

## Faculty Affairs Committee

### MINUTES

Friday, October 10, 2008

10:00 a.m.

CSU Chancellor's Office - Coronado Room

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

**Guests:** Lorie Roth, Margy Merryfield, Gail Brooks, Mark Van Selst, Joanne Plaistead, Pam Chapin

#### 1. Approval of the agenda

#### 2. Approval of the minutes for September 11, 2008 MSP Thobaben/Baaske

#### 3. Announcements

Executive Comm. discussed that ASCSU is currently not a formal part of the Alliance to Save the CSU.

CLA task force, upon request of Executive Vice Chancellor, Reichard, is being formed. (See below for further discussion.)

#### 4. Reports

##### 4.1 Gail Brooks

First question has to do with compensation for 08-09. The budget did not provide for the compact. So, it is an issue at this point. The only monies guaranteed are the PPI \$7million (post promotion increases). The other money – which does not exist – may lead to a likely return to negotiations. Will be back at negotiations with all of the unions – not a pretty picture in general. Uncertainty about the budget persists in light of the financial crisis. Fortunately, the lack of funding to CSU was not as bad as it might have been. All indicators are not good for the state of California. Governor may borrow money from pension plans.

The equity committee has spent a LOT of time and money trying to decide how to spend the \$7million. Foroohar – when will an announcement on a re-opener happen? Brooks, soon. Foroohar – is it retroactive to July 1? Gail, yes, but it will not incorporate any changes that have happened in the interim because the expense of recalculating.

McNamara – is it fair to conclude there will be a re-opener? Gail – wait until the announcement.

Foroohar – is the re-opener for just this year, when there is no funding, but for subsequent years in the contract? Gail – not clear. What is re-opened is the salary – it is not a full re-opener.

Joanne Plaistead – TT / Temp ratio handout, discussion. Decrease in the proportion of TT to Temp. We are moving farther from ACR 73. McNamara/Foroohar asked for headcount of faculty by TT and Temp.

Met with VPs of Student Affairs – we need processes of appeal for students who claim discrimination, retaliation, on the campus to be brought to the CO. There is the issue of whether this law applies to students who are applicants for admission? Reichman – does it apply to grades? Does it apply to other complaints about first amendment issues? ASCSU can provide insights and ideas.

Benefits – last week, after we decided on AIG for our 403 B plan, we found out about AIG. CSU went back and looked at what our options were. Went out with an RFP – looking for a 3<sup>rd</sup> party administrator different from a master record keeper, as is AIG, they don't charge us for administration. We wanted a master record keeper – the 3<sup>rd</sup> party administrators were too volatile. There were only two firms that bid – AIG and ING. ING did not have the capability to handle our account and coordinate with State Controller's office. We were left with AIG. Very few are bidding to be 3<sup>rd</sup> party administrators. AIG retirement is separate from AIG holding company. Subject to Texas Law rather than New York law. VALIC might be sold off from AIG. In terms of how the change affects us, there will be a special enrollment Nov 3-28 – Anyone who is in a TSA will be forced to re-enroll – AIG, ING, Met Life, Fidelity, TIAA-Cref. Pam Chapin visited to answer questions that arose concerning rollovers of legacy funds from other companies into the 5 above listed vendors. There will be a FAQ area of the website to address such questions.

Retiree vision program – is to be offered effective January 09 through VSP.

Profile of CSU Employees, fall 2007 Publication was handed out.

#### 4.2 Lorie Roth

CSU taskforce which is being put together right now involves half of the members from administration, half from faculty. The reason for this task force, per Reichard, was shoving in people's face that they would use CLA without considering other instruments. Now we have more ability to have time to think and reflect on the CLA – what it does, how it does it, and whether it fits with the CSU. Also consider other instruments that may be used for learning assessment that best suits our needs. We have asked for administrators, Sandra Flake at Chico – the campus that vehemently opposes CLA – for her input.

Second-year and third year assessment. The president's council on accountability. In that document, it says, we are going forward with the CLA for 2 years, and then

reassess. Since the end of the 2 years comes at the end of this year, what is the timeframe for reassessing? Brodowsky nominated for CLA task force (Thobaben/Foroohar). Unanimously passed. Baaske – should the task force look at both years of administration of the CLA. Baaske passed around what is known as the Welty document. Hopes the task force is not forced to render a premature decision, before 2<sup>nd</sup> year is in, to reject or accept CLA.

Search for Keith Boyum positions- AVC of Academic Affairs, 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of search committee, comprised of 3 senators along with 7 others, finalists by early December coming in late January.

#### 4.3 Mark Van Selst (Executive Comm. Liaison)

Executive Committee received a report from the CO regarding the lack of capacity in the CMS this fall. Corrections were made so that these problems ought to be resolved. Some changes as to what campuses can do with the system-wide CSM are also coming.

Campus Faculty Development Councils will be writing a response to Access to Excellence Accountability Plan and will send this to the Senate. Expectation is for this to be forwarded to FAC for a response. ExCom will also be writing white papers on other aspects of the accountability plans concerning faculty related matters. A concern arose as to whether or not there will be “implementation plans” for Access to Excellence and if there will be faculty input into the development of these plans.

Given the state’s fiscal crisis, Academic Affairs has asked ASCSU to consider the possibility of cuts to the CSU and to ASCSU. These cuts might be in the range of 3-7%.

The Chancellor’s Office is considering Learning Management Systems.

It was suggested to the CO that the CLA Task Force be renamed to the Learning Assessment Task Force rather than just focused on the CLA. This request seemed to be favorably received.

LDTP had a forthright and productive meeting with the CCCs regarding the LDTP process.

## 5. Discussion Items/Resolutions

### 5.1 Faculty hiring practices (Baaske/Merryfield).

The Chancellor’s Office has drafted some guidelines and training regarding working with Affirmative Action Plans.

The Task Force has prepared a draft of “Recruitment and Hiring Guidelines Tenure-Track Faculty and Full-time Lecturers.” Elements of the draft recommendations were discussed. Questions were raised regarding immigration issues for candidates. It was suggested that General Counsel make a FAQ available for applicants and the newly hired. Another issue concerned hiring with tenure and whether campuses have established procedures and whether these are followed. This issue was placed on the

agenda. A request was made of Merryfield for data on the number of faculty hired with tenure (recent year) and whether these numbers are increasing. A final document will be shared with FAC in November.

## 5.2 Faculty satisfaction survey (Brodowsky/Merryfield)

Sample scales drawn from Business that assess satisfaction, engagement, and justice were shared with FAC by Brodowsky. The question is what can we and what should we measure when faculty feel valued (engaged and motivated) by the organization. That is, employee satisfaction is related to what outcome(s)? These could be retention, professional productivity, teaching effectiveness, or morale. Brodowsky will send out an electronic version to the committee and the committee will suggest data that we might be able to gather that would reveal measurably outcomes.

On a related issue, FAC noted the lack of systematic utilization of exit interviews on CSU campuses. Candidates who decline job offers might be surveyed this way as well. Brodowsky and McNamara will create a draft resolution for ASCSU consideration. Aspects of “votes of no confidence” in relationship to job satisfaction and exit surveys was also discussed.

## 5.3 Shared governance and CO initiatives resolution? (McNamara/Foroohar)

Regarding the memo written by McNamara to John Tarjan. Thobaben and McNamara were at the Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) meeting last week. The message has gotten through and they are considering the points about the charge of the community engagement task force and process issues. Do we want a resolution on Shared governance and CO initiatives? Referred to AS 2845-08-FA 0f March, 2008 – Second Resolved does this. Should we reaffirm it, or just let it be with the memo that was put forward. Do we need a resolution on process or content? We’re still waiting for an official response to our Memo from ExCom. McNamara will once again bring this up to ExCom if we do not get a response by next meeting, FAC should readdress this issue.

## 5.4 Impact of budget crisis on faculty and MPP hiring – replacement vs. growth positions for classes of employees. In these times of budget crisis, we need to look at the ratio different classes of employees. If there is a freeze on one class of hires, then should not that freeze be on all classes of hires? There is a need for CO and campuses to provide transparent data so that ratios of different classes of employees can be compared over time and across campuses.

FAC discussed the content of resolution calling for campus senates to be vigilant in monitoring the creation of new MPP positions during the current fiscal crisis and requesting data on numbers of MPP positions throughout the system over a period of years so that comparisons can be made.

## 5.5 CFA contract and ASCSU responsibilities resolution (Foroohar/Reichman)

It seems clear that there are some gray areas where both the ASCSU and CFA have interests. Whether or not this is desirable, and whether or not these need to be identified and lines of demarcation drawn, were discussed.

It might be desirable to have a resolution prepared for the November plenary that calls for constructive engagement if the CSU and CFA reopen the bargaining contract. MSP that Reichman draft such a resolution for the next plenary to this effect.

#### 5.6 Faculty Development resolution (McNamara)

FAC discussed the lack of development provided to lecturers. McNamara and Thobaben will draft a resolution addressing this issue and perhaps citing (and commending) Beth Ambos' Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities Report. Kevin will draft a letter on behalf of FAC thanking Gail Brooks for the Profile of CSU Employees from Gail Brooks.

#### 5.7 Transforming Course Design resolution (McNamara)

The question was whether or not to continue to retain this on FAC's agenda. It was determined at this point that whether or not this is effective will be determined through assessment. There is a fear that the CSU's Transforming Course Design will become a template for course content, with its attendant loss of academic freedom. Therefore, we will retain this on the agenda and link it perhaps with Access to Excellence Accountability and the budget crisis.

#### 5.8 Campus practices regarding governance (Cheyne) postponed

#### 5.9 Faculty Exit Interviews including workload – moved to 5.2

### 6. **Adjournment - 2:42 p.m.**

Action Items (Resolutions) for the next meeting:

Faculty Exit Interviews

Budget Crisis and MPP/Faculty hiring

Support for CFA/CO constructive engagement in case of re-opener