Academic Senate of the California State University
Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes
September 15, 2005

In attendance: Glen Brodowsky; Bernadette Cheyne; Manzar Foroohar, Jan Gregory; Jacquelyn Kegley; Paul Persons; Michael Regan; Robert McNamara; and Romey Sabalius. Observer: Ron Kroman, retired faculty. Visitor: new Senator Mike Perkins from SDSU. Staff: Lorie Roth.

1. Called to order at 10:30

2. Approval of Agenda

Chair Gregory announced that Hank Recichman will be a time certain At 2 p.m. to discuss budget.

Jan also added a resolution on “Resumption of Collective Bargaining.”

“Discussion of the Student Conduct Code” before the Trustees was added to the agenda. (We did not get to this).

There was a brief discussion of the Constitution Day issue—it now does not seem to be infringing on curriculum decisions. However there was concern that some principles and a possible wedge problem might need to be addressed. This issue may be comparable to the efforts of some groups to try to determine the biology curriculum by seeking to give Intelligent Design an equal place in biology curriull. It was agreed that Glen Brodowsky, Jan Gregory and Robert McNamara would serve as a group to work a more general philosophical piece to deal with intrusion on faculty prerogatives including external pressure on textbook publishers, Constitution Day, the Biology issues and reintroduction of the Morrow Bill,

Reports- No reports

Discussion of Budget issues- Both Paul and Jackie expressed strong remarks about the possibility of non-reimbursement for attending Academic Technology meetings. If we cannot attend because of lack of funding, what does this mean for faculty representation?

There was then discussion of the Resolution on Assisting Victims of Hurricane Katrina. It was moved and seconded to send this resolution forward to the Plenary. Tabled until have additional resolution.

Minor edits were made to the second resolve. Paul requested a resolve that would indicate support for CSU students, faculty, staff who have personally gone to assist in the disaster.
Presentation by John Travis and discussion.

John shared an overview of the proposals offered by both CSU and CFA. He also pointed out that the contract will continue to function until the statutory processes have run their course. He does not believe that these processes will be exhausted during this academic year because there are so many problems. However, one should not promise anything for certain. One big area of concerns is the seeking of paybacks, especially on appointment issues and those affecting lecturers. Another difficult problem area is the article on Grievance.

In answering a question, John confirmed that from the viewpoint of CFA the term “faculty” does include lecturers. One issue for the committee is how this relates to the merit pay proposals which see this working through the RTP process. Lecturers are reviewed through a different process.

Legislature and Governor do not specifically allocated budget to compensation. They give a budget to the CSU and the Trustees determine the amounts to be given different categories.

Having discarded Weighted Teaching Units, it has been more difficult to deal with reduction of workload. One proposal was to hire new faculty members to cover retirements and other needs and thus to allow the campuses to determine how to reduce teaching load. This did not work. The two key issues on the campuses are compensation and workload, the latter concerning a decrease in the number of students in classes. This year the proposal is to use the “old” mode and level mechanism as guidelines and then to assign WTU’s on the basis of a certain number going over the formula mode and level.

Resolution on the Urgency of Settling Faculty Compensation matters in the Current Contract Bargaining

There was discussion of this resolution and minor editing. Bernadette Cheyne moved and Michael Regan seconded that we move this forward to the Plenary agenda. The motion was passed.

Resolution “Assisting Victims of Hurricane Katrina”

There was discussion and minor editing of this resolution. The motion to move this to the Plenary agenda was passed.

Visit from Executive Committee Liaison- Hank Reichman

Hank indicated that our Senate budget has remained the same, while, in fact, other units in Academic Affairs have been cut. The problem is while our budget has remained the same, our needs have increased, particularly in release time needs. The Chair’s salary is now calculated as a 12 month base rather than as in the past with three months salary
added to their salary. This saves the senate some money. The committee reviewed the
budget sheet provided by Senator Reichman. Possible savings were discussed. The
possibilities discussed were to cancel one interim committee meetings; cancel Legislative
Days; reduce the number of Executive Committee members attending BOT meetings;
reduce attendance at systemwide meetings; and perhaps further reduction of assigned
time.

Resolution on Resources for Teaching

There was extensive discussion of this resolution. There was a concern that the present
version of the resolution was too prescriptive and perhaps unrealistic.

It was moved and seconded that we extend our meeting time beyond 4 and perhaps up to
5 with at least a 15 minute break. Motion passed.

Resolution: “Re-Affirmation of Prior Actions and Statements on Merit Pay”

A major discussion centered around whether to spell out the principles from the Merit
Pay Task Force Report; whether to draw on this work and history and whether to
highlight two main principles- the CEPC Gap one and the one concerning bonuses. Do
we want to pull certain principles out and highlight them in separate resolutions or just
highlight them in the list by putting them in a different order?

It was decided to keep the principles as stated in the original report.

A resolution will be added that states that “the ASCSU urge that any merit pay system be
accessible to all faculty members. It was moved that the resolution as amended be sent
forward to the Plenary. Passed with one member (Sabelius) opposed.

Discussion of Interim Meeting Possibilities

Meet in two different locations-one south and one north. There could be brief general
discussion of issues and then assignment to the two groups. Then again, the group could
come together to try to finalize. We all could meet in San Francisco and this would save
travel costs for a many members of the committee. Jackie has a campus obligation on the
7th and may have to be connected by phone. Paul raised a concern about the absence of
staff to our committee such as Lori and our usual meeting with Jackie McClain. It was
pointed out that McClain has not made several of our last meetings. It seems that in
terms of general cost and benefits our plan to meet in San Francisco makes the best sense.