

Faculty Affairs Committee

MINUTES

Wednesday, November 12, 2008

10:00 a.m.

CSU Chancellor's Office - Coronado Room

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

Guests: Lorie Roth, Margy Merryfield, John Travis, John Tarjan, Mark Van Selst, Buckley Barrett

Meeting was called to order at 10:09 a.m.

1. **Approval of the agenda:** M/S Baaske/Hood. The following changes were made: Leo Van Cleve will not attend the meeting to discuss International Programs since the situation with the detained Iranian student has improved. That discussion will be placed as number 6.1 under Discussion Items. There has been a title change for the three resolutions. Times certain were added for Tarjan and Van Selst at 1:00 p.m. and Darlene Yee was removed from the time certain. There were additions to the discussion items and changes in the order of the resolutions. The agenda was approved as revised.
2. **Approval of the minutes for October 10, 2008:** M/S/P Baaske/Foroohar to approve the minutes as revised.
3. **Announcements**
4. Merryfield: A question arose as to whether in a future meeting we may wish to discuss what kinds of data we would like the Chancellor's Office to collect. This may be addressed when we discuss the resolution regarding exit surveys.
5. McNamara: Reported on the meeting with the Executive Committee this morning. A number of topics were discussed.
6. Budget cuts and reopening of contract discussions were major issues, including how the latter might relate to the ASCSU budget. The importance of advance notice regarding ASCSU meeting schedules was emphasized in terms of making the most economical plane and hotel reservations.
7. Barrett reported on Legislative Days in April and how they are strategizing on the ASCSU presence for that activity.

8. Discussion regarding LDTP revealed that there is an issue of trust within the community colleges that needs to be addressed.
9. Concern was expressed that the Transforming Course Design initiative is being pursued at a time when we are facing potentially serious budget cuts. This led to a discussion of unfunded mandates in general and the degree to which these continue to emerge even during times of diminishing resources. These concerns will relate to our discussion of Access to Excellence goals and also can be addressed to Gary Reichard during the plenary.

10. Reports

4.1 Lorie Roth:

- On October 30-31 the Proficiency Conference was held which relates to English and Math remediation. It was perceived as a very successful conference.
- Last Friday there was a trainer's conference for ITL which included ten workshops that faculty development people and their associates could attend. It was well attended and well received.
- The joint task force on CLA will be meeting to begin a discussion of what kind of assessment we will engage in. We know we must do an assessment; it's just a question of what kind of assessment and whether CLA is the appropriate instrument.
- The search for a replacement for Keith Boyum continues. There are six individuals that have been identified. The search committee is trying to meet guidelines to complete the task by Christmas, but this may not be realistic.

4.2 John Travis:

- The union has been overwhelmed recently with the increasing recognition of budgetary problems in California. After the request to return \$31 million to the general fund, the union was concerned about the signal that might send regarding what is going on in the CSU, especially since it was not a mandated return. One of the fundamental principles for the Alliance was that all participants would fight for our funding. Now we are looking at a \$66 million additional cut which would be mandatory. The union is preparing a response to be sent to Sacramento regarding the effects of such a cut.
- The union and CSU are back in bargaining with a formal meeting set for next Monday. There are many constituencies within the CSU and the union is continually attempting to consider all of these constituencies.

One of them is lecturers and their concerns regarding job security. There are expectations that negotiations will be challenging. A major thrust of negotiations regarding salary related to inequities within the salary structure in the CSU, which includes inversion and compression. Thus do not believe they can give up on the equity program and SSIs. There will be a campaign...the union will not just roll over given what is at stake for faculty constituencies. The union understands that the CSU position will be that there is no money for additional compensation, but the union does not accept that stance...there is money for whatever the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees decides there is money for.

- In response to a committee question, it was reported that the union had no contact with the Chancellor's Office prior to his decision to give back the \$31 million. After the decision was made and prior to its dissemination to campuses, there was some discussion. Although the Alliance was not in favor of the Chancellor's actions regarding the \$31 million, the Alliance still remains viable. It is important to note that the Alliance would not be used for a partisan campaign, such as salary negotiations between the CFA and CSU. The Alliance was meant to be enduring. Issues of confidence and trust were raised by the Chancellor's choice to return \$31 million. The union recognizes that it will have to be "nimble" in responding in a variety of arenas, including the political one.

4.3 John Tarjan:

- Questions have arisen about faculty representation on system-wide committees and task forces, including the amount of representation and how representatives are selected. Of particular concern is engaging in timely consultation with the ASCSU Executive Committee prior to appointments being made. Referencing the Task Force on Community Engagement in particular, but another 2008 summer appointment as well, Tarjan noted that there were a number of concerns related to issues of consultation. After some discussions with Chancellor Office personnel, Tarjan believes that the message was delivered and that there seems to be sincere intentions of addressing such matters in the future.
- A caution was offered regarding taking care in selecting appropriate faculty representatives to committees or task forces, especially in terms of finding individuals who possess areas of expertise or serve on ASCSU committees that deal with the topics that will be under discussion.
- As the designated voice of the faculty, only faculty appointed through the ASCSU are to be considered official faculty representatives to Chancellor's Office sponsored system-wide committees.

- There was a question as to whether a resolution really is necessary at this time in that typically consultation does occur prior to system-wide committee appointments. It appears that there were some anomalies that now have been addressed and it is expected that future appointments will occur without controversy.
- Academic Affairs in the Chancellor's Office will potentially be dealing with a budget cut of approximately 7% which would likely impact the statewide senate, perhaps by as much as \$70,000 although Tarjan was not able to offer a more specific figure. More detailed information will be forthcoming. It was argued that several years ago the senate endured a significant cut that involved eliminating a number of senators and that other units in the Chancellor's Office were not impacted as severely. This should be taken into consideration if a new round of cuts is forthcoming.

5. Resolutions

5.1 Implementation of Faculty Surveys in the CSU

(Brodowsky/McNamara):

Merryfield began the discussion by providing a report on input received from campus AVPs for Faculty Affairs. Samples were provided from San Jose, Humboldt and San Bernardino. Practices across campuses are very inconsistent, but at this point few processes are in place to collect this information. Actual percentages of faculty leaving the system are relatively low, especially for tenured faculty. There are no processes at all in place for gathering information from faculty who choose to retire.

It was suggested that a question regarding campus environment relative to minorities be included in exit surveys.

There was a question about whether a standardized survey would best serve data collection and interpretation. It was noted that campuses push for autonomy based upon their local cultures, but that we could identify the type of information desired without specifying exactly how that information is gathered.

It was suggested that a central location that could be accessed for this type of information would be helpful, rather than having to do individual campus searches.

The committee reviewed the draft resolution. A number of changes were suggested, including adding reference to *Access to Excellence* and changing the title to be more inclusive in terms of who would be included in the survey. The revised resolution will go forward for first reading.

5.2 Constructive Engagement in the CFA/CSU “Reopener” Bargaining (Reichman)

The resolution was discussed and revisions were suggested to resolved clauses numbers 1 and 5 and to the title of the resolution that were agreed upon by the committee. A copy will be given to FGA over the lunch break in the event they wish to co-sponsor the resolution. A waiver will be requested.

5.3 Protecting Instruction During Times of Budget Crisis (Foroohar)

A number of changes were made to the resolution, including a greater focus on student needs. The revised resolution will go forward for first reading. Buckley Barrett brought some suggestions from FGA that will be considered when we return to the resolution in December.

6. Discussion Items

6.1 International Programs

There was discussion regarding the situation of the student who was detained in Iran. The committee decided that a resolution is not needed at this time. We will leave the item on the agenda for future discussion, but it is not a priority at this time.

6.2 Campus practices regarding governance (Cheyne)

Chesnee will supply compilation of data that was gathered from campuses regarding their academic senate operations. The matter will be discussed further at the December meeting.

6.3 Faculty (lecturer) development resolution

McNamara has received feedback from a number of campuses related to faculty development practices regarding lecturers. The issue arose when reviewing system-wide data about support of lecturers’ development activities which indicated that a very small percentage of lecturers receive such support even though they comprise 60% of the system’s teaching faculty. McNamara will try to create a draft resolution by the next meeting.

6.4 Shared governance and CO initiatives

There was discussion regarding the manner in which individuals are appointed to Chancellor’s Office initiated system-wide committees. Concerns were expressed about how the Executive Committee is selecting individuals to serve on such committees, and that there appears to be a pattern of appointing Executive Committee members rather than seeking individuals who might have greater expertise to bring to the committee. We have registered our concerns with the Executive Committee through John Tarjan. The issue is on their

agenda, and we will follow up on the results of that discussion and what is reflected through subsequent action.

6.5 Access to Excellence goals and budget constraints

We require more specific information from the Executive Committee on the faculty development initiatives that are tied to the *Access to Excellence* Implementation Papers.

6.6 Transforming Course Design: Protecting academic freedom

This matter will be held until the December meeting.

6.7 Proposition 8

It was noted that this is a civil rights issue and there was discussion as to whether the committee should create a resolution. The committee believes that this is a relevant issue for the committee and McNamara and Cheyne will draft a resolution for discussion at the December meeting.

6.8 Freedom of educational travel to Cuba

Foroohar will draft a resolution calling for freedom of scholarly inquiry and related travel to Cuba to be discussed at our December meeting.

7. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.