Academic Senate of the California State University

Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes
January 25, 2006

Called to order at 10:15 a.m.


1. Approval of Agenda
   The following items were added to the agenda:
   a. Disability Accessibility to Technology
   b. Faculty Workload for EdD teaching.
   c. Merit Pay
   d. Teaching Associates-Graduate student teaching
   e. Possibility of Academic Conference
   f. Senate budget issues

   The agenda was approved as amended.

2. The minutes from December 2 were briefly reviewed and approved.

3. Announcements
   a. Volunteers were solicited for the Thursday social.

   b. RTP Workshop-February 24, 2006- Crowne Plaza, LAX. Each campus is to send a team of five, faculty and administrative representatives. The workshop will feature “Best Practices” in RTP. A luncheon panel composed of Provosts will focus on their experiences with RTP. Ontiveros provided the committee with copies of the invitation for the workshop and the agenda.

   c. Report on Joint Salary Structure Committee. This was established through the last bargaining process with representatives from CFA and Administration. Gregory asked if the committee could get copies of the report; Ontiveros said that there was not a report but rather a two page summary about salary structure and she thought this could be given to Faculty Affairs.
4. Reports
   a. Jackie McClain- 11:00 a.m.
      There was discussion of COBRA and other benefits for newly hired faculty. If a newly-hired faculty member comes with COBRA arrangements can be made to cover costs for this at the level of the cost by the prior employer. For those who do not have health insurance, McClain reported that by state law CSU can only make this available when they are formally employed and according to PERS regulations.

      A general discussion of the CSU benefits package in comparison followed. McClain indicated that she is trying to find good data on these issues. The committee also discussed ways in which individuals can get coverage. And McClain offered to put together an information sheet about how persons can get independent coverage until they are benefits-eligible.

      She also indicated that the CSU Administration is committed to building better relations with organized (union-represented) employees groups and has retained a consultant, who has a union background and extensive experience in mediation, and is well respected, and they are now meeting with CFA leadership to discuss ways to facilitate discussions and bargaining. She is committed to improvement of relations. There also will be training of various “key players.” and all campus presidents have been informed about this. Bargaining continues and despite a number of difficult and contentious issues on the table, she has hopes that some agreement can be attained.

   b. Hank Reichman- Executive Committee- 2:50 p.m.
      Paul and Jackie reported on the proposal to revive the Academic Conference, which in the past this was funded by the Chancellor separate from the Senate budget. Reichman agreed on the need for such a conference, especially since the Board of Trustees is soon to lose long-term Trustees such as Murray Galinson and Debra Farar. The Facilitating Graduation Conference now scheduled for October 20, 2006 could be a step toward a full-blown Academic Conference, perhaps in the spring. Funds for the October event will come from Keith Boyum’s budget. Recichman thought that a resolution calling for the reinstatement of such a conference was much in order. Paul and Jackie will work on this.

      Reichman reported on the Senate budget and the resolution to reduce the membership of the senate, which is coming to the Plenary. At the present time the Senate cannot operate with its budget. In the past, David Spence had supplemented the budget, but it was outside the regular budget. The
Chancellor has committed all the additional money from enrollment to campuses and is not likely to offer to give the ASCSU additional money. Trying to make do this year and cutting representation to key committees such as ATAC as well as the Board of Trustees has harmed our effectiveness. If we keep the present members, the choice is to reduce assigned time to second year senators. Further, to make this an issue with the Chancellor hurts our ability to press more important issues. There was considerable discussion of these complexities.

b. John Travis, CFA President- Thursday, January 26- 10:30 a.m.

Tom Krabacher brought up an issue from FGA, namely, the appropriateness of a joint FGA/FAC resolution on the inversion of salary at the lower end and the compression of salary at the upper level of the salary scale—asking the Parties to address this issue in bargaining. Travis reported that this has always been an issue in bargaining, usually in certain disciplines such as business and nursing. CFA has already done some investigation of this set of problems. He believes that much of this is a management problem at the campus level and it is difficult to solve these kinds of problems in bargaining. During the last bargaining session it was agreed to establish a Committee on Salary Structure. John did not think that all of the problems were going to be solved in this bargaining session. There is a provision in 31.23 of the contract permits faculty to apply for an equity increase for various reasons. CFA will propose to revise 31.23 to suggest clearly that this is a mechanism that can deal with compression and inversion. It will also propose a pool of funds for this purpose. CFA believes that the SSI process can over time take care of the inversion/conversion problem, although at the top step for professors more money will be needed. The proposed CFA new salary structure will not solve all the problems. Both parties are aware of the inversion/compression issue, although probably CFA sees this more of a priority concern than does the administration.

Tom asked if such a resolution from the senate would be considered by CFA as meddling in contract issues. Travis replied that it would not. The point was made that this resolution would also be a message to our colleagues.

Robert McNamara asked about the report of the Committee on Salary Structure. Travis affirmed that there had been no official report but that CFA’s proposal for salary structure was based on the committee’s report but modified. Goldwhite reminded everyone of the report of the Task Force on Merit Pay and inquired if a similar, neutral Task Force on Salary Structure will be appropriate. Travis thought that at this point it would not be appropriate. He also said that the Merit Pay report had been very useful, but the union’s position is two fold: (1) The CEPC gap needs to be
closed before a merit plan is addressed; and (2) There is already merit built into the system. Travis did indicate that there is some discussion of a merit provision for full professors.

The consensus was that FGA and Faculty Affairs should go ahead with the proposed resolution on the inversion/conversion issue.

Travis then discussed bargaining in general and the recently-hired consultant, C. Richard Barnes. With no money available the Parties had addressed and resolved a number of no/low cost issues in the last bargaining session. Now with the whole contract was on the table, bargaining would be more difficult. They proceeded with bargaining without much publicity. Some conceptual agreement was achieved. Now, tough issues remain including the FERP program. The CSU has proposed some “take a ways” especially in Article 12 and concerning job security for lecturers, for instance, hiring full-time lecturers without regard to three year contracts or preference for work for part-time faculty. As for the salary structure there is a push to remove the ceiling of the top step and talk about a salary range and a “soft gap” at the top. Another extremely complex issue is “workload.” CFA intends to address workload on three levels: (1) the growing number of students per class, i.e. increased student-faculty ratios. (2) Searching for tenure-track faculty (i.e. a base number of tenure-track searches); (3) Reengaging in talking about weighted teaching units, although with some trepidation because some campuses have already addressed reducing the teaching load for faculty. This has been proposed at the “conceptual” rather than the “particulars” level.

The administration decided to improve relations with labor and decided to hire a consultant to help resolve the problems. First, Richard Lawry, a mediation consultant, came to interview various union persons, but then received an appointment as a President in Tennessee. He did not leave a report but recommend Richard Barnes, an expert in labor and union/management mediation. (He was with LALUNA and worked with the Clinton administration,) Travis says he is a very sharp individual. and has identified some problems including the backlog of grievances and arbitrations as well as an unhealthy “culture” for bargaining. Barnes is proposing to provide training for both system and campus personnel.

Romey inquired about the incident of CSU, DH blocking the distribution of the CFA newsletter on e-mail under the rubric of political solicitation matters. Travis said that CFA indicated is filing an unfair labor practices on this matter.
5. Resolutions

a. Ongoing External Efforts to Shape Curricula in Institutions of Learning- Kegley and McNamara- Some minor changes were made to the rationale and the revised resolution was approved.

b. Providing Newly Recruited Faculty with Necessary Support- Glen Brodowsky.-Minor revisions were made to the resolution. Discussion focused on removing references to retention in this resolution and pursuing it separately at our March meeting. Foroohar and Brodowsky will constitute a sub-committee to develop a resolution calling for acquisition of information and data on retention, akin to the work of the Faulty Flow Committee that reported to the Senate in 2003. Foroohar will send a summary of a study done at SLO on reasons why junior faculty members are unhappy; each of us will get information on faculty retention issues on our campuses. The committee also reviewed, slightly revised, and approved the resolution.

c. Resources for Teaching- Paul Persons. There was review and discussion and modifications of this resolution. It was suggested that the resolution have a new title so that it indicates that this is about support for lecturers. One suggested title was “Providing Lecturers with Timely, Necessary Academic Support.”

d. Academic Textbook Prices, Practices, and Principles- Romney Sabelius. Jan circulated a revised copy of this resolution. This should be on our agenda for February,

e. Guidelines for Use on Non-CSU Public Safety Officers on CSU Campuses. Jan also circulated copies of this resolution, which will be on our agenda in February.

6. Discussion Items

a. Time Certain: 10:40 a.m. - Discussion of FGA interest in a resolution on salary issues.

Harold Goldwhite, representing FGA, reported that FGA thinks a resolution about re-examining the basic salary structure is the way to go and should be a joint resolution with FGA and FA. Brodowsky thought that establishing a Task Force, with representatives from various constituencies, would be an excellent idea. Goldwhite noted the Task Force on Merit Pay that had produced an excellent report and studying models of salary structure and reporting back might be a task for such a Task Force. The general consensus was that we would wait until our
discussion with John Travis tomorrow morning before making a decision. It was suggested that Goldwhite and Krabacher join us tomorrow at 8:15.

b. **Discussion of possibility of having an academic conference.** In the past important issues to the CSU were addressed by faculty, campus senate chairs, administrations and trustees via annual academic conferences. It is also important, in light of the emphasis on facilitating graduation, for all to be able to focus on the quality of instruction and student achievement. This kind of cross-fertilization is important to the health of the academy. Kegley reported the possibility of a “Facilitating Graduation” conference in October that would emphasize campus “Best Practices.” Perhaps this could be a vehicle for having a true Academic Conference. Persons will produce a draft resolution on this.

c. **Darlene Yee came to report on referring three items of business to – Thursday, January 26- 10:45 a.m.**

   a. **Workload as it related to graduate faculty especially as it related to the new EdD. Degree.** If FA would confer with Education faculty and Academic Affairs regarding the NCATE criteria, this would be helpful because these criteria refer to workload.

   b. **Examining the decline in size and quality of the pool of tenure-track faculty for hiring especially in certain disciplines.** Can we get some data on this issue? How do you evaluate a decline in quality? And if you get them in for an interview why do they not take positions with CSU?

   c. **Shall we endorse merit pay or propose an merit pay structure that works?** This item seems incongruous as ASCSU passed on resolution on merit pay in fall, 2005, and the rationale for revisiting it is unclear.