1. Approval of Agenda
New discussion item on Academic Freedom added.

2. Approval of Minutes – 14 May 2014 (Eudey)
Approved.

3. Member Announcements
Introduction of members.

We discussed our upcoming conversation with the General Council and the history of the Academic Freedom issue within FA and ASCSU. We also briefly discussed the status of our proposal to ExComm to create a special committee on academic freedom, and our desire to have experts, especially faculty with legal background, to serve on the committee. We are concerned with having appropriate expertise and time to address this topic appropriately within FA.

4. Reports

4.1 Chair: Manzar Foroohar (SLO)
FA Priorities for 2014-15:
- Work toward drafting a comprehensive system-wide policy on academic freedom
- Revisit CSU policy on intellectual property issues especially in relationship to online delivery
- Advocate for expanding tenure-track positions to meet the growing need for access to a quality education and insuring shared government
- Advocate for increasing system-wide support for faculty research and creative activities

Manzar reported on the ASCSU extended ExComm retreat held in August. Priorities for each committee were set. FA’s are similar to last year, with the addition of “B” related to intellectual property and online course delivery. Manzar noted the Chancellor appeared supportive of increasing RSCA funding.

4.2 Chancellor’s Office Liaison: Gerard Hanley/Leo VanCleve
Bottlenecks and Cal State Online issues will be shared by Gerry at a later time.

Leo said AA is continuing to do its normal work. The Graduation Initiative continues to be important, and will take up a fair amount of time. He provided an update on the search for the EVC, and that the AVC for Research and Partnership search has been reopened.
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[Note: Gerry attended the meeting on Thursday, Leo attended Wednesday, and the latter part of Thursday]

4.3 General Counsel, Framroze (Fram) Virjee (time certain: Wed. 11:30-12:30)
Introduced selves.

The committee was happy to meet with Fram Virjee, and engaged in a lengthy discussion of issues related to the academic freedom policy in the CSU. GC Virjee provided an overview of the research he has done related to the topic, and his understanding of the 1971 CSU statement, and the conversations occurring regarding the ASCSU constitutional language on academic freedom. Virjee believes the BOT and CO engaged in consideration of the CSU statement on academic freedom simultaneous with its consideration of the ASCSU constitutional change, and determined that the CSU language did not need to be changed at that time.

Virjee cited some new cases related to free speech by government employees and academic freedom that will continue to inform CO interpretation of policy and practice, and clarified his understanding of prior case law. Fram agrees we should look at 1971 policy with idea of these cases in mind and whether they change that policy, needs changing as a result of that. He also notes a new EVC of AA may want to weigh in on new policy related to academic freedom.

We engaged in lengthy discussion as to why a policy change might be needed. Virjee is unaware of any time when the 1971 policy did not adequately cover any AF issue that has arisen. He is not clear that we need to fix a policy that has not bee proven to be failing. FA members provided some examples of concerns with outdated language, concern that the terminology “classroom” fails to recognize the range of locations in which academic freedom protects faculty, concerns with the silencing effect of unclear policy leading to self-censorship before an issue arises, and desire to be proactive. We noted that many of the daily infringements on academic freedom do not get reported to the Chancellor’s Office, and the lack of a clear and comprehensive policy prevents faculty from being protected. The lack of clarity between academic freedom and the free speech rights of state employees was also discussed as problematic. We also discussed the degree to which academic freedom is infringed upon by recent public records requests of emails, course materials and other documents.

We discussed some of the processes engaged in when concerns arose at CSU campuses in the past year. Virgee described the level of information-gathering needed to be prepared to respond to a situation and indicated that decisions were made as to action within a day of receiving the necessary information.

From this conversation, FA believes we have a better sense of what we will need to do to move forward. We need to be more clear about what we believe needs to be changed and why, and perhaps collecting information about times when the policy has not supported academic freedom. Mark and Shane will work on the “gap language” to share at our next meeting.

4.4 Human Resources: vice chancellor of human resources, Lori Lamb, and Margy Merryfield, Senior Director Academic Resources (time certain: Wed. 3:00-3:30)
Introduced ourselves

Lori Lamb joined us on her second day at the CO.
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Margy noted the upcoming workshop for new department chairs to be held Oct 24 at CSULB. Typically draws 80-90 new or newer chairs.

Information on hiring is in flux. She predicted 600-650 new TT hires for this fall, and we're probably in that neighborhood but won't know until after campuses are polled to find out about completed searches. This is the biggest new group since 2008 or so. For that reason, they are paying close attention to see how we're doing on total TT numbers. It's expected this is the first year since 2008 that TT faculty numbers have gone up rather than down. Likewise, in terms of recruitment for coming year, currently 400 posted recruitments but there will be more as some major campuses don't have jobs posted. Some approvals and descriptions are still in process. She expects to have more specific polling data by next time we meet.

Last fall we had 470 new people, which was higher than several years prior but not break even. Starting salaries are inching upward even in the humanities. Averages are in the mid 60s in lower paid fields. What is most striking is that the investment in support for new people continues to be stepped up at campuses. While start-up packages were highest in the natural sciences, on average across disciplines new hires received about $25K and some workload release for a total average value of approximately $40K.

Margy said they are trying to monitor resignations and non-retentions. Our tenure pipeline does not appear to be leakier than anyone else’s, but 3.5-5% of probationary faculty resign in a given year, and 1-1.5% are denied retention and tenure. Non-retentions typically range 30-40 people systemwide, and this year was 39. Not many at any given campus. Margy’s sense/guess is that in about half of the denials a grievance is filed, with some withdrawn due to giving up or as part of a settlement. There hasn’t recently been a cohort study of probationary faculty, and it might be worth doing again. The lack of hiring over the past few years, coupled with retirements and resignations comes with many challenges. By the next meeting Margy should have reliable data regarding current tenure density and hiring patterns.

Margy mentioned that there is a heavier concentration of lower division courses being taught by non-tenure track faculty, and the implications of this are still being considered. Margy also noted that FERPing faculty show up in databases as “retired faculty” in the year the FERP starts, but also are included in calculations of tenure density as “tenured faculty” during the terms in which they are teaching. She estimates that 7-8% of the full professors are in FERP.

**4.5 Executive Committee Liaison: Susan Gubernat (time certain: Wed. 3:30-4:00)**

Susan provided an overview of issues on the agenda for the plenary, offered information on the Academic Conference, discussed on-going efforts to get a faculty member included on the student success fees task force, follow up on the ASCSU resolution regarding Access to Excellence and discipline councils. Conversations about the role of committee liaisons are occurring between ExComm and Ron Vogle.

We discussed the request for a special committee on Academic Freedom, and shared with Susan the issues FA is working on and resolutions we intend to submit for the plenary.
Andy Merrifield provided an update on bargaining, noting we do not yet have a tentative agreement. He provided detailed information on four outstanding issues that are of particular interest to Faculty Affairs: salary, workload, recognition of extended ed faculty, and recognition of qualifications of long-term lecturers as job applicants. He offered specific information about compression and inversion, equity raises, and the funding CFA believes is needed to address these issues. He also addressed intellectual property issues, the definition of “extraordinary support” for work, and opportunities for funding for faculty service.

We discussed the different approaches ASCSU and CFA are and could be taking to address equity raises, and the inaction of campus presidents on this issue since the last contract was approved. It was clarified that the successor contract negotiations need not prevent presidents from providing equity raises under the current contract.

We also discussed the reality that women, faculty of color, and faculty who were first generation college students do the most university service. It was noted that the CFA diversity training, “Unconscious Bias” addresses a variety of issues related to inclusion and equity, and is highly recommended.

5. Review of Chancellor’s Office Response to Faculty Affairs’ Committee resolutions.

1) AS-3160-13/EX/FA: Selection of Faculty Representatives in Shared Governance

As noted in Agenda Item 1 (Committee of the Whole) on July 23, 2013, proposed changes to the policy on the selection of presidents first requires consultation with “appropriate systemwide constituencies including but not limited to the systemwide Academic Senate leadership, CSSA leadership and representatives of systemwide staff leadership.” This resolution clarifies the position of the Senate and consultation will move forward. (Follow Up?)

We discussed several strategies for following up on this issue, since the chancellor is not inclined to change policy, but appears to be following the practices supported by the ASCSU. At this point we will not put forward a specific resolution, but Karen and Romey will monitor this issue and report on it as appropriate under an on-going agenda item entitled “Faculty Representation in Shared Governance.”

2) AS-3164-14/AA/FA: In Support of Ethnic Studies in the California State University

The ASCSU endorses the efforts of the CSU Taskforce to Advance Ethnic Studies and we concur. The Taskforce membership is primarily comprised of Ethnic Studies faculty and
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their work is continuing. Their recommendations will be informed by this resolution but further comment is reserved until the Taskforce completes their work. (Follow up?)

Loretta offered information from the Taskforce, noting the survey collection process and the review of results that will begin shortly. The Taskforce hopes to complete its work this fall.

3) Recommendations on system wide/campus criteria for distribution of RSCA funds – Subcommittee on research (Follow up?)

We reviewed the progress we made last year promoting RSCA funding and access to such funding for faculty of all ranks. We discussed the history of RSCA funding at the system level, and our concerns that the level of funding is still far below our needs. We recognized that money allocated to RSCA is money not allocated somewhere else, and we need to be careful about how to frame requests for money so that we’re identifying need and its connection to system goals, and indicating the impact of funding or not funding RSCA. The 1987 report utilized criteria for determining the desired funding level for RSCA in the system. Betsy and Karen will review this report and provide a summary of the review criteria in preparation for a first draft resolution on RSCA funding.

We’ll want to consider how this issue fits in with other budget priorities the ASCSU wishes to advance, and we should work in concert with FGA as we address this issue.

6. Second Reading Resolutions
N/A

7. Potential New Resolutions

7.1 Sexual violence on California campuses

We discussed the national conversation about sexual violence on college campuses, and the actions occurring within the state. We held an initial conversation on Wednesday about what might be included in a resolution, and Loretta completed a draft resolution that was shared Wednesday evening and discussed in detail on Thursday. We aimed to honor those survivors of violence who brought this issue to attention, and recognize the role faculty can and must take in regard to sexual violence prevention, education and response. After much discussion we developed a draft, but will want to further develop the rationale with emerging information from the Department of Education and expected state law.

The resolution was submitted for consideration at the plenary as a first reading item.

7.2 Political Attacks on Academic Freedom

We discussed the focus of this resolution, and whether to make this more general or specifically address faculty working on the Middle East. We decided a more general resolution was desirable as it could serve broader purposes, but would use some of the Middle East examples in the rationale. We adjusted some language and made additions to the rationale. At the plenary we will ask for assistance in identifying additional examples to further support the resolution.

The resolution was prepared to send forward for a first reading at the plenary.
8. Additional topics for discussion

8.1 Creation of a new ASCSU committee on academic freedom (Docs. On Academic Freedom – Dropbox – September)

The request was presented by Manzar to ExComm, and we further discussed the committee with Susan Gubernat during her liaison visit. On Thursday Manzar announced that that ExComm rejected the request for the committee.

Absent a special committee, we will work on writing a resolution that indicates what we’d like to see in a new AF policy and request action be taken to create such changes. Cesar will be point person for getting things together for the new resolution, and will obtain assistance from Manzar, Shane and Mark.

8.2 Sexual violence on campus (Kensinger?) (Dropbox – September)

Discussed under new resolutions.

8.3 Attempts to stifle academic freedom on California campuses (Foroohar)

Discussed under new resolutions

8.3 Role of lecturers in shared governance –(ongoing discussion item) - Davis


We made progress last year on issues related to lecturers and their recognition as “faculty” on campuses, and we will continue to build on this in the current year. Now appears to be the time to call for campus senates to look at current senate constitutions to see whether they are fully inclusive of lecturers as faculty. We will draw upon the AAUP report to inform some of our work this year. We do not want to be directive to campuses, but to offer some information, recommended practices, and take into account how participation in governance is a component of/impacted by participation in governance. Karen will spearhead this, and Betsy Eudey and first-year senator John Yudelson will be providing assistance. We will consider offering a resolution later this year, perhaps in time for a first reading in November.

8.4 Faculty spotlight awards (new awards?)

There were no new awards to discuss.

8.5 Contract with ELibrary (Ornatowski)

Although many issues related to ELibrary and the move to online texts are tied to the Academic Affairs committee charge, we recognize that some issues are also relevant to our committee, especially is it impacts teaching and research, and potentially personnel review (RTP and lecturer evaluations). The related issue of open source publishing by faculty was discussed. We will continue to watch this issue and consider action in the future.

8.6 Department chairs’ workload – Eudey

Betsy reviewed the actions we took last year, and noted the document posted to the dropbox. We may discuss this topic in the future, including discussing whether a new report is warranted.
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We will keep this on the agenda, and encourage members to read the ASCSU Roles, Rewards, Responsibilities of Chairs report before the October meeting.

8.7 Student evaluations –Eudey (Preliminary report and ongoing discussion item)
Betsy reviewed the data collection we engaged in last year and noted that the summary document from last year is in the dropbox. We discussed some evaluation processes at specific campuses, content of evaluation forms, and local versus standardized or nationally normed evaluations. We also discussed the need for faculty to be involved in discussions about choice of and use of evaluations, with special attention to encouraging the inclusion of lecturers in these conversations. We discussed some circumstances under which lecturers are differentially impacted by evaluations than tenure-line faculty.

So far this is not an action item. We can urge faculty to be involved in the process, and have a series of best practices with examples. If we think about resolutions, we should think about the differential impacts of diversity on evaluation structures and encourage those who read evaluations to read with knowledge about differential reviews based on who is in front of the classroom.