Faculty Affairs Committee
Wednesday, 12 February 2016
10:00-1:00

Virtual meeting (via zoom)

1. Approval of Agenda: Approved as written

2. Approval of Minutes (20 January 2016- FA Dropbox February 2016)
   a. More detail on minutes with full sentences please. Please send full comments to Deborah in writing and she will send out a new draft.

3. Member Announcements
   a. Manzar brought a resolution on Islamic Phobia. Committee decided to not bring it forward. Manzar brought forward some examples of hate speech and other actions on campus that demonstrated hateful actions. Her campus student groups demonstrated against such actions and one of the Presidents of a student club received an email death threat. The suspect was apprehended. A second example was at CSUSD a student was attacked but student wished to remain anonymous but it was reported to police. The President of CSUSD sent an email to the campus condoning this action. Manzar cited a third example. Do we wish to revisit this resolution? Discussion ensued. Ideas discussed were what would be the purpose of such a resolution? Answer to support the students as a faculty group. Have we in the past had such resolutions identifying any particular group that may be under attack? Shall we write a resolution that covers anyone attached for their identity? Shall we focus particularly on Islam phobia? What do we ask for? Perhaps local senates pass resolutions on this issue? What perhaps would we like the statewide leadership to address? This is an historical moment given what is happening in our society and on our campuses. We have two CSU Executive orders that condone discrimination and this type of behavior. Should we ask the system to report on these incidents so we have a better idea of how to address? Is this an important Title Nine issue? A simple resolution to support students and ask leadership to create an environment that supports students and will not tolerate this action.
b. ACTION: Manzar to work on a draft and bring to March meeting and send to us before meeting for edits/comments

c. Loretta campus (Fresno) senate is writing resolution to support Chico in their resolution of no confidence

4. Reports

a. Chair’s Report – Foroohar
   1- Chair Filling has been in contact with quantitative reasoning task force and they will have a meeting in March
   2- Chair Filling report on BOT meeting focus on: four year graduation rate, super seniors, review of graduate programs
   3- Chico situation the Chancellor has sent someone to Chico to interview campus faculty and staff to see how they could operate in a successful new president search.
   4- Strike discussion and dates of strike
   5- Discussion on tenure density. L Lamb in response to tenure density would be open to a task force to discuss change and membership of such task force.
   6- Background check policy was reported and no problems have been reported form the campuses but
   7- Academic Affairs resolutions on selection of faculty members to honoree degree committees
   8- Continue discussion on online course
   9- APEP resolutions on forth year of high school math and resolution on CSU students profile. Working on revising.
   10- FGA discussing advocacy day, which was set for April 12th, so may change? List of bill priority list for March plenary.

b. Comments
   1- IS FGA looking at a response to Financial Sustainability Report?
   2- April 12th day discussion to change or not?

c. Background Check Working Group Report – Roberts
   1- The Task Force has not met again
   2- Resolution form Illinois posted in Drop box for us to read please
   3- L Lamb has found on some campuses over zealous use in the auxiliary arena with the students. No apparent plan for addressing this issue.
   4- L Lamb sent a 14 page “Implementation of BC” also in Dropbox.
   5- Students are experiencing the largest impact at this time and this dictates a relook at the policy.

d. Campus Climate Working Group – Norman
   1- “Workplace Environment Group.” No change in survey since last report, Linda Hansen working on IRB approval after five hours of training. IRB has not been sent for system wide approval. IRB would like to see both paper and online version. Probably will not be
sent before strike dates. Discussion on questions such as “body language” “Bullying”. The questions were not changed. Can this assess how happy people are on campus? This will be denoted at low level aggression not bullying. Discussion on third party vendors administering the survey. Do they understand the nuisances of individual personality? The framework was presented to a group of cognitive psychologists this week. This revealed the work of academics and how to interpret the data in that context. Is possible to do the survey and leave out the faculty? It is possible? The staff union was the one who recommended the survey. Send the committee questions please for discussion. Peace in Dropbox.

e. Chancellor’s Office liaison, Leo Van Cleve

1- Academic Affairs put report to BOT on Graduation Initiative. It is on BOT website. Emphasis placed on four year graduation rate for both BOT and Governor. Can we have an idea of the things the BOT and CO is implementing to get to an increase in four year graduation rates? Bring to March meeting for more discussion.

2- Responses below on resolutions.

3- Where do we stand on task force for tenure density? We are agreeing to meet and talk about membership and a charge. Look at March as a time to move ahead with this.

4- RSCA funding response says this will be restored for the year 16/17. What was the discussion at CO level? The intention was for a permanent ask. First as the response was written it does appear it is one year but Leo will go back and rephrase to the intention of ongoing however the word “permanent” was not a term CO wanted to use. In terms of the larger amount it was understood the amount that was asked for. The resolution asked for “restore” so the number from 2008/09 was used. The 2.5 million was not intended as the amount but the permanent line item in the budget. It will be a “regular allocation” going forward. Next year it will be the 2.5 million. The CO cannot restore a line item that is not an amount. What about the future? FA decided with this resolution to ask for line item only and the next resolution to ask for the increase in funds. Cesar and Deborah will take responsibility to draft next resolution on RSCA for March.

f. Executive Committee liaison, Robert Collins (time certain: 12:00)

1- Strike discussed ask for different dates in relation to Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates Meeting at the same time. We need to be there as a CSU.

2- Academic Conference at Cal Maritime logistics

3- Academic Free discussion on Ex Com and CO administration how do we go forward?

4- RSCA as line item will be added as line item as outlined below

5- Senator E Melocar asked for Faculty to Faculty newsletter

6- Chair Filling to send call for membership on Admissions Advisory Committee please consider.

7- Comments:

1. Follow up of CSU Financial Sustainability Report—What is Ex Com doing?

2. Academic Freedom new response from CO regarding CFA input. Is Ex Com planning to move forward with this? Chair Filling is consulting with CFA on how to move forward. Discussion on Shared Governance on a “process” vs a “state of
mind”. This is from a 1985 statement by ASCSU. Will be sent by Collins for FA discussion.

5. Chancellor’s response to FA resolutions

a. **AS-3239-15/FA**: Inclusion of Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty in Faculty Orientation Programs

We agree with the ASCSU that campuses should consider including all faculty in orientation programs and do so when feasible. We are aware of good work in this area at a number of campuses. While the responsibility for implementing this rests primarily with the campuses, the Academic Human Resources Department at the Chancellor’s Office is ready to support campus efforts in this area where it can.

Discussion: Good response. Like to see as part of lecturers contract for compensation efforts. “Support” from CO means what? Lecturers are faculty and as such should be treated as faculty. Are the resolutions not strong enough to support what we are really asking for? Should we be more clear of why we are asking and what we are asking? The response does not have a practical implementation. In some cases the CO cannot do very much or does not want to do much. So we may be caught between autonomy and CO support. When we want the cause to be supported by CO by stepping in. Perhaps orientation is a campus specific purview and the CO does not wish to alter that relationship.

Fullerton is doing some activity in response to lecturer orientations. AVP’s for FA are holding a meeting next month and perhaps this could be a topic of discussion.

How do we make more of an impact with our resolutions? Wide spread communication of resolutions on campuses in their role in implementation of resolutions. Hearing back form campuses on how they implemented these would be very helpful.

b. **AS-3247-16/FA**: Restoring, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA) Funds as a Line Item in the CSU Operations Budget

As he has indicated in earlier conversations with the ASCSU, Chancellor White believes that research is fundamental to extending knowledge and preparing our graduates in support of the mission of the CSU. The Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA) funding envisioned in The Master Plan Renewed is one component of our commitment.

To let you know that RSCA funding in the amount of $2.5 million will be a part of the regular allocation for the 2016-17 academic year, under the assumption that state funding for the CSU remains stable. We look forward to working with campuses to distribute these funds in support of our CSU faculty.

Discussion as listed above e. 4.

6. Second Reading Resolutions
7. New Resolutions
   a. Islamic Phobia (Manzar)
   b. RSCA Funding (Cesar and Deborah)
   c. Campus Publication of Emeritus Faculty Directory

8. Additional topics for discussion/possible action
   a. Visiting scholar (Julie Rowlands on shared governance- See dropbox February 2016)
      1- Invitation to next FA meeting in March approved. Manzar will invite
   b. Shared governance
      Tabled in last meeting. Important issue that needs further discussion. Where do we go next? From plenary do we have resolutions brought to the floor that have an ask and/or support a principle? Gubernat is asking for our assistance. Shall we put it on the March agenda or not? How can we work together on this? Or not? Put Shared Governance topic on March Agenda for discussion for first items and if we decided to go to second reading we will bring back to the body.
   c. Academic Freedom Task Force
   d. Textbook dispute at Cal State Fullerton- Pasternack (FA Dropbox- February 2016)
      1- More to report in March by Pasternack
   e. CSU policy on intellectual property- impact on on-line courses move to March
   f. Matrices for tenure density Move to March
   g. Situation of female faculty, staff and students in the CSU? (Ornatowski/Mark Wheeler)
   h. Faculty spotlight awards (reviewing new awards)