

**Academic Senate of the California State University  
Faculty Affairs Committee  
Thursday, September 14, 2006 10:00 a.m. – 2:45 p.m. Room 410**

**MINUTES**

**In Attendance:** Bernadette Cheyne, Robert McNamara, Glen Brodowsky, Manzar Foroohar, Harold Goldwhite, Diana Guerin, Romey Sabalius, Mark Van Selst, Rudy Vanterpool, Ron Kroman

**Also Present:** Paul Persons (ExCom liaison), John Travis (CFA), Lorie Roth (C.O., Academic Affairs), Jackie McClain (C.O., Human Resources), Gail Brooks (C.O., Human Resources)

1. Approval of agenda  
M/S/P
2. Approval of minutes for May 3-4, 2006  
M/S/P
3. Announcements
  - 3.1 Minutes-taking  
Minutes will be rotated: Mark, Harold, Diana, Robert
  - 3.2 Other  
Plenary 8:30 AM Friday  
Student Success (Radisson)  
Nov. Meeting Thursday to 5PM (Nov. 21)
4. Reports
  - 4.1 Jackie McClain, Human Resources Time-certain: 11:15 a.m.

Gail Brooks: Associate Vice Chancellor, primary areas of benefits and compensation. Jackie will continue to meet with FA with Gail as replacement if required. Employee relations will report jointly to Gail and Jackie. This covers benefits and compensation but not labor relations.

HR issue of what happens with those who were not eligible for health benefits at hire. New brochure developed.

Committee expressed appreciation at HR responsiveness to Senate concerns.

CalPERS will not cover faculty for the first month of hire. This is a real problem for the CSU. This is a possible advice item from ASCSU to CalPERS.

On bargaining: incentive programs. Is there a better way to approach merit programs that avoids the historic baggage? There is the possibility of adding a 4<sup>th</sup> year to the contract. In addition to the potential merit allocation there are substantial monies for faculty pay. CO position is somewhat hopeful/promising.

CO proposal is to reduce FERP from 5 to 3 years. This issue is bargainable. The CO differs internally on FERP. The negative concerns on FERP are that new faculty are limited since salary savings from FERP don't cover a full time new faculty member – this involves (typically) hiring a lecturer. This is seemingly a major concern of the BoT. Historically FERPs were limited on their committee work; this has been mitigated. Assumption seems to be that FERP faculty would be replaced at start of FERP with F/T T/T. This assumption

seems questionable but does highlight why limiting FERP committee possibilities would be a poor practice.

All packages have budget contingencies limiting funds.

On SSIs and why they are charged against the system: start-up costs, promotions, etc. are not funded. These monies arguably eat up the savings from retirement salaries (“salary savings”).

What are the positive incentives for faculty? How can we reduce negative incentives. Incentives (rather than ‘merit’) since historically merit programs are viewed as ‘sticks’ rather than ‘carrots’. Salary inversion must be dealt with as part of or prior to any merit/incentive system. Merit systems, to be effective, must be mutually bought into. Given BoT directive to CO there will be a merit system – the question is how to implement.

#### 4.2 John Travis, CFA Time 10:30 AM

Week long bargaining session in SF at the end of the summer (including Jackie McClain) – relatively productive meeting.

Consultants hired by CO to aide relationship with CO and their various associated unions. Barnes (mediator) worked to make a more effective relationship between the parties (e.g., CO & Academic Prof. of Ca./CFA/etc.). Ultimately this is a cultural issue (culture of distrust and distaste). The negative relationship makes bargaining much harder than it could otherwise be.

Salary Issues:

- Salary inversion within disciplines
- Cap at SSI maximum (esp. level D lecturer/librarian and full prof)... This includes the “gray area” where only merit increases can increase salary (beyond SSI cap).
- GSI slow moving
- CPEC gap (18% average)

CFA bargaining does not believe that all of these issues can be met in one contract. The CO “close the gap” proposal was seen as unlikely to actually move towards this goal. The CFA proposal works towards this but was not seen as acceptable to the CO (too costly).

Additionally, the CFA and CO disagree on the cost of the SSI... CFA sees SSI as “self-fulfilling budget” from retirements, CO sees SSI as costing “new money” (and more budget transparency). Within the CSU the SSI is charged against compensation pool... and thus the GSI is decreased.

This week (Wed.) meeting to discuss whether or not further bargaining would be worthwhile or call it a stalemate (with proviso that Friday was kept available for further bargaining). There were no miracles but CO movement justified meeting Friday. Bargaining will continue with smaller groups prior to the full bargaining on Friday.

Salary is the big issue, but there are some additional potentially controversial issues that need to be discussed. A possible future option is to go to HEERA, fulfill impasse, ask PERB to declare impasse, go to mediation, and then end up with fact-finding.

Other issues include: FERP, parking (esp. on some campuses) and workload (quantification problem and comparison across institutions – additional resources (faculty) or additional compensation... academic program database is one option... increases workload definition with class size increases).

Social comparison of new vs. mid-career faculty shows that the least satisfied faculty are those with 15-20 years on campus (Diana).

On student evaluations, there are some contract issues that were discussed.

#### 4.3 Paul Persons, ExCom Liaison 1:45 PM

- CO ATAC. Academic transformation document called for efficiency in faculty and technology resources. Clearly this is a FA issue.
- Graduate initiative.
- LDTP. Costing for review of course descriptors.
- Veteran access to education within the CSU (a largely untapped population); also ties into digitally mediated education.
- October: staying at the Hilton for interim meetings; Radisson for Student Success Conference. Need senators to agree to moderate the panels.
- Cornerstones II. BoT will launch "Cornerstones II" Selection of executive and three others drawn from 5 advocated by the ASCSU Executive Committee from campus recommendations. The new initiative will focus upon access, quality, etc.
- Budget. No major news. Discussion of additional travel costs.

#### 4.4 CO response to resolutions passed at May plenary

- Responses were reviewed.
- Response about future budget growth for ASCSU was promising.

### 5. Business Items/Resolutions

5.1 Resolutions regarding CSU executive compensation: Discussed, revised, concerns about tone and target audience. Currently under review by FGA.

5.2 "Global strategies" for addressing budget shortfalls: Deemed FGA issue, low FA priority.

5.3 Requests to CSU from law enforcement agencies for confidential information (Persons): Resolutions from FA last year asked that all such requests go to a central clearinghouse and also that the individual be notified unless it breaks another law to do so. What is current status of action following up? Persons will discuss with ExCom and request information from CO. Depending on the answer this may need further follow-up or resolution.

5.4 Processes for addressing issues related to student affairs: Ad hoc vs. formal basis. Consensus seemed to be that most "student affairs" issues would be FA or AA. An ad hoc basis seemed appropriate. The student ASCSU liaison could be sought out as appropriate.

5.5 More aggressive implementation of ACR 73 (per ExCom, reference 21st Century Report and Faculty Flow document): Refers to Student-Faculty Ratios, etc. Considered a high priority issue. Seek AA and FGA co-sponsorship for developed or developing resolutions. We need to know current status relative to ACR 73:

- Hiring plan
- Funding plan

- “Fact book” of the CSU (Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi in CO AA; also Cordelia Ontiveros recruitment and hiring – under academic human resources)

Cheyne and Guerin will follow up.

- 5.6 Foster faculty leadership/governance through greater recognition of value of these contributions (per ExCom). How is it viewed in the RTP process? Exhortation of campus senates to ensure inclusion of service into the RTP process. Resolution in support of such to local senates (Vanterpool and Goldwhite will co-develop).
- 5.7 Videotaping of class sessions (per ExCom, look at campus and AAUP policies). Discussed campus and AAUP policies. Consent is a crucial factor. David Horowitz, facebook, myspace, etc. (use of class content outside of class purposes). Copyright /information ownership of pay-to-develop courses (writing workshop for senior students). What are rights/obligations re: informed consent of audio and video. AAUP policies and intellectual property laws need to be addressed. Seek out intellectual property pamphlets that address some of these issues. Speak with Chris Helwig (CSU counsel), Marcus Harvey (or successor for AAUP west coast). Van Selst and Sabalius will follow up.
- 5.8 Unfunded/underfunded graduate programs (per ExCom work with F&GA, also address how money—if it comes—filters down and is distributed): Are we tracking resources, tracking dollars? Does the senate want to address the overall funding for graduate programs? New graduate enrollment will receive additional money. This money may or may not flow into the producing programs. Workload additions from graduate programs need to be addressed. Suggestion to have local senates not approve graduate programs without adequate funding and to be cognizant of where new programs will seek funding from. Not a FA priority at the moment. This issue has been discussed on the ASCSU floor in years past. No action taken or recommended at this time.
- 5.9 Strategies for gauging faculty satisfaction (per ExCom): Not discussed.
- 5.10 Urging CFA/CSU to settle contract issues: Not discussed.
- 5.11 Posting of grade distributions: Not discussed.
- 5.12 Non-university sponsored activity (Van Selst): Discussed. No action. The case involved an off-campus speaker who brought his own bodyguards onto campus. This was judged to be too narrow an issue for statewide policy.

## 6. Discussion items

- 6.1 Do we want to ask CalPERS to examine the first month eligibility for Tenure/Tenure-track faculty: Discussed earlier in meeting.
- 6.2 Glen’s survey (ex-com would like information from this forwarded to them): Glen agreed to forward survey information to members of the Executive Committee.
- 6.3 Educating the BoT (ex-com will handle this issue for now in the broader sense of exploring strategies for improving the relationship between senate and CO activities): Not discussed.
- 6.4 Monitoring of faculty online activity: Not discussed.

7. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.