Faculty Affairs Committee
Wednesday, 2 September 2015
11:00-5:00 (Anacapa)

Thursday, 3 September
1:00-5:00 (Room 136)

1. Approval of Agenda/Introductions
   a. Move resolutions to give Tracy info by 4 today.
      1- HR policy on background checks
      2- Trustee Emeritus Resolution

2. Approval of Minutes; Approve with corrections
   a. Item 4.5 third line ethnic studies in CSU under attack
      replace with “ethnic studies programs are feeling stress
      on some campuses”

3. Member Announcements
   a. GMC Debt at SSU
   b. Summer Arts contract expired and campus made decision
to not renew at CSUMB. Will be RFP summer 17

4. Reports
   a. Chair’s Report – Foroohar
      1- Meeting with EEC:
         1. June meeting ICAS issues what are the UD
courses accepted for CCC and CSU for
transfer. UC will lead ICAS this year.
         2. July trustees meeting Steven asked for TT
density metrics. Trustee chair agreed.
         3. CFA in impasse and mediation
4. CSUSB dismissal of provost, CSUC appointed interim Provost to Provost but rescinded.

5. Closed Presidential services an issue. L Lamb said this is an option for Chair of BOT but not true for all searches.


7. Fiscal Sustainability report will come to floor

8. ASCSU budget in discussion

9. RSCA 2.5 million for 15/16 AY from CO

10. All interim meetings via Zoom only...zoom zoom zoom!

11. FGA report to plenary on 36 bills, again on 9/11 and 10/11

12. AA/APEP SB 1440 and CCC offering UDGE

13. FGA, AA and APEP are discussing Ethnic studies report

14. AA requirements for masters degrees

b. FA priorities for 2015-16 –Roberts: reviewed events of the day and the source of the goals for each ASCSU committee. Manzar will place minutes in drop box. Discussion on each item ensured.

Retention, Tenure, and Promotion
Professional Development
Drafting Updates Policy on Academic Freedom
Tenure Density
RSCA (Outcomes capture and mapping)
Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness
Faculty driven assessment of student learning

Addressing barriers of faculty retention
GAPP Funding

c. Human Resources: Assistant Vice Chancellor Margy Merryfield (time certain: Wednesday, 2:00 )
1- Barriers of faculty retention new faculty is a huge investment. Set salary aside beyond that what are the things do we do to support junior faculty, to support senior faculty to stay engaged and create a climate of inclusion. CSU support in striking a work life balance.

2- Numbers
1. 800-850 new faculty on TT.
2. 16/17 more hiring on many campuses.
3. Taking another look at retention

3- On line training for search committees for a strong, diverse pool. Getting an upgrade roll out Oct 1.

4- Working on curriculum for Chairs role. October 16th CSULB.

5- Background checks
1. Increase health and safety in the workplace
2. Assesses for criminal records, education verification and verify employment

6- The positive criminal record is compared to relevance of the position

7- Continue vs rehire following article 12 of CBA

8- Move to another campus position
1. Not a faculty promotion or range elevation
2. Exposure to level 1 data
3. Sensitive jobs

9- Very limited in the use of credit checks

d. CFA Liaison, Jen Eagan (time certain: Wednesday, 1:00)
1- Meet and confer goes from CO to campus. Campus proceeds and CFA enters only after discovering meet and confer did not occur in many cases.
2- Meeting and conferring currently on 1095-1097 and BC
3- Still need to meet and confer on federally mandated items

4- Presidential searches puts the new president in a awkward position as well in introducing oneself to the campus. As mentioned by the new president at CSUS.

5- Open article 31 and 40. Salary and benefits in EE. Update since May management has not moved from 2%. CFA is asking for us 5% it is what many teachers are asking and getting. Received on word answer form CSU-No. Declared impasse. Next step is mediation. Had mediation on Monday. Another mediation session tentative Dec 18. Not hopeful so plan would be to go to fact finding. Will take some time estimated the report Jan or Feb 2016. Equity programs varied and were “a drop in the bucket”. Some were not inclusive. These were campus issues stemming from hiring practices. In the mix is also promotion increases above 7.5%. These are not equity. CSU management should be embarrassed by the equity problems on so many campuses. These are not a substitute for GSI across the system. CFA proud of 11 million dollars for new faculty. BOT agenda has executive compensation on the top of the BOT agenda. Chancellor wants to do salary study for faculty and Executives. Agenda for BOT Sept continues with Executive salaries. Race to the bottom we are behind across all systems.

e. Executive Committee liaison, Robert Collins (time certain:)

  1. Tenure density
  2. Conf planning committee March 2017
  3. Executive VC Blanchard “to way communication” questions that we wish to be answered on Friday
  4. Sustainability financial model FA weigh in and have questions for Friday

    1. Review Sac Bee for Susan G op ed piece Tuesday
2. What are the keys issues form Ex Bd. Chair Filling is leaving it open for all groups to weigh in.

f. Chancellor’s Office Liaison, Leo Van Cleve

5. Chancellor’s response to FA resolutions:
   a. AS-3207-15/FA (Rev): The Call for a Plan to Increase Tenure Density in the California State University
      Chancellor’s response: We agree with the spirit of this resolution and recognize the need to increase tenured/tenure track faculty in the CSU. It is one of our top priorities that is interrelated with the California economy and negatively impacted by budget cuts, which conspires against recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty. We will strive to increase tenured/tenure track density and reduce SFR, but committing to a ten year goal with metrics so closely tied to state budget allocations requires careful analyses, projections, and planning on each of our campuses. We take this resolution under advisement and we will continue to urge the Governor and Legislature to provide the additional funding necessary to hire tenured/tenure track faculty in the CSU.
      Discussion ensured on our response to this item. How do we respond? Shall we follow up with resolution? We agree that this response is an example of why we need a resolution on shared governance. This offers no plan and is disrespectful to the faculty this works against the goal of increasing tenure faculty density.

6. Second Reading Resolutions
   a. N/A

7. New Resolutions
   a. New HR policy on background checks for the CSU employees discussion
      1. Campus specific policies vs CO
      2. Information collected...who is hired? Who is not?
      3. Information security
      4. Transcript collection
      5. Minority discrimination
      6. Foreign national discrimination
      7. Cost
      8. What qualifies you to be in a classroom in your BC.
      9. How far back does it go?
      10. Resolution Suspension of CSU Background Check Policy HR-2015-08
          1. Edited and in Drop box. First reading to ASCSU 9/4/15

b. Support of Adding an emeritus/emerita Faculty Member to the CSU Board of Trustees
1- Support from CSU ERFA to add emeritus/ta faculty due to experience, history and knowledge
2- FA in support of resolution.
3- Barry will take to FGA in hopes of support.

8. Additional topics for discussion/possible action

a. Policy on Academic Freedom:

AS-3197-14/FA: The Need for a Comprehensive California State University Policy on Academic Freedom

Chancellor’s response: The resolution calls for the Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Trustees to draft a comprehensive California State University (CSU) policy on academic freedom. The resolution also includes specific faculty rights they believe should be included in the policy. The Chancellor’s Office will closely examine the resolution and respond to the Senate’s request before the end of the academic year. (Emphasis added)

Manzar will bring this to the floor to VC Blanchard for his plan ideas. Discussion with Jen on CFA for their ideas. CFA is in support of policy but not working on this but they are interested in FA doing so. Campus policies are very different some protect faculty some do not. FA wishes to support a CSU policy that would provide a framework for the individual campuses. The CSU could provide the best practices for the individual campuses.

b. Shared governance:

1- SLO’s resolution:


(See Chancellor’s response to SLO resolution in FA dropbox: September 15)


Chancellor’s response: The Chancellor will take the request to revise EO 669 under advisement.

3- Faculty exclusion from decisions/consultation about administrative hiring; interims becoming permanent without searches

c. Including lecturers in orientation programs for new faculty

1- Will come to interim meeting in October by Karen

2-

d. Reviewing Ethnic Studies Task Force report, possible action/recommendations

1- Was data collected to make points more valid? Where is it?
2- 50 TT hires for ethnic studies majors
3- Quarter campuses will not begin until later Sept and the review deadline does not give this group enough time.
4- The group has not met. Report went to all senates and has received comments from some are giving over 600 words. Also went to all faculty in the CSU.
5- Comments regarding Composition and Communication as ES dept as the founders of these areas as the “conception and development”.

e. Revisiting the 1987 report on RSCA and requesting adequate funding
   1- 1988 CSU requested 7.5 Million
   2- Formula has not changed many years of no funding
   3- 2015/15 2.5 million
   4- Survey from Zed to showcase undergraduate research due 9/11
   5- Cesar and Deborah to work on looking on past documents and look at formula.
   6- Chancellor has made a commitment to line item for funds and wishes to support junior faculty.

Tomorrow: September 3, 2015 Time 1-5 Room 136?
A. Resolutions
   a. Revisions to Suspension of Policy on CB for first read at ASCUS 9/4/15
   b. Addition of Emeritus Faculty to the BOT CSU
B. Financial Sustainability Report (members comments)
   a. Good but tame. Page five incentivize students not campuses, if we are giving money to one campus it has to be taken away from other campuses. Did not look at creative strategies such as pricing, merging CSU and UC?
   b. Not wide ranging and mis-focused. Public-private partnerships have been a disaster on some campuses. Putting it on the backs of students. Uncreative, tried and failed some ideas.
   c. Skin in the game is really a pound of flesh for students and families
   d. May have different views from both faculty and campuses
   e. The ideas are not new and some campuses have implemented some of these successfully such as philanthropy.
   f. Degradation of public value in a public university
   g. The more outside sources are the utilized to support the university especially for research has the potential to taint the data.
   h. Fee structure to have students be more aware of the resources they are using
   i. The public have to pay for public education
   j. To do go you first have to do well…this we owe our students
C. Ethnic Studies Report (cont)
   a. Data clarification page 14-15 survey results described in narrative form. Question on breakdown by campus. Charge was to provide an overview. Discussion on merits of both positions. Campus by campus vs aggregated.
   b. 50 TT hires. Some members supported others had concerns
   c. Page 28 Mentoring beyond the norm to students of color need support emphasize more. Like to see the CSU investing in this area to support student success.
   d. Some committee members believe the report provided valuable information and strongly endorse the report

D. Revisiting CSU policy on intellectual property- impact on on-line courses

E. Work group Workplace Environmental Committee (Thomas)
   a. Began as civility and went to work place environmental committee
   b. Benefit to faculty and staff regarding aggression and micro aggression to one another form verbal to physical. Putting together a survey using best practices around bullying. Close to a preliminary draft
   c. Possibility of team taking Unconscious bias work shop
   d. Administer to everybody on campus (Faculty, staff, FT employee) urge all members of campus get it
   e. Question has Academic Freedom been discussed? Yes R/T civility vs environment
   f. Staff unions concerned as they have had comments regularly on bullying
   g. What will become of results? Put through IRB by Thomas? The hope to strengthen the reporting of data.
   h. How does one interpret intimidation? Will this harshly judge faculty?
   i. Discussion on definitions of bullying, sexual harassment, intimidation
   j. Survey examples read. Discussion on minutia of questions
   k. Suggestion to seek other models for survey
   l. Discussions on cultural differences of communication
   m. Survey also assesses what action occurred as result of reporting

Next Meeting October 9th. Virtual using Zoom