

Executive Committee and Campus Chair Meeting Minutes
December 2, 2004
Chancellor's Office, Munitz Room

Executive Committee Members: Bob Cherny, Cristy Jensen, Lynne Cook, Marshelle Thobaben, David McNeil, John Tarjan

Senate Chairs/Designees: B. J. Moore (Bakersfield), Jim Postma (Chico), Michael Botwin (Fresno), Mike Bedell (Fullerton), Donald Sawyer (Hayward), Ken Fulgham (Humboldt), Margaret Merryfield (Long Beach), Raymond Garcia (LA), Bob Hammaker (Maritime), Dan Fernandez (Monterey Bay), Ronald McIntyre (Northridge), Glenda C. Brock (Pomona), Cristy Jensen (Sacramento), Lloyd Peake (San Bernardino), Caran Colvin (SF), Miki Donoho (San José), Jacqueline Trischman (San Marcos), Melanie Dreisbach (Sonoma)

Visitors: Ann Peacock (ASCSU Ex. Dir.), Kathy Kaiser (Faculty Trustee), Jan Gregory (Chair, FA), Ted Anagnoson (Chair, AA), Elizabeth Hoffman (CFA), Sam Edelman (ASCSU), Lorie Roth (CO), Gordon Smith (COLD)

1. Introduction of Campus Chairs, Executive Committee CSU, Visitors
2. Announcement—facilitator training for the LDTP project has taken place. It seems to have gone well.
3. Reports
 - a. Chair
 - i. Issues Discussed at Academic Council Today of Particular Interest to Faculty
 1. parking
 2. outside employment
 - ii. Academic Technology Advisory Council (ATAC)
 1. Funds are limited.
 2. Provosts are looking for faculty input—please communicate with the ASCSU with your ideas.
 3. The group is looking for ways to facilitate the professional development of faculty.
 4. Related issue of concern to provosts—how do we disseminate information learned at conferences more broadly to the campuses?
 5. Concern was expressed over the use of technology to increase SFR. Quality should not be negatively impacted by technology.
 6. Continuing financial support of technology is an issue.
 7. The focus needs to be on using technology to increase quality, as cost savings are elusive and often come at the cost of quality.

- iii. Applied doctorates
 - 1. The CSU may need to have the authority to offer a doctorate in audiology to meet state needs.
 - 2. It appears that the CSU will ask for the authority without asking for additional funding.
 - 3. There will be some opposition from the UC, a lot of opposition from the privates—there is a move to offer this type of program via self-support. There is a lot of concern in the group about going down the self-support road.
 - iv. Graduate education—Chair McNeil hopes that the ASCSU will develop a position on the funding, future of graduate education in the CSU.
- b. Academic Senate CSU (ASCSU)
- i. Faculty Affairs (Jan Gregory, chair)
 - 1. Have a resolution that reaffirms academic freedom (students, others). The committee is looking at statements of academic rights, freedom, and procedures for ensuring student rights. (See the senate newsletter for more information and web links.)
 - a. Long Beach, San Francisco campuses have been targeted by the national media in response to student complaints. Policies and procedures are in place to deal with these types of issues but are often not used and faculty and students may be unaware of them.
 - b. Some concerns may be legitimate. We should make sure that faculty uphold principles of academic freedom, the rights of students and fulfill their professional responsibilities.
 - c. We may wish to develop models to guide the development of committees on professional ethics.
 - d. We might assemble a packet of resource materials for campus senates to use in addressing these issues.
 - e. There is a concern about the use of e-mail for political advocacy, other inappropriate purposes. Do we need to have policies governing use?
 - f. We may be failing to police our colleagues with regards to ethics, professional responsibilities.
 - g. The definitions of academic freedom, professional responsibility seems amorphous. Perhaps we need to have more discussion of what these mean amongst ourselves and with the administration.
 - h. We need to take student complaints seriously and investigate them.

2. Service of lecturer faculty on campus senates
 - a. Compensation for service is an issue. There are a variety of approaches across campuses. Is this another way of increasing “free labor”?
 - b. Can this service be a part of the evaluation process with an eye towards range elevation? Even voluntary service can be counted.
 - c. Sonoma has three lecturer seats on the senate. Some release time is available to them. A half time requirement for service complicates thing during difficult budgets.
 - d. Some concern was expressed about enshrining representation rights for a particular class of faculty.
 - e. Lecturers serve on a number of campus senates.
 - f. Wouldn't service for lecturers actually work against their possibility of doing enough scholarly activity to move into the tenure-track ranks?
 - g. On at least one campus counselors, coaches, lecturers serve voluntarily on the senate.
 - h. An argument was made that compensation for service of lecturers should not be singled out since many of us in different categories are not adequately compensated for service.
 - i. The second resolved clause that commends campuses that have lecturer senate “slots” is seen as controversial even though it does not request a change in any campus policies.
 - j. Some changes were suggested to the resolution.
- ii. Committee on Teacher Education & K-12 Relations (TEKR) (Lynne Cook, liaison)
 1. Enrollments are down in teacher education. One reason may be that students cannot enroll in programs until they pass the CSET. This may be complicated by test/campus schedule conflicts. A one-term waiver of the requirement may be indicated.
 2. SB 2042—change in credentialing process (combination of university, school district credentialing). Districts and universities are working together to try to get academic credit for credential requirement completion. 5th year programs (new use of the term) and induction programs are being explored/compared. These changes have resulted in lowered enrollments on several campuses. We may not be

“competitive” with either private universities or school districts for credentialing.

- iii. Early Assessment Program (EAP)--\$100,000 has been given to each campus to support the implementation of EAP. Many have appointed coordinators. It is unclear how the money is being allocated on the other campuses. The Academic Senate CSU has appointed an advisory committee on EAP. Please refer questions/comments on EAP to Ted Anagnoson.
- iv. Academic Affairs (Ted Anagnoson, chair)
 - 1. Graduate Education Report Issues to Be Discussed
 - a. Potentially Designating a Graduate Faculty
 - b. Resources to Support Graduate Education
 - c. The Role/Offering of Certificates and Credentials
 - d. Recognition of Faculty Work in Reading/Supervising Master’s Theses
 - e. Applied Doctorates
 - i. They are going to be required for accreditation in audiology.
 - ii. Physical therapy may be the next field to move in this direction.
 - iii. Nursing may also move in this direction.
 - f. The CSU produces 40% of the graduate degrees in the state.
 - g. We need to be careful to not take on more responsibilities without the appropriate resources. Several chairs echoed this thought.
 - h. The provosts are discussing this issue right now at a meeting at a Los Angeles Airport hotel. Chair McNeil is attending.
 - i. We are not talking about PhDs. These applied degrees do not require the same amount of scholarship.
 - 2. Advising will be an important topic this year.
 - 3. We have a resolution pending on community service (mandatory vs. voluntary).
 - 4. We have a resolution recommending flexibility in GE course completion before transfer for some majors.
- v. Fiscal & Governmental Affairs (Cristy Jensen, liaison)
 - 1. We experimented with substituting visits to local legislators for our traditional legislative day with mixed results. This

approach will be rethought. We will likely move back to an intensive legislative visit day in the spring as our main lobbying effort.

2. We will be implementing an education program for the 30 or so newly elected representatives.
3. Bob Hammaker (Maritime) suggested a letter be written expounding the values and benefits of the CSU system to the state to be signed by campus senate chairs. They drafted a similar letter with regards to the Maritime Academy, had their Executive Committee and statewide AS senators sign it, and then sent it on to all of their district legislators. A difficulty in doing this would be to get all of the AS Chairs to sign it. Bob can furnish a copy of the letter drafted by the California Maritime Academy (CMA) faculty leadership. This could be sent to all new legislators in a CSU orientation packet.

vi. Faculty Trustee Report

1. A long-term student fee policy and the Compact seem incompatible for the time being, based on resolutions passed by ASCSU and the many issues/questions raised at the prior BOT meeting. But the questions surrounding a viable long-term student fee policy have not disappeared.
2. The campuses have submitted accountability reports. Graduate education is not being addressed. You should as the Senate Chair have seen your campus' final report and hopefully have commented on it. Go to the website in my Trustee report for the link so that you can view your campus report.
3. There is a large **hole** in the state budget. Only 11-15 cents of every revenue dollar can be used for discretionary purposes. Higher education is the only component that does NOT have some attached guarantee or mandate.
4. Campuses will likely need to give back money if they do not meet our enrollment targets.
5. Hiring has not been successful—the salary lag remains, particularly at the full professor level. CPEC will issue the new salary report for Faculty in Dec. 14-15 meetings.

4. Discussion Items

a. Survey of Campus Strategic Planning Practices

- i. Humboldt—had focus groups of various constituents (over 20)—it seems that the president's vision still dominated the process.
- ii. Long Beach—had many meetings in 2000 but the ultimate plan seemed to be pretty generic. They are starting with campus leaders

and rolling out the process this year. It is possible that they are getting relatively little value from these numerous meetings.

- iii. Sonoma—had an outside consultant (William Cordeiro from CSUCI) who seemed to be very good. They have a steering committee of 32 people (5 faculty). They are optimistic about aligning the vision and the fiscal resources of the campus. It is important to have many faculty involved.
 - iv. Hayward—are attempting to align resources with the university's mission.
 - v. Maritime—Our planning retreats have been successful. The hard part is implementing ideas. We used the STRATUS consulting group for the first time this Fall. Bob Hammaker was in Long Beach the first day of the campus retreat so he missed a lot of what went on...but, he did hear some dissatisfaction from those who attended; not with the sharing of thoughts but rather with the way STRATUS ran the retreat.
 - vi. San Francisco—have a report coming forward after hundreds of meetings and several years. Perceptions vary about the value of the process, the importance of the final report. Perhaps the problem is that they are not addressing some underlying issues of importance to many faculty.
 - vii. Sacramento—the process has ebbed and flowed. It is organized by themes (8) such as teaching and learning. This may be a valuable approach. They have selected the strategic planning option for their WASC reaccreditation. There is a heavy weighting toward drawing faculty involvement from senate leadership due to reassigned time issues.
- b. Undergraduate teaching vs. scholarly and creative activities
- i. The Humboldt administration is pushing towards a focus on research—the president wishing to change the focus in order to revise RTP standards, increase outside funding, and support graduate education.
- c. Advising
- i. At the Maritime Academy students declare their major as freshmen. Each freshman is assigned an advisor and that advisor works with that student (in almost all cases) for the duration of their undergraduate studies. All students are REQUIRED to meet with their advisors face to face before the beginning of a new semester. The nice thing about this is that something of a relationship develops over 4 years and the advising periods create true value. While there is a big difference between having 675 students and having 14,000 or more, the advising program in place at the Maritime Academy is a good one that works well.
 - ii. Trustee Kaiser—The Advising resolution was introduced by CSSA at the Oct. 28 BOT meeting. Their resolution calls for a study of the

advising process and resources throughout the CSU and then the development of a Strategic Plan to address the issues. CSSA has offered to help as students in the advising process. As Faculty Trustee, I am encouraging us to convene a Conference on Advising. However, I think our first step is to get the reports from the campus Facilitating Graduation taskforce groups. It should be very clear that advising does NOT consist of marking a series of courses, which however valuable is only one piece of a process, wherein faculty and staff assist students in discovering their academic interests, talents and skills, and make appropriate matches so as to move effectively towards graduation and the successive career steps.-- this is my 'take on advising' as well as how I remember the general conversation. Others may differ.

d. Lottery Monies

- i. One president used the money for laptops for faculty without any faculty input. The decision itself may not have been a problem but the process was.
- ii. Long Beach—has a lottery committee. The process is somewhat decentralized.
- iii. Bakersfield—used to be very centralized. Most faculty were unaware these funds exist. The administration views this as their money. No money is used to support individual faculty.
- iv. There are many models/amounts of discretion/faculty involvement across campuses.
- v. Related issue—how are indirect costs which are generated by faculty distributed/spent? There may be inadequate faculty involvement/transparency.

e. 05/06 Campus Budget Planning

- i. What happens during the summer when budgets are finally approved and faculty are absent? Faculty just needs to be there.
- ii. Transparency in the budget, the process of decision-making is necessary. How can we ensure this?
- iii. Monterey Bay—not very much budget information available, not much input on budget from faculty.
- iv. Hayward—budget committee appointments are for 4 years. People commit to showing up during the summer.
- v. Pomona—there is no budget committee with senate participation.
- vi. Long Beach—everyone on campus has access to the entire budget including salaries. The committee meets in the summer.
- vii. Northridge—have regular overall reports on the budget from the President and Provost at senate meetings. Faculty reports that the budget committee meetings are unsatisfactory. Decisions on cuts have been decentralized.

- viii. LA—there is a secret formula for sharing indirect costs. They have a full summer quarter. Budget meetings are called at inconvenient times and only two faculty are on the committee. The President makes most decisions.
- ix. Humboldt—were able to protect the recommendations of the faculty advisory committee that is largely based upon the model of Long Beach.
- x. SF—have a group looking at indirect costs.

f. CMS

- i. San Bernardino—will need \$20m to implement CMS, are borrowing \$9m from the system with no repayment plan.
- ii. San José—spent less on CMS than other campuses but will be paying for it for years.
- iii. Pomona—has had to borrow funds. The Student module does not seem to work well for faculty. There have been many problems with the system. Other campuses have stolen personnel. They are using many consultants.
- iv. Long Beach—seems to have gone smoothly. Paid for the conversion prior to the last round of budget cuts.
- v. Sacramento—are encouraging faculty to be involved in the process. Student module will eat up all discretionary funds and growth monies. CMS may adversely affect academic quality.
- vi. Northridge—have had a lot of glitches. Have seen some improvements in functionality over previous systems. Some simple reports still cannot be generated. We paid for CMS before the last round of budget cuts.
- vii. LA—some parts of Student work but advising has been a disaster. The cost of CMS is killing us.
- viii. San Francisco—have no desire to proceed with Student. Finance seems to have problems cutting checks.
- ix. Fresno—prerequisite checking does not seem to be working.
- x. Humboldt—we are a Banner Campus.
- xi. Maritime Academy—which was being "carried" on Sonoma's database, has just this semester taken control of their own CMS. They are now using some consultant support to help run the system. They are not sure what the cost implications are at this time. Sonoma originally "carried" Maritime as a cost saving plan for both of us. At the time it was implemented we could not absorb the cost on our own. We have had reasonable success with the system. It has worked out exceedingly well for student advisement purposes including (1) checking pre-requisites (2) placing academic holds on students for advisement purposes (3) generating transcripts.

We have had a number of training sessions on the system and most faculty thinks it is user friendly.

- xii. A petition was distributed which requests that campuses be allowed discretion in the decision and timing regarding the implementation of the Student module.
5. Lorie Roth, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs and Gordon Smith, Director, Systemwide Library Programs, presented an ICT literacy assessment demonstration to the combined group.