Minutes

Academic Senate of the California State University
Faculty Affairs Committee

Present: Cheyne, McNamara, Goldwhite, Guerin, Reagan, Sabalius, Van Selst, Vanterpool

Guests: Lorie Roth, Craig Smith, Ron Kroman, Beth Ambos, Tom Krabacher, Catherine Nelson

Recorders: Reagan, McNamara, Van Selst

1. Approval of agenda

   Added 5.8, AB 1548, to agenda. The agenda was approved as amended.

2. Approval of minutes for February 9, 2007

   Minutes were approved as submitted.

3. Announcements

   3.1 Plenary to start at 9:00 tomorrow.
   3.2 Exec and standing committee chairs will write to BOT about the proposed changes to the Trustee’s consent calendar.

4. Reports

   4.1 Jackie McClain: Human Resources – Due to fact-finding meetings, she was unable to attend the committee meeting.
   4.2 John Travis: CFA – Also in the fact-finding meeting.
   4.3 Hank Reichman: Did not attend.
   4.4 CO response to January Senate resolutions: Discussed Gary Reichard’s response to the Senate’s January resolutions.

5. Information and Discussion Items/Resolutions

5.1 Handbook of Free Speech Issues – CSU Office of General Counsel

   - Page 10 seems ok up to this point—student-related—but then there is a shift in tone from permissive to restrictive
   - Is a faculty office a “public area”?
• Issue of office sharing
• Page 13  balancing speech and public concern
• Craig Smith joined the committee. He runs the Center for First Amendment Studies at Long Beach. He noted problems with contextualization, etc. The problem with the Faculty section is that the law and the rulings are unstable. The shift in voice at page 10 suggests a different author. There may be pending legal issues that encourage the author to adopt a very conservative tone.
• There is tension between academic writing and ideological content within the classroom
• Bounds/limits on academic freedoms (time, place, & manner)

Faculty Affairs Response to Handbook (via memo to the Executive Committee):

1. Shift in tone
2. Degree of contextualizing of footnotes becomes lost
3. Language becomes much more restrictive
4. Movement away from valuing free speech through the latter part of the document
5. What is the timeline for producing a “final” version

   a. We have historically been effective at moving best practices around free speech forward.
   b. We have some concerns around public employees (e.g., around whistleblowing) that may encourage legislature to encourage CSU to loosen the restrictions in this document.

5.2 Exit interviews for department faculty

• Discussion of rationale for separating exit interviews from strategies to assess faculty satisfaction.
• There is some exit interview information in the “recruitment report.”
• Are exit interviews “the norm”? If not, they ought to be.
• Are these results (if they exist) standardized and reported out?
• There are no campus standards around exit interviews.
• We should assess the reasons why people are leaving.
• There appears to be a disconnect between what happens on campuses and what gets reported.
• The data can provide insight into what aspects of faculty life encourage faculty to go elsewhere in a standardized format that can be assessed in a meaningful way.
• In the “Recruitment Outcomes” report, the CO uses the term “tenure-track” to mean tenured and probationary (vs. lecturers), whereas we typically refer to tenured and tenure-track (vs. lecturers). Few tenured faculty members leave the system.
• There ought to be common elements covered in the exit interviews to allow comparison and summarization across the system.
• Even before an offer was made (after a campus-visit and interview) some faculty pulled themselves from the search. Thus, in addition to exit interview, a failure to pursue employment interview?
• Cordelia Ontiveros ought to be consulted with respect to the format for the “Recruitment Outcomes” report.
• Proposal for a Resolution: Request for additional information in the CSU Report on Recruitment and Retention (currently identified as the “Recruitment Outcomes” report).
• Resolved: that the ASCSU include data from standardized exit interviews which shall include
  • Rationale: approximately 9% of probationary faculty are leaving the system.
  • Suggestion to wait with resolution for Cordelia/Jackie to meet with committee.
• Rationale: there is a huge investment in monetary resources as well as faculty time (training, student learning, ‘costs’ from new instructors, etc.)
• Suggestion that both changes in format of the report and introduction of required exit interviews be introduced.
• Mark will write out our concerns/what the issues are in a more formal manner than what is present in our minutes.

5.3 Workload Re-allocation: A Special Report to CSU Senate Chairs

• Second time on agenda for us.
• Executive Committee left it up to us to decide whether to address it formally.
• There are concerns since the document was produced by the Faculty Trustee, even if as an individual.
• The committee does not believe it is necessary to take formal action at this time.
• M/S/P to drop from future agenda.

5.4 Consent to travel to international destinations

• Faculty Affairs and Academic Affairs will co-sponsor a resolution on the value and importance of international programs.
• The concern originated in the discussion of whom and under what circumstances international programs can be restricted.
• Are there associated restrictions on international travel vis-à-vis research?
• Campus presidents are responsible for campus travel authority (can be delegated: EO 156)
• In the old executive order there are guidelines, i.e. essential to campus operations, trip relates to campus programs/objectives, presenting at a meeting or an officer of the association. Potentially this excludes meeting participants?
• Limits on program existence abroad (CO EO 998) should not constrain faculty travel (since it does not involve students). EO 998 does constrain student (academic program) travel.
• Class coverage is a legitimate concern.
• Risk management; CSU was not in compliance with appropriate risk management procedures.
• No need for action at this time.
• This is a likely future issue and one that ought to be watched for developments.

5.5 Campus support for collegial governance

• Concern of fiscal and space support provided for campus senates
• Documents have been compiled and distributed in the past to argue for additional support from the administration on the less supported campuses.
• Refer back to executive committee via a memorandum that asks for the following information:
  1. How often senate & exec meets
  2. How much release time
  3. Proximity to president/provost
  4. Space for senate offices
  5. Operating budget

5.6 System-wide digital repository

• Public domain only
• Committee is mostly librarians
• May provide RTP documents
• May be possible to separate access for on-campus/off-campus
• STIM: strategic technology initiative management
• It does not look like it is impinging on faculty rights and may, in fact, prove an important resource
• No action needed at this time

5.7 Video surveillance on Fresno campus

• Harold Botwin (Senate Chair) provided background on the Fresno surveillance policy via e-mail
• Collaborative policy developed that included significant Senate input
• No action required at this point

5.8 Class Evaluation Issues

• Second reading item at CSU Dominguez Hills
• Intention 1: evaluate all classes to norm it
• Intention 2: standardized administration
• To what degree should there be campus autonomy
• No action at this time

5.9 AB 1548/SB 832
• Visit from Tom Krabacher and Catherine Nelson from FGA
• Serious deficits in AB 1548/SB 832 which ostensibly are intended to reduce the price of textbooks
• FGA view is to try to move the audience to change the behavior
• It is unclear how any of the items reduce the price of the textbooks
• Lawsuits may actually dramatically increase the cost of textbooks
• Mark will send textbook affordability minutes to Tom Krabacher

5.10 Indirect costs

• Beth Ambos joined us for this discussion and helped provide context for the issues.
• Indirect cost items include those hard-to-identify costs such as electricity, etc., that are associated with sponsoring the grants.
• Indirect cost rates are not verbally identified but (to avoid audit, etc.) follow strong written guidelines.
• What happens when a campus MINIMUM indirect cost is less than the SET indirect rate for a grant activity?
• Auxiliaries, etc. are required to be cost neutral (self-support). When mandated indirect costs are below grant costs this produces a stalemate of legislative limitations.
• EO 753 can be applied to each auxiliary rather than each grant (as done on some campuses).
• Faculty are losing grants as a result of the indirect cost stalemate.
• Ultimately, there will be faculty, staff, and resource implications on a campus that receives a lot of grants without sufficient funding for indirect costs.
• The extent of the problem is unclear across the system – can we determine the number of grants not pursued or grants not funded due to indirect-cost related concerns.
• Faculty Affairs needs more information on how prevalent the problems identified are for faculty at the campuses. Beth will provided feedback to faculty affairs following the meeting of the senior research administrators across the CSU.
• No further action by the committee at this time. Future potential action is pending additional information from Beth.

5.11 Talking points on the role of research and creative activity in the CSU

• Provost’s Academic Council document
• Marshelle indicates that the revised document is not yet out
• Provosts are meeting in the near future at which time it is likely that a revised document will be approved
• Once the committee receives the revision, we will act upon it

6. Future Discussion Items/Resolutions

6.1 Strategies for gauging faculty satisfaction
• Further discussion about potential value of a campus-wide survey.
• Some of the information is already collected by Cordelia Ontiveros and perhaps a discussion with her will shed more light on how to proceed.

6.2 PATRIOT Act: International students and faculty: Discussion on this item was deferred to our next meeting.