Academic Senate, California State University  
Faculty Affairs Committee  
Minutes April 7, 2006 

Present: Brodowsky, Cheyne, Gregory, McNamara, Persons, Reagan, Sabalius, Vanterpool

I. Report from the Executive Committee

1. Hot issues  
   a) Retention of junior faculty  
   There is lots of interest in the issue of junior faculty retention. Surveys on other campuses indicate findings contrary to what Chancellor's office say about the issue.

   b) Relationship between ASCSU and campus Senates  
   In the context of the report summarizing the survey that Brodowsky circulated earlier this year, there was discussion of the relationship between ASCSU and local Senates.

2. Marshelle Thobaben reports that after the Chancellor’s external road show to churches, next year CSU will focus on internal communication about critical issues. She says they are also expecting several guests at the May plenary.

II. Other Announcements

1. Paul Persons reported about the Senate chairs’ meeting:

   **Gary Reichard** first spoke about strategic enrollment policies on campuses, saying that he will be working with Academic Council (Provosts) on this. This is a positive move – perhaps the same should apply to the system in terms of strategic enrollment planning as the actions on one campus often affect the enrollment on others. One question is whether or not someone needs to do regional studies to determine which campuses are likely to lose funds due to enrollment changes caused by other campus actions (example: LA builds dorms; does it attract students who might go to SLO?). The issue of the 2 % give back was discussed. Gregory said that the more global issue is thinking about the system versus individual campuses.

   **New funding for Graduate programs 06-07**  
   Only funding for growth with the re-benching system was discussed, including the possibility of joint admission programs– if one doesn’t get into first choice school, s/he can be directed to other campuses/programs where space exists.

22 points of light were discussed.
Losing faculty
Ontiveros says CSU data indicate that each year about 2% of the faculty “separate” from their campuses, but faculty on the campuses believe the percent is much higher. On what issue should FAC focus? The rank of faculty who leave, and at what point in their careers? This is an important issue that may lead to a resolution – it is also a bargaining issue.

Trustee Craig Smith –
In terms of workload, many faculty are complaining; he believes that departments should be more creative in crafting workloads. Further, the 120 kickoff point was discussed – but the contract is not specific.

2. McNamara – met with trustee George Gowgani
McNamara was impressed with Trustee Gowgani’s, knowledge. This trustee sits on CPEC. He raised particular concern: he feels there is a very adversarial relationship with CFA. Nonetheless, it seems the BOT continues to be adamant about merit pay. Trustee Gowgani has not read the merit pay report – he wasn’t aware of it but was given a copy of it that he says he will read. He was not aware of the constitutional amendment about senate composition and its genesis, the Chancellor’s funding decisions.

3. Follow up from the March plenary
a) External Security Resolution
Very little feedback was given about it at the Plenary. Do we need to make any changes in this for the May meeting? Group will check their plenary notes and if they discover anything, they will send their notes to Cheyne. Gregory will talk to John Tarjan.

b) Support for Lecturer Faculty
Two comments were made – we should not hyphenate reaffirm, and we should capitalize Internet.

c) Renewal of Academic Conference
One senator had wanted to add a resolved clause to affirm how much everybody valued the conference; Persons is working on the language for this. The conference may generate team building at a time when the CSU is undergoing great change, and allow more direct communication between trustees and the senate. One suggestion had been that rather than holding the conference, the chancellor should use the money to fund ASCSU. FAC recommends not to adopt this suggestion (Cheyne).
Alter rationale to emphasize that it is team-building and builds morale for the various constituents in the CSU.

d) Academic Textbook Pricing

Persons had sent out a revised copy to which Gregory proposed revisions.

Gregory noted that the SFSU bookstore manager had made a presentation to the local Senate about how faculty can play a role in trying to deal with exorbitant textbook costs, and would be happy to work with us on the issue. Gregory had moved to reopen the issue in a message FAC never received; Brodowsky moved to un-table the Textbook resolution. Seconded and passed.

General discussion ensued about how faculty members can participate in a number of ways to help keep student costs down. According to manager of the SJSU bookstore, the percentage of faculty who do not order on time is high. Sabalius urged that we urge faculty to turn in their orders on time.

Sabalius noted that there is no longer automatic bundling at Prentice Hall and McGraw Hill. Students have the option to buy electronic or partial books, and to request black and white copies, ring-bound copies; they can buy directly from Thompson.

Persons argued that this is not an onerous resolution – the legislature and student senate have raised this as an important issue and this resolution helps faculty senate show some support for students who have vigorously spoken out on textbook prices. Gregory supported Persons in this assertion.

Sabalius described an unfolding drama at SJSU: Beat the Bookstore, a local competitor, will buy back books at 2% more, but sell them at 2% less. One problem with Beat the Bookstore is that it will only order certain high margin books, leaving the harder-to-order expensive books to the campus bookstore.

The resolution format was discussed (e.g., bullet points about what faculty can do to help keep prices down rather than a lot of text). Also, should we move the sixth resolved to the fore, reaffirming the faculty’s right and duty to select the materials – traditional or alternative- to best deliver the curriculum?

Gregory noted that the right and responsibility of selecting the appropriate materials from a pedagogical perspective isn’t inconsistent with considering ways to keep student costs down. Within these parameters, there are some things faculty can do to mitigate costs.

RESOLVED That consistent with the fundamental right and responsibility of faculty to select course materials, the principles of academic freedom, and the goal of providing high quality education that the ASCSU reaffirm the fundamental right and
responsibility of the faculty to set curriculum and select those materials – either
traditional or alternative – that are pedagogically most appropriate for delivering that
curriculum; and be it further

RESOLVED That within these parameters that ensure the academic and intellectual
soundness of course materials selected, the ASCSU encourage CSU faculty when
selecting textbooks and other course materials, to consider, when appropriate,
selecting course materials that minimizes the cost to the students; and be if further

RESOLVED That, ASCSU recommend that faculty consider, and adopt, as many as
possible of the following strategies;

e) Retention of Junior Faculty

Gregory asked those present to begin by offering anecdotal evidence concerning
whether or not retention of junior faculty is problematic on their campuses.

Sonoma: the junior faculty seem to be dissatisfied. Administration says that this is not
a problem – but faculty view it as a problem. Issues: workload; an expectation of
more scholarship, but not enough financial support.

Northridge: Junior faculty are generally unsatisfied, although there have been been
some efforts based upon salary equity. Issues: housing; salary.

Chico: Issues like those at Sonoma. But they do get support to travel. Issues: salary
(a huge issue); costs of housing.

San Jose: Issues are housing costs, salary, committee work, and assessment efforts.
Many junior faculty members choose to leave to go to community colleges to earn
more with no publication and committee work.

Humboldt: It’s still possible to buy a house.

Dominguez Hills: Issues are lack of research opportunities, lack of funding for travel,
teaching load, and housing costs.

SFSU: Teaching/workload; research expectations.

Strategy – what does the senate want to do to improve faculty recruitment? Gather
data about faculty who have exited pre-tenure within the past 5 years; measure the
attitudes of those who are here and who are frustrated, including retired and the FERP
faculty; focus on the junior faculty. Question: Should it be done through chancellor,
a task force, HR, or an independent professional survey? There is some sentiment in
favor of using an external professional researcher to survey the faculty.
f) Discussion on the Survey Report

Brodowsky presented his research findings on the fate of ASCSU actions (what do campuses “do” with them?). McNamara questioned whether the statistics really indicate a ‘problem’ – e.g., is it a problem if only 60% follow up in a certain way, or is it indeed a good thing?

g) Videotaping

At the request of a colleague, Sabalius brought up issue of videotaping class materials and lecturers and the problems of intellectual property ownership that may arise. FAC would like more clarification about just what this colleague’s concerns are but in the course of FAC’s discussion, several potential problems related to videotaping became apparent. The committee agreed that the issue merits more investigation.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35.

Respectfully submitted,

Glen Browdosky