

Faculty Affairs Committee

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

April 10, 2009

Coronado Room - 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Kevin Baaske, Glen Brodowsky, Bernadette Cheyne (Recorder), Manzar Foroohar, David Lord, Robert McNamara (Chair), Paul Rivera, Marshelle Thobaben

Guests: Gail Brooks, Margy Merryfield, Barry Pasternak, Lorie Roth, John Tarjan, John Travis, Mark Van Selst

The meeting was called to order at 10:12 a.m.

1. **Approval of the agenda:** M/S Baaske/Thobaben to accept the agenda. Request to add an item to the agenda as 5.6. Accepted as friendly. Approved unanimously as amended.
2. **Approval of the minutes for March 18, 2009:** M/S Thobaben/Baaske to approve the minutes of March 18, 2009. Minutes approved as presented.
3. **Announcements**

McNamara:

- Was copied on a list serve communication from the Faculty Development Council (FDC) indicating that they were very appreciative of the resolution the ASCSU passed regarding lecturer opportunities, and that they would consider strategies for addressing some of the recommendations contained in the resolution.
- Even with the expected \$50 million CSU budget reduction, the ExCom does not anticipate any major changes in the Senate budget for next year.
- The ExCom would like to change the December 11 interim to December 4, which seems to work better with Senators' schedules.
- A call has gone out for volunteers to serve on the Services for Students with Disabilities Committees and no names have come forward. The next meeting will be on April 17. Brodowsky indicated a willingness to attend and will speak with ExCom.

4. Reports

4.1 Lorie Roth (CO)

- CLA Task Force met for what they believe to be the final time. Catherine Nelson has done a great job of guiding the Task Force. It is now in the hands of the two chairs, and most people seem happy with the work that has been done. There are five major recommendations which will come out in a final report that will be delivered to the President's Council on Accountability.
- Discussed proficiency before the first year for remedial students. At the last BOT meeting there was discussion that students who are not yet proficient be mandated to enroll in an early start program. Were this to occur, it would still allow a student to be admitted to the

university even if they did not successfully complete the program. There was a question as to whether this had been referred to the APEP Committee. John Tarjan will be notified to ensure that it is appropriately vetted by the ASCSU. Brodowsky noted that this is a very successful program on his campus. The CO is trying to gather best practices and put them on a website.

- Regarding the CDIP website, still anticipate having people from Faculty Affairs review the site, but currently are not ready for this to occur. McNamara asked that this remain on the agenda for our next meeting so we can receive an update at that time. Merryfield provided some information on the current status and the desire for faculty to offer their expertise as reviewers even before the May meeting.
- Noted that Thobaben is working on formative assessment. Thobaben will offer a report later in the meeting.

4.2 Gail Brooks (CO):

- Acknowledged that there were difficulties at the last meeting and reaffirmed that she is fully committed to work with FAC and engage in open dialogue. It was agreed that in-the-moment discussions would be preferable when issues of appropriateness arise. Brooks noted that the presence at the last meeting of people who were on the bargaining team added to the discomfort. Thobaben noted that Chair McNamara had been harmed in the process as an unintentional outcome and expressed hope that this would be addressed.
- Discussed an early draft of the Strategic Plan Vision and Goals that had been discussed with the committee in the past. Noted that she and Merryfield have a more fully-developed version of this document and would like to send it to the committee with a brief questionnaire requesting our response to the document. McNamara requested that committee members receive the document in advance and then discuss it at our meeting in May.
- Based upon current law, systemwide HR must take on the responsibility for appeals from students who claim discrimination once they have exhausted campus processes, as well as those who claim discrimination in being denied admission to CSU. Brooks would like to bring this back to the committee for more in-depth discussion during our May meeting. There also was some discussion as to how discrimination policies relate to employees. This also will be discussed at a later meeting.
- Regarding bargaining, the first mediation session will occur on Monday. These meetings have to do with the 2008-2009 negotiated contingent raises. If this cannot be resolved in mediation, it will go to fact-finding. A new process would begin next year for the 2009-2010 raises.
- McNamara strongly urged HR to continue to supply systemwide data. Merryfield noted that a faculty recruitment and retention survey was conducted in the fall but has not yet been compiled and analyzed. Brooks cautioned that in terms of employee retention, the information received is only what individuals are willing to say, and that this is not always an accurate representation. Foroohar noted a recent resolution requesting that information on MPP hires be tracked. This will be investigated.

4.3 John Travis (CFA):

- Reiterated Brooks' information regarding mediation beginning on Monday. Tony Butka, a very experienced mediator, will serve in this capacity. The mediator, however, has very limited power in the process. If mediation is unsuccessful, will move to fact-finding, which is a quasi-judicial process conducted in front of a panel who then writes a report. These findings are not binding on either party. CFA continues to favor arbitration and will request

this if mediation proves unsuccessful. If the CSU chooses to impose its last best offer, the union then can engage in concerted activities; however it is unlikely that the union would suggest actions such as strikes. Noted that it is unlikely that next year's budget will be such that it would stave off another round of re-openers on salary between CSU and CFA for 2009-2010.

- Referenced ballot measure 1A, which he noted is very confusing but which suggests that, if passed, state programs not protected by statute could be in dire straights, including an inability to recoup money that has been cut from the CSU over the past number of years. Also referenced the likelihood that another round of cuts would occur if the state does not receive the \$10 billion in stimulus money from the federal government. Since that trigger already has been pulled, the CFA is going to encourage the governor to not further penalize those programs unprotected by statute.
- Regarding the question of state supported versus self-supported programs, the CFA is concerned about the impact of this on students because self-supported programs are much more expensive and students may be lost. Also, lecturers often teach such courses and when shifted to self-supported there is a loss in salary and benefits. The union considers moving courses in order to avoid paying for them out of state funds as a violation of a number of state mandates and policies, and the CFA will be monitoring this closely.
- Also are looking at the issue of student evaluations of faculty, especially as it deals with on-line versus in-class evaluations. There is some anecdotal evidence that if an on-line evaluation is used for a class not taught on-line there is a significant fall-off in the number of students who respond, and also that the results seem to be significantly skewed. Faculty of color have added a number of additional concerns regarding evaluations, including evaluations given in classes that primarily are not composed of students of color and the perception that the results of these evaluations are negatively skewed. Travis urged the committee to read "Report on Student Evaluations" from March 12, 2008 which the CFA believes will influence their position when negotiating the next contract. The major concerns are the role such evaluations play in the RTP process and their impact on lecturers. The committee agreed that it will confer with ExCom as to whether FAC should review, discuss and potentially respond to this report.
- In response to a question regarding a time line on the re-opener process, Travis expressed hope that they can get through the process by late spring or early summer, but it is possible that it could roll over into the fall and occur simultaneously with the re-openers for 2009-2010.
- Regarding state-supported versus self-supported programs, student financial aid can be used for both, but because the latter are more expensive the money will not go as far. Relative to student demand, it is likely that fewer students could be served, especially given losses in faculty and increased SFRs. The issue needs to be addressed with a view toward a much more long-term solution.

4.4 Mark Van Selst (ExCom Liaison) and Barry Pasternak (Substitute Liaison):

- Van Selst noted that a resolution on Faculty Scholarship of Community Engagement would be a good idea in order create a formal record.
- Turned the rest of the meeting over to Barry Pasternak to appear as liaison in his stead since he had other responsibilities to attend to.
- Pasternak offered a follow-up regarding the on-line information sent out by Merryfield at the end of last semester. Pasternak was asked to take up with the ExCom whether it would like FAC to address the issue.
- Pasternak also acknowledged the serious budget situation and that the issue of faculty furloughs has come up for next year, although this is very speculative at this time.

4.5 Liaison Reports

Thobaben: Reported on the Task Force for Faculty Scholarship of Community Engagement. Believes that it is moving in the right direction. At their next meeting will bring a recommendation that ITL oversee community engagement, and that a service learning coordinator be added to ITL to provide more oversight in this area. Review for Faculty Scholarship of Community Engagement will be externally funded. If funds are not available then the initiative will not continue. In addition, this will not be related to the RTP process, so those involved will get a formative, but not a summative, review. Reviewers would be volunteers from each of the campuses who would provide confidential feedback that could be used or not. There would be two reviewers selected from each campus who would not be paid, but would be compensated for travel to the CO to receive training on how to do formative reviews. There would be a pilot program that would involve 6-8 campuses. If all of this comes to pass (eg. outside funding, unpaid reviewers, etc.) then it will be a go. Also very important that recommendation contains strong references to campus autonomy in how this initiative might be implemented. There is a hope that by having these kinds of reviews, the scholarship of community engagement will receive greater credibility and thus, indirectly, influence the RTP process. If approved, grants would be sought and the pilot would begin next year.

5. Resolutions

5.1 CSU Faculty Professional Development Strategic Planning (Second Reading): Discussed feedback from the March plenary and, in response, made some adjustments to the resolution.

5.2 Concerns Related to the Migration of State-Supported Courses to Self-Supporting Special Sessions During Times of Budget Constraints (Second Reading): The committee engaged in a lively discussion on a number of issues related to this resolution and made several adjustments in response. McNamara, Baaske and Foroohar will continue work on aspects of this resolution for discussion at the May meeting.

5.3 Increased SFR in Times of Budget Crises (First Reading): After some discussion it was decided that the co-authors (Brodowsky/Lord) will rework the resolution. It particularly was noted that no alternatives are offered and that inclusion of alternative strategies might strengthen the resolution. Of particular importance is involving faculty in the decision-making process when dealing with issues of this nature.

5.4 Re-affirmation of AS-2867-08/FA/FGA (Constructive Engagement in the CFA/CSU “Reopener” Bargaining): Discussed whether we wish to re-affirm this resolution. It was decided to defer the matter to May and discuss it again then.

5.5 Support for Campus Guidelines and Policies on Consultation and Shared Governance (possible co-sponsor): This will be taken up again at our next meeting. Committee members were urged to review this resolution as to whether we wish to co-sponsor and, if so, to offer any suggestions they may have.

5.6 Voting on Motions by Ballot (from ExCom): Reviewed a proposed resolution from the ExCom regarding the ASCSU voting by ballot. Concerns were expressed about having a one-third affirmative vote, which seems arbitrary and very low. In reviewing Robert’s Rules, it specifies a majority vote in such matters. Although there was some concern about secret votes in general, this resolution should at least, at minimum, reflect Robert’s Rules.

6. Discussion Items

6.1 Campus practices regarding governance (Cheyne): The committee reviewed some preliminary data from a survey conducted in 2007-08. Cheyne reported that the data is incomplete and, in some cases, there is an inconsistency in how the information is reported. It was suggested to request that John Tarjan ask ASCSU staff to follow up in order to acquire updated, consistent and complete information, and that this occur via telephone. Also noted that assigned time reporting must be clear in specifying quarter versus semester assigned time WTUs. Once the information is updated, then it can be distributed to individual senators and senate chairs for a final proofread.

6.2 2009-2010 ASCSU calendar: This was discussed under McNamara’s announcements above. The committee agreed to support the change from December 11 to December 4, and that there would be no benefit in changing the Wednesday start time to noon for committee meetings prior to plenary sessions.

6.3 Department Chair reviews (McNamara): This was deferred to the May meeting.

6.4 Faculty Research and the CSU Mission (Baaske): This was deferred to the May meeting.

7. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.