

Faculty Affairs Committee

MINUTES

Friday, February 19, 2010
10:00 a.m.

Coronado Room – Chancellor’s Office

Present: Baaske, Brodowsky, Davis, Foroohar, Lord, McNamara, Ornatowski, Reichman, Shapiro, Snell, Thoboben

1. **Approval of the agenda** (with addition of 4.3) – **M S/P Reichman/Foroohar**
2. **Approval of the minutes for meeting on January 20, 2010** – **M S/P McNamara/ Snell**
3. **Announcements** none (yet)
4. **Reports**

4.1 Chair’s Report

* Chair delivered summary of Extended Executive Committee Conference Call (2/12/10)
Summarized (from Executive Secretary’s minutes):

Plenary guest speakers decision: since legislators can ask ASCSU to reimburse their travel expense, EC prefers to invite CO personnel to the next plenary

Faculty Trustee: both candidates were interviewed by Governors Appointment Secretary John Cruz

EC concurred on a set of actions to initiate and follow up on communications with the Chancellor’s Office on the situation before the March plenary

and:

If no trustee is named by March 3rd, Pres. Tarjan will let ASCSU know,

and:

If no one named by March 10th, item will be placed on agenda for Plenary discussion

Brief Report from candidate Hank Reichman: interview w Governors office went well; was thorough.

Also: An article will appear this weekend in LA Times about this issue

* FAC thanked Hank for sharing his experience and for his perseverance

Chair’s report cont’d:

Course Identification Numbering(CID) review process: Chair summarized the report from the CID group (of which he is not a member). Note from the CID committee:

Please urge, on local Senates, faculty (especially department chairs) to review the descriptors for disciplines that have undergone the CID process – more faculty

feedback is needed before this new system of articulation is 'set in stone'
weblink: <http://www.c-id.net>

- Discussion of how important it is to get this feedback from faculty before the new descriptors become the new standard and – also - how important it is to make descriptors wide enough to allow individualized faculty expertise, academic freedom, breadth and diversity of teaching methods and materials, within any system of course articulation

4.2 Gail Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Human Resources, Chancellor's Office) and Bill Candela (Senior Director, Labor Relations)

- * Brooks expressed desire for more opportunities to work w FAC
- * CBA contract expires June 30: does not look like either side will sunshine proposals by the earlier-targeted date of March 4th
- * Candela spoke about summer session changes
He summarized the history of CSU's summer term:
Summer was historically run as self support – “extra classes for extra pay”
2001 launched YRO
A policy decision was made to use summer as a YRO operation
Bottom line: Article 21 has now been modified with the understanding that summer would be growing on all campuses
But we face enrollment challenges and most campuses (except UCSD) want to roll back summer back to self support in order to take the enrollment off the books and tighten enrollment overages

Candela summarized changes to Article 21:

If faculty teach in summer they get paid 1/30 or 1/45 per unit...same rate as during the Annual Year

What's different: despite the equivalent pay, it's closer to the system we had in place before YRO – i.e. an extra term for extra pay

No lecturer benefits or entitlement accrue

Extended Education Department decides, (possibly in consultation with the department or college), which classes are offered

Summer **may** count toward PERS retirement says Candela, but Vice Chancellor Brooks/Candela are not sure about this – they will get back to us

Discussion Summary - Summer Term:

- * Concern that this new system is financially driven and may pit tenure track (more expensive) faculty against the urge to hire a cheaper lecturer
- * Also: who selects which classes will be offered – the dept? Or the Extended Ed?
Suggested by FAC: a FAQ would be a great idea comparing the various summer options
- * How will the fee waivers work for faculty/families? Brooks will get back to us

- * Concern that since extra funds for popular courses go back to the dean/colleges, there will be initiative to offer large popular classes instead of smaller classes required for graduation because they are less “expensive”
- * How would the departmental FTE targets and future course offerings be impacted if depts. “offload” popular FTE-generating classes onto the summer (since these courses, offered in summer, would **not** count toward a dept’s FTE target)
- * Candela gave general update on bargaining – hopefully we will have concrete info in the next few weeks re: salary raises from last contract

Faculty Affairs Committee members engaged Vice Chancellor Brooks and Candela in a discussion on the role of department chairs

- * Concern expressed about making the job of chair more desirable (not necessarily through more release time or salary)
- * We need to have skilled chairs but the conditions of work drive good people away – for instance, chairs are dissuaded from taking sabbaticals while serving as chair
- * What can we do to fix the “I **never** want to be chair” phenomenon?
- * Faculty Affairs Committee offered Chancellor’s Office a suggestion: perhaps a ‘task force’, or some way to try to resolve the problems that chairs inherently accrue

No Chancellor’s Office responses received yet to January resolutions – pending

5.2 Second Reading Items

5.21 Resolution on Private Donors and Respect for Academic Freedom

*Discussion on the proposed first read item: Faculty Affairs Committee members suggested it would be best to keep specific campus references to a minimum since the situation is generalized, not localized on one campus. Some members felt the resolution should, however, cite some recent specific occurrences

- *Suggestions were made on language for first reading before March plenary

5.3 Potential First Reading Item

5.3.1 Resolution on Faculty Trustee matter- Tabled in January

To be introduced in March per terms suggested at Extended Executive Committee

5.32 Resolution on Evaluation of Department Chairs

* Discussion on how to strengthen the faculty voice in terms of the important role faculty play in evaluating department chairs –

* Faculty Affairs Committee members noted that some campuses do not perform department chair performance reviews

* Campus practices vary widely in terms of chair and dean evaluation – but all agree there would be a value to getting information from all the campuses on what their campus policies are toward chair /dean evaluation

- * What right does a dean have to demand faculty “change” a chair evaluation?
- * Resolution crafter(s) will broaden the text based on group feedback

4:31p.m: Discussion with Executive Committee

Chair Tarjan – Spoke with Executive Vice Chancellor Echeverria about the General Education initiative

Numerous communications with various parties. Some concerns raised by a Faculty Affairs Committee member because a campus president indicated that they might welcome Board Of Trustee recommendations about graduation and General Education. Most changes in the past have come with faculty consultation through chancellor's GEAC committee. The Executive Vice Chancellor is well aware of that, but this will not happen as this is a president's group. Executive Vice Chancellor is an advocate of faculty role.

The concept of deliverology was raised in the conversation. Administration wishes to eliminate the use of the term deliverology. Instead, the language shifts toward commitment to results.

Backing off deliverology from Barber and to allow each campus – within its own environment – to achieve its own goals. There remains some concern that these changes in language are merely a way of assuaging, but not addressing, faculty concerns.

In the General Education workshop, General Education was discussed among the presidents as one way to facilitate graduation. There needs to be a thorough investigation to decide whether or not there is an argument to be made that would justify any changes in General Education.

Concern remains on Faculty Affairs that curricular decisions are being made absent the input of faculty who have the expertise and purview to make such changes.

Questioning of General Education is perhaps not about General Education, but rather an excuse to hide a pre-existing predilection of the chancellor to get rid of UDGE. A pro-active stance would be for the faculty to state that UDGE is the purview of the faculty and no changes to it can be made that are not initiated by the faculty.

Concern remains that faculty are not invited to the main table at which issues central to the faculty are discussed.

Deliverology has a real tight implementation schedule. So even good people who have sincere concerns, still have to make this work.

Question: What has been generated from the grad facilitation report is a decision to have regional workshops to help campuses meet the objectives.

At the last plenary – ASCSU passed a resolution calling on Executive Vice Chancellor to establish a venue and process for addressing issues and concerns about the implementation of deliverology.

Executive Vice Chancellor acknowledged that there are some delivery teams on campuses that are not adequately representative of faculty. There needs to more done to bring faculty into the process.

But are we getting too bogged down in the process and not examining the content? How can we press to be part of the formative process of making this happen?

There needs to be a resolution on the process as well.

While the goal of facilitating graduation is laudable, we would like to ask our colleagues in the administration to invite the faculty to the table to discuss the implementation of these plans.

Can we be proactive by saying that General Education is essential and if the administration violates that, then we can hold the administration accountable?

Faculty Affairs Committee member(s) will work on a resolution on respecting faculty voice. Is this an issue of due process that would be needed to address such problems?

Chair Baaske will write a resolution on the General Education reform.

6. Discussion Items

6.1 Self-Support Summer Sessions/Graduate Programs and Integrating Summer into the Curricular Structure of the CSU

Discussion of this item occurred under 4.2 in conversation with Chancellor's Office representatives

6.2 Chair Interference in Faculty Grading

Discussion deferred

6.3 Supporting Faculty Research, Scholarship & Creative Activities (RSCA) within the CSU Mission – Baaske

Discussion deferred

6.4 Faculty Affairs Committee Review of the ASCSU-CSU-CFA Joint Report on Student Opinions of Teaching Effectiveness – Brodowsky

Discussion deferred

7. Adjournment