Minutes of October 8, 2004
Faculty Affairs Committee
Academic Senate of the California State University

Chairperson Jan Gregory called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

Approval of Agenda of October 8, 2004: M/S/P, with modifications.

Approval of Minutes of September 9, 2004: M/S/P, as amended.

Members Present: Foroohar, Gregory, Kegley, Persons, Montanari, Vanterpool

Discussion of Old Business & Concerns:

The Committee engaged in a brief discussion of several concerns needing attention from both the Central CSU Office, and at specific campuses. Discussion centered around recent and ongoing administrative deliberations over Risk Management policies and procedures at the system-wide level. It was noted that the Office of Academic Affairs needs, as a practical matter, to have a greater participation in these sorts of system-wide deliberations. A second topic focused on the deterioration of faculty morale on some campuses, directly linked to actual and potential negative impacts of program discontinuations and consolidations that fall short of reasonable expectations of joint decision-making practices. It was pointed out that issues of risk management are covered in an important document entitled, Handbook of Election Issues.

Senator Foroohar reported that on her campus administration is moving forward with plans to implement CMS. Some committee members would like to see more faculty involvement at the fact-finding level before a full-scale CMS implementation. There is a great deal of misinformation being disseminated about the respective advantages and disadvantages of People Soft and Oracle. Lorie Roth, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs, noted that meetings have already begun at the Chancellor’s Office on this very matter. Discussion on CMS implementation ended with a recommendation that sensitive information about CMS issues should be shared with the FGA Committee, with the goal of collecting data from the CSU campuses to help us better understand where the campuses are in the actual implementation process.

Discussion of New Business

A motion was seconded and unanimously approved, recommending that: FAC Chair, Jan Gregory, request of CSU Senate Chair to communicate with campus Senate Chairs to provide his Office with accurate information about the status of CMS implementation on their respective campuses. It was suggested that Campus Senate Chairs could be advised to consult with their appropriate administrative Officers in order to obtain reliable information. If at all possible, FAC would also appreciate
information on estimated costs of individual campus CMS implementation. M/S/P unanimously.

Senator Montanari, speaking on behalf of a FAC sub-committee now working on a study of the academic ramifications of the flight of Business School Programs to Extended Education, noted that the impetus for engaging in this study is a concern that wholesale shifts of traditional academic programs to divisions of Extended Education could have significant negative impacts on curriculum programming in general. A pervasive concern involves compensation disparities that are potentially inconsistent with MOU agreements. The MOU does permit campus presidents to approve special funding for market equity along with a comparable base salary, but no salary ceiling has been established. A question germane to the dispute is how much discretion campus Provosts have to increase worker salaries without consultation with CFA. Warschauer and Montanari will continue to work on a written report.

CSU Senate Executive Committee liaison to FAC, Marshelle Thobaben, brought to the Committee’s attention one campus’ actions (San Marcos’) handling of compensation for an off-campus public speaker. The guest speaker at issue is Michael Moore, filmmaker and producer of the highly controversial movie, Farenheit 9/11. The Committee engaged in extended discussion of reasonable expectations both faculty and students have that their first amendment right of freedom of speech not be unreasonably impaired. This lively discussion ended with a recommendation coming from FAC: That FAC Chair, Jan Gregory write a memorandum to CSU Academic Senate Chair (David McNeil), requesting of the Chancellor’s Office that a mechanism be put in place for making campus presidents more sensitive to matters of respect for academic freedom of members of the campus community, as well as sensitivity to reasonable expectations that First Amendment free speech rights be not unwisely impaired. Appropriate mechanisms to facilitate such an opportunity for enhanced sensitivity could be accomplished through a series of “sensitivity training” workshop as well as incorporation of effective techniques or proven best practices for hosting off-campus speakers. M/S/P unanimously.

Discussion of Major FAC Policy Recommendation:

(1) Academic Freedom and Student Rights
FAC deliberated a draft resolution on Academic Freedom, a recommendation to be introduced at the plenary sessions of November 11-12, 2004. The Committee closely examined the wording and substantive contents of the Resolve clauses. There was consensus that a new title for the resolution is needed.

Discussion of Pending Items for Possible FAC Resolutions

(1) Student Grievances and/or Student Appeals Processes.
It was noted that a focused review of existing campus policies and procedures dealing with student grievances and appeals be undertaken. Issues affecting students’ rights to due process, the composition of student grievance committees and other related
concerns warrant such an assessment across the CSU system. Questions of importance to FAC are: Who should be assigned the task of gathering pertinent policy documents from the campuses? Can any feasible steps be taken from the Central Office to encourage campuses to index material on student grievance policies and practices on their websites in a more “access friendly” format? Somehow, this message needs to get out to the campuses. Committee members Montanari and Foroohar are the designated point persons on this matter.

(2) Enrollment Management.
The question was raised how the Compact relates to campus autonomy and the Academic Senate in maintaining control over the quality of teaching and learning, particularly in light of enrollment management needs. Would a set of global directives on enrollment management policies and procedures work better for the system as a whole?

Joint Meeting of Faculty Affairs and the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs committees (October 8, 2004). The purpose of this joint meeting was to engage in discussion of a Faculty Compensation and Workload Statement. Bob Cherny provided a brief background statement for the issues before the group. He stated that given the upcoming approval of the budget by the Board of Trustees, it was decided that rather than doing a resolution on workload and compensation, it might be more fruitful to have a general Statement on the various issues that could then be adopted by the Senate. Lively discussion followed the introduction. Generally speaking members from both standing committees expressed support for a Statement instead of a formal resolution. There were several constructive suggestions how the wording of the Statement could be improved upon. The session was wrapped up with a cautionary statement from Cristy Jensen that we should also think seriously about advocating revenue enhancements, especially in light of our strong stand on student fees. Cherny noted that the students had done an excellent job in reaching the Trustees on the fee issue. Cherny summarized by saying that it should be a cover letter, the 21st Century document, and a supplement followed up personally.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of FAC
Rudy Vanterpool, Vice Chair
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