphy/Liberti). It was thought that a policy like this is needed and has important implications, but that the current proposal is unclear in several places. It was noted that there already is a policy that lower division GE must be taken before upper division GE, an idea that had strong support. There are questions, however, as to whether the current policy is enforced.

Some specific areas that require clarification on the document under consideration were pointed out. For example, a) the meaning of the phrases “program prerequisites”, “prerequisites should be an indication of the reason…,” b) why B6 should have a mathematics prerequisite (B4) but not other prerequisites, c) the third to last paragraph, and d) why CAPR is mentioned at all. In general there was concern about the stated prerequisites and in some places why certain
prerequisites were required while other related GE course categories were not. There was also general concern about how these prerequisites would impact students taking upper division courses in their home department to fulfill a major requirement rather than a GE requirement.

It was explained that the goal was to come up with appropriate GE prerequisites taking into account the descriptions required for GE classifications. The goal was to build expectations into the prerequisite structure.

It was not clear if the current document is meant only to address courses numbered 3XXX and 4XXX, or others as well. It was not clear, in its current form, that the document would apply only to GE courses.

Some were worried that implementation of this policy (or one like it) would require course revisions for all the courses to which it applied. Concern about PeopleSoft’s ability to handle the implementation was expressed. There was some general complaining about PeopleSoft. The possibility of having course descriptions appear faster in PS and/or the idea of having a “pop up” for courses with a GE designation about GE prerequisites. It was thought that this would avoid the need for all affected courses to go through a course modification process.

The chair of CIC was supportive of the document being referred back to that committee.

Some specific areas to be addressed are: Clarify that the document only refers to GE courses (or make it clearer as to the scope of the policy), catalog copy implications, PeopleSoft implications, and reasonable exceptions (e.g. majors).

M/S/P (Reichman/Eagan) to refer back to CIC.

8. 08-09 CIC 17, Policy Guidelines for Requesting New Course Prefixes

M/S (Seitz/Garbesi) There was concern that this document would require the establishment of a new major/minor/etc. in order to institute a new prefix. It was explained that the goal is to prevent the initiation of new prefixes without having any review process. Women’s Studies (with prefix WOST) was given as an example of why this is not necessary and has not been followed in the past. Another example was given with college level prefixes such as SCI. It was noted that some departments have moved away from such designations because of trouble getting credit for enrollment in these courses. There are, of course, also areas of study that would not fall within a single college. The area of Jewish Studies was referred to as an area impacted by this document. It was not clear whether a program should grow under the “wrong” prefix and then change the prefix or if the prefix should be assigned and then the program would/could grow.

Many of the questions raised rested on the definition of an “academic unit” as it appears in this document. It was suggested that much of the problem would be resolved if this term was clarified or, perhaps, replaced with “recognized area of study”.

It was felt that there should be some critical mass of courses available in the curriculum before a new designation is granted. The idea of a temporary designation was mentioned.

M/S (Seitz/Gubernat) motion to send it back to CIC with suggestion to add another bullet for “innovative new interdisciplinary areas of study” and perhaps clarification of “academic units”. The motion passed.

9. Discussion of Winter Quarter cutbacks and planning for Spring

Linda Dalton provided some enrollment data. In particular, the number of students “disenrolled” as of the start of classes was about the same as in prior years. Staff in the mailroom and elsewhere worked on January 2nd in order to process anything that arrived on campus or online prior to the start of classes. Fewer than 400 students were disenrolled because of nonpayment. A total of approximately 160 sections were cancelled (not counting classes that were simply moved, etc.) with an average enrollment of 7.5 students. Overall enrollment, which is on target, is higher than last year. Cancelled classes saved the university money. CSUEB is looking at a $12 million cut to the base budget, so there is a long way to go. It was asked if the savings from faculty raises (unlikely to be distributed) would count towards savings. It was explained that
raises are still being negotiated and that CSUEB has not been allocated funds to cover the raises that were not given.

It is up to the College Deans to determine how much of a cut should be instituted for the Spring Quarter. The goal will be to plan ahead so that sections needn’t be cancelled after students have already begun to enroll. It was explained that Deans were given 5 years worth of data on average class size. So, unless there has been some radical change in demand, it should be possible to determine which classes will fill and which will not (even taking into account late enrollments). It was noted that there have been some substantial shifts in enrollment in the past two years with the increase in the Freshman and Sophomore class, a shift that has to be understood university-wide. One idea would be, in order to reserve rooms, to list classes with a class capacity of 0 (and turn off the wait list). That way a room will be available, should an additional section need to be opened up. One key goal will be to find ways to get students to enroll earlier than in the past. At this time there is very little deterrent ($25) for late enrollment. Because classes have not filled in the past, students could always find the classes they needed after “shopping around” and/or waiting till the last minute. One idea was to put a greater emphasis on producing annual schedules (or annual minimum schedule, as courses can always be added). It was noted that if this is done, it will be very important that these schedules were accurate and to ensure that classes that appear on the annual schedule are offered during the quarters stated. There was general agreement that additional advising would be helpful.

The discussion moved to the need for GE advising and the role of the faculty in this level of advising. It was noted that the current system is easier to negotiate than in the past. It was also pointed out that there is the capacity to make a note at myCSUEB regarding advising sessions and what advice was given. If there is a problem down the line regarding if a given course should “count”, the GE Director is able to approve the credit if there is an appropriate notation in the student’s records. Thus it is difficult to make a “gross” error. It is important that GE be seen as complimentary and exploratory for the major, and having regular faculty doing GE advising will support this idea. It was noted that better GE advising will lead to better major advising. Sally Murphy offered to run faculty training sessions for GE advising. The offer was welcomed.

There was concern about the backlog of transfer credit evaluations, especially for international students. It was noted that students who “break enrollment” follow the current pattern and that classes that have counted for GE in the past will (when the course was taken) count under the new patterns. Faculty may e-mail Linda Dalton with specific cases of students (include student’s name and netid) who are still awaiting the evaluation of their transfer credit. The evaluation should now be completed by the student’s second term. This is a key area of concern in PEM and VP Dalton will follow through on these cases.

10. Adjournment

M/S/P (Glass/Seitz) to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie Glass, Secretary