

**Academic Senate of the California State University  
Faculty Affairs Committee  
Thursday, October 19, 2006, 10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.  
LAX Hilton**

**MINUTES**

In Attendance:

Robert McNamara, Manzar Foroohar, Bernadette Cheyne, Harold Goldwhite, Michael Reagan, Mark Van Selst, Romey Sabalius, Rudy Vanterpool

Also Present: Cordelia Ontiveros, Dick Montanari

1. Approval of agenda – Approved as revised

Addition – evaluation of chairs and deans

Addition – student course evaluations/opinion surveys – postpone discussion until Rudy Vanterpool is here

Addition – Taping of classes deferred until this afternoon.

2. Approval of minutes for September 14, 2006: Approved as presented. Thanks to Mark Van Selst for serving as recorder.

3. Announcements

a. Foroohar – Mediation will start in early November. McNamara asked about the process and the imposition of the last best offer. Mediation is the first step, followed by fact finding, followed by negotiation, resulting, after 10 days, with imposition of the last best offer should the CSU BOT elect to do that. If they don't, then the existing contract remains.

b. Events at the Radisson begin at 5PM with the reception followed by dinner and a speaker.

4. Reports

a. Jackie McClain may not be able to attend the meeting.

b. Cordelia Ontiveros: no report. Foroohar asked about Cornerstones – there are meetings being planned to set the agenda. She suggested that we talk to Paul Persons about faculty and workload as it relates to Cornerstones.

c. Paul Persons may not attend the meeting.

d. John Travis will not be attending the meeting.

e. Chancellor's response to resolutions: See report from Gary Reichard of 10/6 which includes responses to AS-2768-06 FGA and AS 2770-06/FGA/FA

5. Business

5.1 Postponed.

5.2 More aggressive implementation of ACR 73 – Cheyne pulled up the faculty flow report as well as the 21<sup>st</sup> century report. Faculty flow report is particularly useful in terms of identifying the features that attract faculty and those that cause faculty to leave. A number of different aspects of ACR 73 were discussed, such as percentages of permanent faculty, diversity, and the provision that we will not get rid of current lecturers to achieve the desired percentages. Is there a contradiction here? The big problem is the replacement of retiring faculty with lecturers. We need to replace retirees with tenure line faculty. Also to be considered is external accreditation of professional programs. We need to recruit faculty of all types to keep up with growth in FTES. Ontiveros noted that when the flow report was written, the idea was that total faculty hires would grow system-wide. Each year there are a good number of temporary faculty applying for and getting tenure line positions. Goldwhite – requires change in campus culture – one of the easy ways of dealing with decreasing budgets is by hiring lecturers. Do we provide a report to the legislature about our progress toward meeting the goals of ACR 73? We could request that the system prepare such a report annually. McNamara – we do get some data about the ratios of lecturer to tenure line faculty, but we need more information. Is it likely that we could take a position the hiring of lecturers as tenure line faculty since ACR 73 provides that qualified lecturers be considered for tenure line positions. Vanterpool – make a separate resolution about the lecturers. ACR 73 asks that CSU provide a report to the legislature by May 2002. Such a report was done, and we need to study it. Ontiveros has provided some historical employment data that begins with 2001. We showed notable improvement in 2003 and 2004, but by 2005 we dropped down to 63% of FTEF. Information related to ethnicity from 2002 shows relatively good news vis-à-vis ACR 73 with up to 24% non-white faculty. These and other reports are available on line at [www.calstate.edu/hr/apindex.shtml](http://www.calstate.edu/hr/apindex.shtml).

Foroohar suggested that we ask local senates to request the same reporting on the local level. It was suggested that we be innovative in defining full time faculty, but one problem is that clinical faculty are not doing the service that tenure line faculty are doing, which is a very important consideration. Ethnicity reporting is optional, and more and more people are designating themselves as “other,” or opting out. We need to compare ourselves to the national and California PhD pool and, compared to other universities, we are doing a relatively good job. The question, though, is of fit. We may be able to attract them but don’t do a good job of retention because the existing culture is pretty traditional. Cheyne will draft a resolution.

5.3 Foster faculty leadership/governance through greater recognition of value of these contributions: A report was done a few years ago called Shared Governance Reconsidered. Effective participation in governance needs to be properly recognized and rewarded. Vanterpool has accessed these documents to help in the drafting. The RTP implications need to be considered. Foroohar agrees that most of the newer faculty are spending their time on scholarship, but then the burden falls on the tenured faculty. We need to connect service with release time. Encourage campuses to look into their processes for diversifying the RTP process, acknowledging that some people are better at service while others are more involved in research. McNamara – we still have a high retention rate of faculty but that has not been broken down between tenured and non-tenured faculty.

5.4 Audio/Videotaping of class sessions: The committee was not sure at its last meeting whether we should pursue this or not, but ExCom would like us to. We should talk to Paul Persons on this matter. Plus, our email discussion suggests there are several issues including privacy for students (who might feel inhibited) and faculty, and also intellectual and fair use issues. Funding may affect these rights, e.g. if the system provides funding for distance education, do they maintain rights to the material? There is a UC statewide policy on copyright that is of interest since taping of classes (outside of disability accommodation) is largely a copyright issue. There is a whole

range of sample agreements available. A lecture is inherently the property of the faculty, unless there is extraordinary funding from the institution. Goldwhite referenced a set of handbooks that are available on the subject. The email from Van Selst contains a link to these handbooks. Perhaps we need an informational resolution for the senate to keep campuses apprized of relevant intellectual property rights laws. However, with the increased use of technology, the intellectual property rights laws are still evolving. Reagan is reluctant to have such an informational resolution. While we want to assure faculty rights, any agreement with the administration would probably cede some of the rights and we do not have the authority to do that. Thus, we should remain tacit. Van Selst recommends a resolution that states that unless stated contractually otherwise, copyright remains with the faculty. McNamara suggests a resolution that reminds faculty that they do not have to allow students to tape classes. Foroohar suggests we ask CSU and CFA to create an informational guide for faculty regarding their intellectual property rights. There is some consensus that our resolution should provide links to some of the handbooks and other resources on this subject. Van Selst noted that the committee and the senate as a body do not want to create a digest of copyright law. McNamara suggested encouraging faculty to inform themselves on relevant copyright law including their rights regarding audio/videotaping of classes by students. Van Selst brought up the situation of an interactive seminar where students make presentations. The student owns the rights to his/her presentation. It was decided to hold off on this matter until we get more information.

- 5.5 Strategies for gauging faculty satisfaction: This item came from ExCom. SLO has done a survey that relates to this topic. Ontiveros knows of a study that was conducted by researchers at Harvard called the COACHE survey. Seven CSU campuses were involved. The September 29<sup>th</sup> issue of the Chronicle of Higher Ed has an article regarding this survey. Seven CSUs were involved. Cheyne will follow up with Lorie Roth and report back at our next meeting. Do we want to develop our own survey, or have a different kind of resolution? We'll look at the COACHE and SLO surveys first, then decide what to do.
- 5.6 Urging CSU/CFA to settle contract issues: We will not take this one on right now.
- 5.7 Posting of grade distributions: This issue is no longer relevant. We have to do it if we are asked.
- 5.8 MPP hiring practices: There is concern about how MPP positions are filled on some campuses, in particular appointments to interim positions that then become permanent without a full search. In May 2005 there was an ASCSU resolution on this issue. Foroohar described a local resolution that addresses the creation of and searches for academic affairs related MPP positions. We need clearer policies on these issues. MPP are in different relationships to their supervisors, so we could expect to see some differences in their appointment processes. There was discussion regarding how internal searches could be meaningful. Goldwhite suggested a policy that no interim appointee may be a candidate for the permanent position. A question arose regarding the distinction between "acting" and "interim." Ontiveros knows of no system-wide formalized distinction. The number of administrators appears to be increasing, but should be kept in proportion to the number of tenure line faculty and students – AFR and ASR. Vanterpool noted that if the interim remains in the position for a long period, that person is never reviewed administratively beyond the immediate supervisor. McNamara believes that addressing the ratio of administrators to faculty and students would be a good resolution, but the issue of faculty consultation also should be included. One resolution should recommend that campuses develop clear guidelines for how MPP searches are conducted and the role of faculty in the searches. We should check the May 2005 resolution. Perhaps another resolution should ask for a report so that our discussion of ratios, SFR, FTEF etc. could be more meaningful when considering the allocation of resources. Brodowsky will get some payroll data from George Diehr and work with

Goldwhite to see what kind of information exists about these ratios, and then decide what, if any, resolution is needed. We will require FTES, FTEF (lecturer and tenure line) and MPP data for 2000-2005.

- 5.9 Bundling of textbooks: We reviewed last year's resolution about faculty mitigating the cost of textbooks. Sabalius said that bundling is pretty much dead. Publishers got too much flack about it. Now, they debundle and allow students to order selected chapters, black and white, spiral bound, at a reduced upfront cost. The only problem is that they cannot easily resell them. The item was dropped from the agenda.
- 5.10 Monitoring of faculty online activity: The committee questioned whether this issue relates to the PATRIOT Act. We will confer with Paul Persons on this matter.

## 6.0 Discussion Items

- 6.1 Revenue enhancement: Wait until after the elections.
- 6.2 Glen's survey: This was passed on to the ExCom. Perhaps we could request the ExCom to ask the local senate chairs to report back. Urge the ExCom to come up with strategies to get local campus implementation of statewide senate resolutions. Through the ExCom, each statewide senator and local senate chairs can be asked which resolutions from the last ASCSU meeting have been referred to committee or acted upon at each campus as a case study of what is done and how effectively.
- 6.3 Educating of the Board of Trustees: ExCom would like to handle this.
- 6.4 Evaluation of Chairs and Deans: Do people answer the surveys that are sent to them? Are they intimidated? Are they participating at all? Vanterpool – committee chaired by faculty member. Surveys, and dean's self evaluation. Ours are anonymous, but is the process and the report confidential? At this time, this is a discussion item and will not require further action by the committee.
- 6.5 Student opinion surveys and evaluation of faculty: Vanterpool – his campus has made this an important item. Wants input from other campuses about the way this is being done on other campuses. What other ways can be used for teaching effectiveness e.g. peer review, etc.? A general discussion followed but was informational only and will not require further action by the committee.

Dick Montanari joined us late in the meeting as a liaison from the Fiscal and Government Affairs Committee. Goldwhite asked him about working with us on ACR 73. Cheyne will create a draft and pass it on to FGA.

## Wrap-up of action items:

- 5.1 Cheyne will e-mail Persons regarding this item.
- 5.2 Draft resolution on ACR 73 (Cheyne)
- 5.3 Leadership/service draft resolution (Vanterpool/Goldwhite)
- 5.4 Cheyne will e-mail Paul about the legal ramifications of taping classes.
- 5.5 Cheyne will check with Lori Roth on COACHE, obtain the 9/29 Chronicle article, and see if she can find Fooohar's survey on her computer.

- 5.6 Removed.
- 5.7 Removed.
- 5.8 Brodowsky will talk to George Diehr about ASR and AFR. Cheyne will find and forward to the committee the May 05 resolution.
- 5.10 Cheyne will follow up with Persons.
- 6.2 Cheyne will follow up with Thobaben.