

College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

Minutes of the CAHSS Council of Chairs Meeting

February 21, 2008

For approval on March 6, 2008

Attending: Ken Ayoob, Harry Wells, Armeda Reitzel, Susan Bennett, Joe Leeper, John Meyer, Michael Goodman, Mark Larson, Eugene Novotney, Steve Jenkins, Judith Little, Bernadette Cheyne, Kim Berry, Rosamel Benavides-Garb, Judith Wyland (recorder)

Minutes: The minutes of February 7 were approved with two corrections under "Discussion/Action Items:

1) #3, last sentence to read: Faculty, in consultation with Department Chairs, determines what amount of participation is appropriate. Motion, seconded, approved with 4 abstentions.

2) #5 c 1. changed to: The Dean instructs the Chairs to review courses that could be cut for next year *only*.

Motion, seconded, approved with 2 abstentions.

Guest Presenter: Cancelled

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Dean will ask about an option for offering classes through Extended Education for summer.

Discussion followed that if it is not an option, there may be bigger losses, as some departments had previously been able to offer regular classes in the summer, and they may also not be funded for regular summer. (note: A subsequent email confirmed that courses could not go to Extended Education with the exception of courses taught off-campus.)

2. Budget deficit explanation: If we cannot use our benefits savings, then our budget is out of balance about \$420,000. In AY 08-09, if we DO get to use benefits, our deficit will be reduced to about \$220,000. However, this does not reflect any proposed cuts, summer school, etc. If we manage to get to base budget, then we begin cuts for next year. A question arose asking if there might be inconsistencies in our process of cutting. Response was, that other program elimination is yet to be determined, and will be made at a higher administrative level after the prioritization process. We can recommend elimination of programs, but we would not realize savings from cuts in the short time frame imposed on us—it would take about two years to realize any savings.

Discussion ensued that from the 90s, a lesson was learned that when cuts were determined, a dollar amount was identified, and it was publicized that the additional funding would be borne by students. That ploy drove political changes to increase the budget to the CSU. Question: "Is this happening again?" Further discussion bore out that there are no historical statistics either for reference, or to guide the University in this time of budget crises.

This can also be seen as a time for a shift in thinking about OAA as a unit. The colleges cannot continue to operate as three independent entities.

3. Small grant Competition: RFP sent out this week; deadline for applications is March 28.
4. Summer Arts Week: Discussion of the process for encouraging student participation, and scholarship determination.
5. Nominations for Outstanding Student Awards: Department participation was encouraged. Dean was asked to thank the event promoters for getting the call out earlier this year, as had been requested last year.
6. Spring Preview: There will be no advising, just the informational sessions.
7. Dean has asked Mike Reilly to look into combining notices for HOP, Preview, Higher Ed.
8. PeopleSoft implementation of student registration and class scheduling has been delayed until Fall 09. Dean requested to ask the CMS staff that when the implementation time frame is being established, in order not to negatively impact the workload of department support staff, there be consideration any other University-wide deadlines being imposed at the same time.
9. The computer refresh list has been sent out.
10. Reminder that departments should be compiling the events/accolades that will be needed in about six weeks for the end-of-the-year report.
11. A call was issued for nominations for the UCC and Faculty Senate. It was agreed that nominations would be sent to Judy Wyland for preparation of the ballots. Hopefully, UCC nominations can be a part of the General Faculty election in March. Faculty Senate representatives need to be voted now, in order that they can be seated at the last meeting of the Senate this spring.

REPORTS:

1. WASC II: Last year the team developed and implemented a pilot project with 18 units on campus, focused on promoting the academic success for all students, especially traditionally underrepresented students. In a self-study process, departments analyze data related to access, retention, migration, and graduation rates of students in their major. The data is thoroughly disaggregated so that particular trends are clear, and which may typically be hidden in more general university statistics. From that analysis, departments are to develop a five-year plan to implement identified best practices appropriate to the department's self-identified goals to increase access, retention, and success of underrepresented students. The team established a 10-year implementation plan for all departments to conduct self-studies based on the data provided and university-wide benchmarks for improvement. The strategy is by incremental implementation of practices most appropriate to particular department circumstances, the overall result will be university improvement in access, retention, and academic success of underrepresented students.

2. Although the WASC II team will work with a limited number of departments at any given time, packets of data were sent out to all departments so that they can begin to review statistics. In doing so, it is hoped that departments will become interested in what the data tells them about themselves, and will self-identify their desire to begin their self-study by contacting WASC II. When a department does so, a 2-person team from WASC II will work directly with the department. If departments do not self-identify, then five to 10 departments will be chosen campus-wide by WASC II to begin their self-study this semester. The selection will be based on where the departments fall in relation to the HSU average for access, retention, and graduation of underrepresented students.

3. Guidelines were offered to explain the correct use of an "Incomplete":

a. There must be an "Incomplete Contract" with a copy held in the files of the department office.

b. "Incompletes" shall not be assigned when there are many missed assignments. Also, it is an unacceptable practice to assign a student an incomplete and then allow the student to repeat the entire course unofficially. CSU Executive Order 792 specifically prohibits that practice. Rather, in the case where there is not enough attendance or completed assignments to evaluate the student, a WU or F should be assigned (or whatever grade the student has earned).

Associate Dean to send out a reminder of the policies governing Incomplete, WU or need for F grade.

Academic Senate—

1. The ad hoc committee is preparing a "Bill of Particulars" to identify priority issues for developing dialogue with President Richmond (in response to a Senate resolution in December). The bill will be presented at the next Senate meeting (2/26). Next year's budget brings on many questions about University "catch-up" on expenses such as CMS and contractual obligations.

Budget—

1. A call will be issued soon for temporary help requests for AY 08-09; deadline, April 7.
2. Call for lottery/equipment will be sent out in April; deadline, May 12.

Curriculum—

1. Committee is beginning to enforce the required time limits agreed upon last year for departmental responses to CCC reviews of self studies.
2. GE syllabi—working on a comprehensive template for faculty use.

Computer & Technology—

1. Committee is working on a policy of cascading equipment in to be helpful in updating College labs. All faculty have been refreshed.

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

Prioritization—The Task Force has assembled information to present Chairs, who will disseminate data to faculty. A concern was voiced about preparation of the draft without enough input. Of especial concern was the method of "weighting," and whether or not reports will have had consistent data to support the determination of decisions.

Response from the Task Force representative was that there will be three separate rankings for the draft recommendations. The draft will then be presented to the deans and departments for a response (if needed). Ultimately, the task force will send a final report to the Provost. This raised questions about the deadlines—especially those in May—and, the possible lack of representation of small departments and programs. Chairs asked that the Task Force re-visit the timelines. The Task Force is also asked to look for efficiencies, and to define "program." It was suggested that minors be included in reports, and that there needs to be a "universal look" at the template. There was no clear agreement about 3 versus 4 categories in the criteria.

The Dean and Associate Dean will determine what reports must be made, and the Deans will meet with the Task Force to determine the template for departments and programs.

It was summed up that there appears to be a change in the nature of the criteria. The question surfaced as to whether it is a prioritization process *or an elimination process*.

The Task Force representative stated that the charge remains one of prioritization, not elimination. There is no predetermining of "weighting." However, the representative does not know what will be done with the reports.

Meeting Adjourned