Academic Senate of the California State University
Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes

Friday, October 12, 2007
10:00 a.m. - Coronado Room

Present: Glen Brodowsky, Bernadette Cheyne, Manzar Foroohar, Diana Guerin, Robert McNamara, Tuuli Messer-Bookman, Romey Sabalius, Rudy Vanterpool

Guests: Beth Ambros, Ron Kroman, Margy Merryfield, Lori Roth, Mark VanSelst

1. Approval of agenda
   Approved as amended unanimously.

2. Approval of minutes for September 5-6, 2007
   Approved as submitted unanimously.

3. Announcements

   3.1 Campus practices regarding governance
       Bernadette sent survey out again in early October. Five campuses have not yet responded; Bernadette will
       send the FAC members the names of the campuses who have yet to respond and also send a note to ASCSU
       senators from those campuses asking them to encourage their campuses to respond. Bernadette will compile
       results and ask for FAC input once all campuses have responded.

   3.2 FAC is in charge of the January social.

   3.3 Margy Merrifield (Gail Brooks is in Sacramento today) distributed a vision statement on the role of CSU
       Human Resources. The goal is to move from reactive to proactive strategic planning approach. She asked for
       members’ comments. Questions and comments:

       • Is there an assessment component to determine if HR is effective? The vision statement suggests some
         metrics such as recruitments, retention, etc.
       • Encourage consultation with deans, as HR on some campuses is an impediment because of slow turnaround
         time at various steps.
       • We should get the faculty first then bring in the students, rather than staffing after enrollment. This relates
         to our agenda items 5.14 and 5.15; Bernadette requests a meeting with Brooks and Margie to discuss these
         issues.
       • Is there a trend across the system to hire in faculty with tenure? Does this create a revolving door, or do
         they tend to stay in the CSU? Can there be more flexibility in hiring at various ranks?
       • It seems that the deans are integral in the leadership aspect of HR; we need creative deans/administration.
         Margie agreed, and stated that there are some examples of creativity within the contract, and these practices
         could be shared across campuses.
       • The training on the contract of frontline HR personnel/administration at some campuses seems lacking;
         could the Chancellor’s Office provided training on this? The focus should be on supporting the frontline
         (the faculty).

   3.4 On the issue of paying new faculty so as to provide benefits earlier than October: A new brochure explaining
       the benefits available has been developed. Campuses can set up a contract to provide new hires with
       additional work in summer so as to allow benefits to be available in September instead of October. An
       example is required new faculty orientation.
Members are encouraged to send additional comments to mmerryfield@calstate.edu.

4. Reports

4.1 Beth Ambos/Margy Merryfield  Time Certain: 2:00 p.m.

Audit by NSF resulted in system-wide examination of campus practices on “effort reporting” (on grants, faculty are given assigned time or salary for their work on grant). Those involved will be trained to establish consistency of practice as required by audit. Some faculty may experience additional required paperwork. This issue crosscuts three divisions: AA, BFA, HR; all are being brought together to establish best practices.

Research/Scholarly/Creative Activities Award Program will be run again this year. CSU will be requiring reports from each campus. Looking for comprehensive description of outcomes from campuses using appropriate metrics (examples given include impact on courses, publications, presentations, creative works, student involvement, leveraging external grants). Chancellor’s Office will compile campus reports to demonstrate how essential this program is. This may necessitate a standardized format from campuses to facilitate compilation of benefits derived from these funds. Beth was encouraged to monitor number of worthy grant proposals not funded. The need to increase the amount of funding for this program was raised. Concerns were raised that some of the criteria in the legislation may be biased against specific disciplines (student involvement or ability to leverage external grants). Concern was raised that the data may be used against faculty rather than to advocate for additional funding.

What is the current status of the white paper circulated last year on the role of faculty research? Beth stated that attention now is focused on the Access to Excellence draft, and that paper is one of the readings on the website for Access to Excellence.

4.2 Chancellor’s Office response to resolutions

This was covered in discussion of 5.2 below.

4.3 Mark Van Selst: Executive Comm. Liaison  Time Certain: 1:30

Executive Committee discussed CSU response to faculty votes of no confidence in campus presidents. Past practice was for Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs to visit the campus and investigate faculty concerns, but because of status of bargaining last spring the visit did not occur.

Student opinion forms: Mark is on the joint CFA/CSU committee and asked for senators’ views of issues that should be addressed:

- Universal student opinions, pros and cons of students evaluating all courses faculty teach versus a subset of courses;
- Use of online ratings and who is responsible for insuring that sufficient numbers of students complete them;
- Extent to which student opinions should be weighted in evaluation of faculty member’s teaching effectiveness;
- Concern that student opinions are inappropriately biased by faculty member’s ethnicity/other demographic characteristics or course content (controversial topics, for example);
- In the future, can peer review be included in evaluation of teaching effectiveness?
- Is student opinion rating to be used as formative or summative in the evaluation process?
- What section size is appropriate for using a standardized form? Smaller than 25 seems to be problematic.
- Reliability of student opinion forms might be improved if qualitative comment required for each quantitative response.
- Some faculty discipline students, and then those same students rate the effectiveness of their teaching; this is a problem.
- Best practices across the campuses should be disseminated.
5. Information and Discussion Items/Resolutions

5.1 Textbook Affordability (with AA)
After meeting with AA committee members at lunch, Rudy and Robert reported that new wording was drafted for the third resolved on AS-2813-07; it was suggested that the word “revenue” in the fourth resolved be changed to “pricing.”

5.2 MBA professional fees
Romey shared a resolution in opposition to the fees for the committee’s consideration. Committee members offered both pro and con positions. Glen, Diana, and Romey met with members from AA and FGA at lunch. They reported that a task force of seven senators (from the three committees) agreed to draft a series of pro and con “whereas” statements over the next month. Together with possible input from campus senates, the end product may be one compromise resolution, two resolutions, or a report from Executive Committee delineating the deliberations.

5.3 Resolution in Support of Internationalization of CSU Educational Programs (with AA)
No word yet from Academic Affairs on whether or not they wish to co-sponsor (it is on their agenda for this afternoon). FAC will propose at the next plenary.

5.4 SFR calculations (McNamara)
Robert requested information about how campuses compute SFR, specifically whether the denominator is 12 or 15? It was suggested to look at CSU website. Phil Garcia would be a person to ask.

5.5 Access to Excellence Strategic Plan Draft
Suggestions:
Need to bolster emphasis on international programs
Within the next week, we will have an email dialogue on the issues that we think should be communicated to Executive Committee.

5.6 Protocol for responding to votes of No Confidence (McNamara/Baaske)
Robert shared a draft of a resolution, “Response to Faculty Votes of No Confidence,” for FAC consideration. He believes faculty on the campuses who passed the votes of no confidence are waiting for support from the ASCSU. The proposed resolution extends the 1996 resolution by requiring explication of steps taken by the Chancellor. He proposed to insert a new third resolved:

The Chancellor’s Office report to the Academic Senate CSU what actions, both immediate and in the long term, will be taken in response to faculty votes of no confidence; and be it further

Suggestions:
• In rationale, add statement that votes of no confidence are extremely serious steps and only undertaken by faculty as a last resort
• Move from general to specific in the rationale; keep resolved statements general
• Consider adding a resolved encouraging the Chancellor to develop a systematic assessment of faculty satisfaction across all campuses
• Explain context of resolution more clearly in rationale or remove all references to spring 2007
• Change title to “Attention to” rather than “Response to”

Bernadette, Kevin, and Diana will work with Robert to revise the resolution in preparation for the November plenary and send the revision out to FAC members.
5.7 Defending academic freedom [Fresno: Middle Eastern Studies?] (Foroohar)
Attacks on academic freedom are increasing. Fresno is trying to put together a program on Middle
Eastern Studies. Letters, websites have appeared in opposition to the program, including putting faculty
names, photos on websites. Manzar is concerned that these attempts to stop programs have chilling effect
on faculty when it comes to developing new programs. Do we need another resolution on academic
freedom specifically regarding outside interference with curricular and personnel matters?

- Should we respond to the general issue or the specifics? We can’t respond to all of these individual
incidents. If CSU Fresno responds, then we could take a position on their action.
- Query: Is the Fresno program balanced? Concern: Should we question a program designed and
approved by faculty? We must strongly support academic freedom and resist outside influence to
remove faculty because of their teachings.
- Faculty, students should be protected from hate speech. Perhaps focus on this rather than
reaffirmation of academic freedom. Endorse tangible actions rather than reaffirming the ideal of
academic freedom.
- Support the reaffirmation of campus as a safe place to explore various points of view.
- Administration must publicly defend academic freedom.
- Reference Fresno in rationale, but not resolved.

Bernadette will research our past resolutions on academic freedom. Additionally, there may be some
useful information from AAUP and in the recent issue of Academe.

The remaining items were not addressed due to lack of time.

5.8 Issues of Academic Freedom within context of system-wide initiatives such as LDTP, etc. (per ExCom)
5.9 AAUP re outside speakers and academic freedom
5.10 FERP faculty rights and responsibilities
5.11 Protection of Campus Autonomy
5.12 FAC liaisons to other ASCSU standing committee
5.13 Procedure if an Academic Senator is unavailable for a semester (e.g. sabbatical, etc.) or is unavailable for
committee work (per ExCom)
5.14 MPP hiring practices
5.15 Faculty hiring practices (McNamara)
5.16 Student evaluations of teaching effectiveness (Bordalino)
5.17 Strategies for gauging faculty satisfaction
5.18 CO reports on faculty attrition

6. Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 3:50.

Respectfully submitted by Diana Guerin