

Faculty Affairs Committee

UNAPPROVED MINUTES

May 6, 2009 - 10:00 a.m.

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

Guests: Beth Ambos, Gail Brooks, Ellen Bui, Robin Marion, Margy Merryfield, Lorie Roth, John Travis, Mark Van Selst, Rosalinda Velasco

The meeting was called to order at 10:07 a.m.

- 1. Approval of the agenda:** M/S Thobaben/Baaske to accept the agenda. Request to add an item to the agenda as 4.4 as an 11:30 time certain (Margy Merryfield report). Accepted as friendly. There will be a number of liaison reports at times TBA. Approved unanimously as amended.
- 2. Approval of the minutes for April 10, 2009:** M/S Thobaben/Baaske to approve the minutes of April 10, 2009. Minutes approved as presented.
- 3. Announcements**

McNamara:

- The CO response to our March resolutions has been received. It was noted that a positive response was received from the CO on all FAC resolutions from that meeting. The committee read and discussed the CO response.
- In Exec. Comm., discussed the Faculty Governance Survey which will be shared at greater length later in the meeting. Concern was expressed that follow-up on the survey is being done via e-mail rather than telephone. Further discussion was deferred.
- There was an update in Exec. Comm. regarding Legislative Days. Noted that Barrett had done an excellent job.
- On BOT items, proficiency before the first year is a significant item that has generated much discussion. APEP will work on a resolution that also will include AA.

4. Reports

4.1 Lorie Roth (CO)

- Discussed the proficiency in the first year issue that will be taken up by the BOT. Now has some of the details of what will be presented. There may be many who will take issue with these topics. Right now is preparing to gear up the topics that will be presented, including exploring best practices. Reichman raised concerns regarding the

wording of the BOT resolution and urged that language in the first and second resolved clauses be restructured to be less prescriptive.

- Another BOT item has to do with the MBA fee. Gary Reichard and Ben Quillian are working on that. Regarding this fee, Reichman expressed concern that the current resolution wording does not clearly define how the additional fees will be distributed. Roth did not have additional information on this item. It will have to be taken up with Reichard during the plenary.
- Regarding CLA (Collegiate Learning Assessment), the committee has finished its work and has made five recommendations that were taken to the President's Commission on Accountability (PCA). Believes that the CLA, PCA and the CO are prepared to adopt the processes that have been proposed.
- A search still is underway for a new director of CAP. Also, five individuals will be brought in to interview for the Predoctoral Program position.

4.2 John Travis (CFA):

- Are actively engaged in the "No on 1A" campaign and will focus much of their effort on this for the next few weeks. In response to a question from McNamara, noted that the union has not taken a position on 1B, primarily because 1A was of most concern and that 1B is dependent upon the passage of 1A.
- CFA participated in the Legislative Days, but are unsure how effective these efforts were. Continue to support AB656 which creates the California Higher Education Fund that will be created by an extraction tax on oil and gas companies. The proposal is for a 9.8% tax, which would probably bring in between \$1 and \$1.2 billion per year. Currently the proposal is to distribute 60% to the CSU, 30% to the UC and 10% to the community colleges. A number of legislators expressed support for this bill, including some Republicans. Another bill that the CFA is supporting is SB218 which would require more transparency and bring under the California Public Records Act (CPRA) the auxiliaries and foundations in the CSU. Heretofore the auxiliaries and foundations have not been subject to the CPRA. It is believed that such transparency would allow for a much clearer picture of finances within the CSU.
- The mediation session has occurred and was not successful. The CFA bargaining team met with the mediator, Tony Butka (who had also served in that position during negotiations for the last contract), and outlined some of the concerns that the union has had regarding the CSU position on availability of funds for faculty compensation. After discussion with the CSU, the mediator indicated that there was very little likelihood of finding a compromise. Ultimately a letter was sent to PERB indicating that negotiations are at impasse. Now fact-finding will occur. First a neutral third party will be selected who will chair the fact-finding panel. The CFA continues to urge moving to arbitration, but the CSU has refused to participate in such discussions. The union still is trying to encourage the administration to allow FERP faculty to take leaves without pay without interrupting their five-year service; so far the CSU has not been willing to do so.
- In terms of the Alliance for the CSU, it has taken the position that the Alliance is not for electoral purposes (e.g. taking a position on 1A). However, in terms of AB656, it is quite likely that the Alliance will take an active role in supporting this bill.
- In response to a question regarding furloughs, noted that there have been rumors but has no concrete information and nothing has come from the administration in this regard.

The position of the CFA is that furloughs would have to be negotiated, as would any measure that would result in a reduction in pay.

4.3 Gail Brooks (CO):

Equity in Higher Education Act: Systemwide Executive Order Preview (Rosalinda Velasco and Ellen Bui)

- Provided a handout entitled “Equity in Higher Education Act: Systemwide Executive Order Preview.” This Executive Order is mandated by Ed Code Sections 66250 et. seq. The protected categories include age, color, disability, ethnicity, gender (sex), nationality, pregnancy, race, religion, and sexual orientation. The handout also included an overview of the complaint procedure, complaints not covered by the Executive Order, and resources and next steps. This will provide a system-wide policy, which currently does not exist.
- Also provided was a “FAQ’s” handout which offered more details on the Executive Order including that, when implemented, this Executive Order will supersede any current campus policies. It also provides an overview of who is covered, and the individual rights of the parties that may be involved. Also, it confirms that the Executive Order is compliant with FERPA.
- This Executive Order will be reviewed by all the administrative units in the CO to ensure that the language is as clear and encompassing as possible.
- Once implemented there will be training via webcast and other training strategies on campuses as to the details of the Executive Order. The Executive Order probably will be launched in July of this year.
- In response to a query, it was noted that the contract contains an article that covers what may happen to a faculty member who has a complaint filed against them.
- Concern was expressed regarding the definitions of discrimination, retaliation, harassment, etc. It was noted that the Executive Order will reference the legal definitions as provided by the state. Also, there was considerable discussion regarding issues of academic freedom. The Executive Order will contain a section that recognizes issues of academic freedom.

Draft of “System-Wide Human Resources Strategic Plan”

- Brooks discussed the draft plan, noted that it is an effort to define goals and a process for human resources. This is the first such strategic plan that has existed for the system. It is intended to include all employees.
- This document will be vetted system-wide, and input will be encouraged regarding the vision and seven goals that it identifies. It is hoped to bring the plan to the BOT by next fall, after input has been received and duly processed.
- Once implemented, there also are some proposed measures of success on which to gauge the effectiveness of the plan. Also, it has been tied in to “Access to Excellence.”
- It was noted that faculty have a number of concerns regarding addressing contemporary needs in overall strategic planning. Also it was recommended that the union be brought into the discussion early on so that their input can be incorporated. In addition, the committee believed that there would be benefit in sending the draft out to the entire ASCSU list serve.

4.4 Margy Merryfield (CO)

- The final version of the Faculty Recruitment Survey is now available on the web.
- A graduate student, as a practicum, has been working on a faculty satisfaction survey. To date, he has reviewed a number of pre-existing documents and has put together an interview strategy which has been administered on a trial basis. This will allow the student to refine the survey, which then will be presented to Merryfield sometime next week. The next step will be to figure out how to administer the survey, since it is unlikely that we will have free labor for this part of the process.
- Referenced the “Tenure and Temporary Faculty Trends in the California State University” report that she had sent to the committee via e-mail which offers a statistical breakdown of trends over the past two decades. It clearly shows that there has been a notable reduction in tenure track faculty during that time.

Robin Marion (Faculty Director of Doctoral Incentive Program)

- Is developing an online support system on Merlot for those who complete the Doctoral Incentive Program in terms of successfully gaining employment, as well as successfully negotiating the tenure/promotion process. Would like the members of FAC to review the “Career Talk” section of this online system and to offer comments and suggestions on the materials that it offers.
- It was noted that there would be benefit in sharing this material with a wider audience—perhaps the ASCSU list serve—so that there can be broader initial review and feedback. The FAC could then take the matter up again in the fall.

4.5 Beth Ambos (CO)

- Addressed the Federal Stimulus package and what is happening in the CSU and on local campuses. There has been great interest nationally within the university systems, and opportunities are competitive, however the CSU is in a very competitive position. Money obtained will go primarily for jobs, which will include individuals working together who may not have been collaborators in the past. In addition, money is available for teacher-related programs. There also is a nebulous area in the Department of Energy, but the information has been chaotic and it has been hard to get a handle on it. People throughout the system are keeping close tabs on what options are available and are exploring how to prepare for going after the opportunities.
- Types of proposals submitted include a scholar’s program for science and math teachers, which also would include teachers in the local school districts. In health, life, nursing sciences there were challenge grant possibilities, about 10-15% in partnership with the UC. There also are grants for research training, particularly for minority students. About 16 campuses are looking for construction funds and are creating proposals that will be due in the next few months. At the CO level, they have been sharing information, offering assistance in writing proposals, and facilitating partnerships. Using a computer program called Share Point, the CO is putting all the available information on a central website. Bottom line, believes that the CSU will prove very competitive in receiving funding for a broad spectrum of programs.

- Campus presidents have been informed of the potentials, and also have been encouraged to dedicate resources, including staff and faculty time, to pursuing these opportunities.
- There was a question regarding the current status of the Intellectual Properties initiative. Ambos responded that they are moving forward with implementation and are looking at a hybrid model which includes support from both the CO and the campus levels. Merryfield added that they are hoping to resolve some of CFA's concerns regarding the meaning of "extraordinary campus support" and once that has occurred implementation will be greatly facilitated.

4.6 Mark Van Selst (ExCom Liaison):

- For those planning to run for Senate ExCom, June 5 is a date to be held for a meeting.
- Met with Jeri Echeverria regarding the processes of faculty consultation and shared governance, including LDTP and other initiatives.
- The BOT item regarding proficiency in the first year was discussed.
- Regarding Legislative Days, they were very successful, particularly related to the Career Tech issue. Had a very productive conversation with Senator DeSaulnier which led to some very positive changes in the legislation.
- Committee members expressed concerns regarding next year's ASCSU budget, including Peacock's position and its funding. FAC believes it is very important to closely watch the money. Currently Butler has assumed the position on an interim basis for six months. At the end of the summer, a decision will be made as to how to proceed.

4.7 Liaison Reports

Foroohar: Academic Council on International Programs (ACIP) meets twice a year. The main discussion item was the budget. There are insufficient funds this year, and next year is uncertain. Student financial situations also are shifting which has affected enrollment in some of the more expensive programs. However, overall numbers have remained the same, about 550. There also was discussion about developing a new language program in Spain, and about a new program underway in Ghana.

Thobaben: ITL met and approved adding an additional member to the ITL board from the Faculty Scholarship of Community Engagement group. There is a pilot project for Community Engagement Formative Review to help faculty who are involved in community engagement which will have outside individuals review their work, which will help when going up for RTP. If funded, this will be supervised by Judy Bartel under the auspices of the ITL board. Thobaben has been elected to chair ITL for the next year.

Brodowsky: Attended the Students with Disabilities Advisory Committee meeting. Things of interest to faculty deal with textbook accessibility and alternative formats, including the Center for Accessible Media (CAM) project.

5. Resolutions

5.1 Faculty Professional Development Strategic Planning (Second Reading): The committee made a number of edits and then forwarded the revised resolution for second reading.

5.2 Migration of State-Supported Courses to Self-Supporting Special Sessions (Second Reading): Some concerns were expressed by AA and FGA regarding already existing self-supporting programs, however this resolution relates to the migration of programs to self-supporting, not those that already exist as such. Some editorial changes were made and the resolution was forwarded for second reading.

5.3 Co-sponsor AS-2891-09/AA “Support for Campus Guidelines and Policies on Consultation and Shared Governance” (FA co-sponsor): It was agreed unanimously to co-sponsor this resolution.

5.4 SFR/learning outcome? (Brodowsky/Lord): The committee made a number of editorial changes to the draft resolution and sent it forward, requesting a waiver.

5.5 Re-affirmation of AS-2867-08/FA/FGA (Constructive Engagement in the CFA/CSU “Reopener” Bargaining?): The committee decided not to go forward with a resolution at this time.

6. Discussion Items

6.1 Campus practices regarding governance (Resolution?): The efforts to update the survey via e-mail thus far have yielded limited results. There was a recommendation that for those campuses that have not responded there be a follow-up phone call within a very limited time frame, given how quickly circumstances can change, especially in the current budgetary climate. Also, if we get the document in a fairly complete form, it was suggested that it be sent out to the local senate chairs for another review prior to broader dissemination. FAC asked McNamara to request that the ExCom direct the ASCSU office staff to follow up ASAP via phone to those campuses that have not responded to the survey. Baaske will send an e-mail to senate chairs advising them that requests for such information will be made.

6.2 Department Chair reviews (McNamara): The committee discussed whether it should address issues of chair evaluations via a resolution. Issues of selection and compensation of chairs also arose. The CBA was consulted in terms of its references to department chairs (CBA 20.30-32). It was agreed that this issue should remain on the agenda for discussion in the fall.

6.3 Faculty Research and the CSU Mission (Baaske): In the fall the committee will address issues surrounding research, including facilities on campuses, workload, other resources (RSCAP) and expectations of who/what we are as an institution in the 21st Century. The committee will invite Beth Ambos to discuss these matters.

6.4 Report on Student Evaluations of Teaching: Although dated March 12, 2008, this report only came to the committee in April 2009. ExCom has charged FAC with reviewing and responding to it. Brodowsky served on the committee that authored the report, and noted that student evaluation processes vary dramatically from campus to campus. He added that the committee determined that student evaluations can offer value in terms of assessing instructor effectiveness, but should not be considered a sole source in terms of assessing same. It was agreed that there may be some issues that the committee should respond to, so the item will remain on the agenda for discussion in the fall.

Human Resources Strategic Plan and Chancellor's Office Doctoral Incentive Program
"Career Talk:" McNamara reiterated that these two items be on the FAC agenda as discussion items in the fall.

The committee offered its heartfelt thanks to Robert McNamara for his excellent service as chair over the course of the past year.

7. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.