1. Approval of Agenda - approved
2. Approval of Minutes – small edits, approved
3. Member Announcements - none
4. Reports
   4.1 Chair: Manzar Foroohar (SLO)
   Provided a brief update on the discussions at Executive Committee and provided some introduction to issues coming later in the agenda.

   4.2 Chancellor’s Office Liaison: Gerard Hanley/Leo VanCleve (time certain: 11:00-11:30)
   Gerald Hanley updated us on the Online Concurrent Enrollment program. Indicated that the call for winter/spring classes includes expectations for record of course success prior to inclusion on the OCE website. AB 386 asks for all online classes to be in a searchable database, which could be thousands of classes. Hope to have a way to ensure quality. Recommendation was made to indicate on the OCE site that courses listed were not the totality of online courses available in the system, but a select group.

   Hanley updated us on the eAcademies, which seem to have been successful at increasing communication among faculty as well as sharing insights into teaching and learning. Follow-up learning communities are just getting started.

   There was a question about hiring of new general counsel. Hanley had no news.

   Hanley is working with provosts to consider additional ways to increase faculty participation in bottleneck-related projects that can reduce time to graduation and improve academic success. He’s also working to identify more funds for faculty development to be facilitated by campus FDCs.

   4.3 Executive Committee Liaison: Susan Gubernat
   (time certain: 12:30)
   Reported on issues they’ve been working on including K-12 teacher prep, bottleneck courses and MOOCs. Also discussed the Fagin visit to ASCSU. She noted we won’t have the academic conference in March as hoped for, and they’re working on new options for this.

   Academic Affairs is going to continue working on effectiveness/quality of online programs especially as OCE site expands. While this is currently an AA issue, there might be FA components. AA might have a draft resolution we might want to review.

5. Review of Chancellor’s Office Response to Faculty Affairs’ Committee May 2013 Resolutions and follow-up on Faculty Affairs Committee resolutions from September 18, 2013.
   None
7. Potential New Resolutions

7.1 Urging Faculty status for Lecturers system-wide
We had a lengthy discussion of issues related to the status of lecturer faculty in the CSU and how our experiences connect to nationwide data and reports related to lecturers. Committee members shared various perspectives on the possible rights and responsibilities full-time and part-time lecturers might have at program/department, college, campus, and system-wide levels, and the reasons for including or excluding them from participation. We discussed how we might encourage consideration of various roles without mandating any particular outcome. We also noted a lack of knowledge of the ways each campus defined “faculty” and the specific opportunities or responsibilities for lecturer engagement in governance and program curricular matters. Karen will continue to take the lead on this resolution, with the possibility of bringing a resolution to the November plenary.

7.2 Consideration of long-time lecturers for emeritus status –Karen
[omitted – included in draft language of 7.1]

8. Additional topics for discussion

8.1 Clean up the bylaws (FA responsibilities)
We will look at the bylaws and see what needs to be cleaned up and share thoughts before and during the next meeting.

8.3 Sub committee on academic freedom (Manzar, Mark, Shane)
Forooah has collected policies on AF from several campuses in CA and outside. Our charge is drafting a recommendation of a policy on academic freedom for BOT to review and approve to replace very old policy we have now. We will review policies from various locations and decide how to draw upon these to draft our recommendation. Our hope is to be brief, concise and clear. We need to have this approved by legal counsel as part of the process. New counsel may not start until January. We will continue discussion at next meeting.

8.4 Sub-committee on faculty hiring (Betsy, Karen)
Waiting to hear CO response to resolution from last meeting. Once we know the response we’ll know how to move forward.

8.5 Sub-Committee on support for research (Saeed, Lillian, David)
We discussed some of the history of RSCA funding for faculty from the Chancellor’s Office, and noted that RSCA is no longer a line item in the budget. We discussed the reasons why system-level RSCA funding is important. The subgroup will engage in some more research and aims to draft a resolution for Oct 31 meeting. We discussed including references to Access to Excellence, a brief history of the situation, the teacher-scholar model, the benefit of a budget line, and the need to be inclusive of creative activities, not just more research/scholarship.

8.6 Free and open dissemination of research and scholarship (CSUN)
Frehlich reminded us of the background to this issue, and noted that CSUN’s academic senate will likely be considering a resolution to encourage faculty to submit works to Scholarworks. We discussed some of the faculty issues related to open source materials, intellectual property rights, rules for externally and internally funded projects, and connections to tenure and promotion standards. Frehlich will keep us updated on progress and we’ll monitor to see if any FA action is warranted.

8.7 Student evaluations (Betsy)
Although data from all campuses has not yet been received, it appears that 6 campuses have adjusted the CBA policy for student evaluation of teaching to allow for something other than “all” courses to be evaluated. Eudey will continue to confirm the status of campus policies and is obtaining information about any evaluation plans on campuses related to these local adjustments to the CBA language. We will monitor to see if any FA action is warranted.

8.8 Course syllabi: Intellectual property of faculty? (Manzar)
Foroohar was contacted by faculty at Dominguez Hills regarding a public records request to obtain copies of all course syllabi in Nursing, with the request coming from some sort of consultant for education start-ups. We discussed the degree to which syllabi are a faculty member’s intellectual property versus public record of course activities and expectations. We identified a March 2003 ASCSU White Paper entitled Intellectual Property, Fair Use and the Unbundling of Ownership Rights that includes information specifically about the intellectual property rights related to syllabus, and we are seeking other texts that might address this issue. We will continue to follow through on this issue, consulting with legal affairs to determine under what conditions faculty might be required to share syllabi and when requests for syllabi may be denied by the faculty or university.