

**Academic Senate of the California State University**  
***Faculty Affairs Committee***

**Draft Minutes**

Wednesday, September 11, 2008

*10:00 a.m., Room 510*

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

**Guests:** Lorie Roth, Susan Gubernat, Margy Merryfield, Beth Ambos, Jim Postma, John Travis, Margaret Costa, Cezar Ornatowski, Darlene Yee-Melichar, Bob Buckley

The meeting was called to order by Chair McNamara at 10:11 a.m. Members and guests introduced themselves.

- 1. Approval of the agenda:** Ordering of the agenda was discussed and adjustments were made. “Campus practices regarding governance” will be moved from this agenda (5.9) and will be discussed at the October meeting. The “Role of campus administration on local senates” will be added to the agenda as 5.10 and will be discussed at the October meeting. “Overlap between CFA contract and ASCSU responsibilities” was moved up on the agenda, to follow “Faculty satisfaction survey.” “International Program Planning Group” was removed from the agenda. At the request of the Executive Committee, “Support for professional development” was added to the agenda as 5.8. M/S/P unanimously to approve the agenda as amended.
- 2. Approval of the minutes for May 7, 2008:** M/S/P unanimously to approve minutes as presented. The committee requested that the chair ask that it be clearly indicated when minutes are posted on-line that have not yet been approved.
- 3. Announcements:**
  - Baaske reported that there was a conference in Minneapolis in June which included representatives from the Academic Senate CSU (Baaske and Van Selst) and from the CSU in general. This conference, related to the Compass project which focuses on general education, included educational institutions in Wisconsin, Oregon and California, working with a grant from the AACU. Compass is a part of the LEAP (Liberal Education and America’s Promise) initiative in which the CSU is a major participant. The CSU will create a steering committee of faculty and administrators who will review an RFP from the AACU, then make a call to CSU campuses asking for proposals relative to best practices in general education. Three campuses initially will be selected, with plans for others to be included in the future.
  - McNamara wishes to move ahead on faculty development issues, especially as it relates to concerns regarding parity based upon rank.

- Community colleges appear to be backing off relative to LDTP, especially when it comes to creating course equivalencies. There will be more discussions and negotiations among the parties to see if issues can be resolved.
- Related to the November plenary, the Dumke is booked on Thursday so there will be some scheduling changes in order to accommodate this conflict. Committee members offered some suggestions to the chair regarding the scheduling change.
- McNamara suggested, and the committee agreed, that it would be valuable to have liaison reports from committee members who are engaged with other committees or task forces whose work might be related to faculty affairs.

#### 4. Reports

- 4.1 Lorie Roth:** Keith Boyum will be leaving Academic Affairs and a search for a replacement is underway. Gary Reichard is attempting to fill out the membership of the search committee. She reported on the current membership of that committee, although members are still needed. Once the committee is completely in place, the membership will be available on line. The CO is hoping to begin review of applicants by the end of October with a hire by mid-December, beginning in the position by mid-January.

A conference on developmental (remedial) mathematics and English (“Proficiency in the First Year”) will be hosted by the CSU on October 30 and 31. This will include CSU faculty from the appropriate disciplines (five from each campus), and community college representatives will be invited to present on the first day since they are very involved in delivering this curriculum. There was some question about appropriate representation from the Academic Senate CSU. This will be pursued further.

Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) and Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA): All of the CSUs will have their data reported sometime within the next month. We will be the only system that has every campus posted. Lorie provided an example from Northridge that reports VSA data. It includes three pieces, including 1) a general data set, 2) student experiences and perceptions, and 3) student learning outcomes. This is the format that will be used for all other campuses. It was noted that this is a change from the original understanding that there would be a system-wide report, and that individual campuses would not be reported due to significant differences among campuses relative to demographics, resources, etc. The purpose of these reports was identified as a need to satisfy outside needs for accountability. There needs to be some discussion of the degree of faculty involvement in CLA and VSA initiatives on campuses. There was a request to add this issue to the agenda for further discussion.

- 4.2 Beth Ambos:** Provided a handout entitled “Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities (RSCA) Report: Preliminary Results of the System-Wide Survey.” This report was presented to the Provosts a few weeks ago and we are the second group to see it. As of yesterday, 20 of the 23 campuses have responded with data. The most important results include reports of engaging in research, scholarship and creative activities; numbers of faculty (60%) working directly with students using the RSCA funds; and 80% of faculty reporting benefits to teaching and curriculum. Went through the report table by table, reviewing each data set. Emphasized that compiling this data did not involve any extra work

on the part of faculty. Committee members noted that the report was well-presented and informative. However, it is not yet complete so should not be disseminated at this time. There was discussion about the emphasis on awards to assistant probationary faculty, as opposed to lecturers and senior faculty. It was suggested that when the completed report goes out to campuses, that the Academic Senate CSU Chair send a communiqué to campuses recommending that they discuss the report and its implications relative to their individual campus.

Another handout, entitled “Academic Affairs – Office of Research Initiatives and Partnerships (ORIP) Updates: September 2008” offered an update on recent and current activities by ORIP.

**4.3 Jim Postma** (Transforming Course Design [TCD]): The basic idea of TCD is to get faculty together to look at a course that has traditionally been offered in a certain format and explore whether there are better ways to do it, which includes improved course delivery, use of technologies, saving money, etc. A team of CSU faculty (including junior and senior faculty) was put together led by a CSU appointed facilitator. Some concerns that arose included compensation to team members, meeting scheduling challenges, dealing with relevant issues specific to the process, keeping to time lines, budgetary concerns, etc. To be done with integrity, future initiatives of this nature should be thought of as two-year projects.

Concern was expressed that the CSU is continuing with another TCD initiative prior to completion and evaluation of the first TCD projects in chemistry and mathematics. A significant question is whether campuses will be willing to adopt a standard model, and how this initiative relates to academic freedom. CFA’s concern regarding this issue comes from the standpoint of the work of one bargaining unit bleeding over into the work of another bargaining unit.

**4.4 John Travis** (CFA): Budget has been the primary focus for the entire summer, including working to develop the support agency Alliance for California that helps to articulate the needs of those involved in public higher education. There are already over 54,000 Alliance members both inside and outside of California. The CSU still needs \$215 million in order to fund the compact and meet system-wide obligations.

Although CFA has not yet heard from the CSU regarding re-opening bargaining on compensation, they are expecting that this will occur. In terms of on-going salary issues, the first year of the salary equity program was successful overall. Bargaining on the second year continues and there is optimism that an agreement will be reached, however the CSU may request renegotiation of the second year if we do not receive compact funding.

Discussions between the CFA and CSU are underway relative to the numbers of Unit 3 faculty relative to Unit 11 teaching associates. There are concerns that the growth in Unit 11 employees is outpacing that in Unit 3.

**4.5 Mark Van Selst** (ExCom Liaison): No report.

## 5. Discussion Items

**5.1 Task Force on Faculty Scholarship of Community Engagement:** Lorie Roth noted that this initiative was being proposed at a time when a transition was occurring in the Academic Affairs office, so the Senate Chair was not contacted, which was a procedural error. Darlene Yee did serve on the committee on behalf of the ASCSU.

This project relates to an Access to Excellence emphasis on CSU partnerships and engagement with the community, and the Task Force is exploring means of facilitating that goal in terms of helping faculty to work in the community and document that as part of their scholarship.

The committee reviewed a document entitled “CSU Formative Review for Faculty Scholarship of Community Engagement.” A number of concerns were expressed. Any group that deals with the issue of faculty scholarship of community engagement should be comprised of faculty scholars. That is not the case with the current Task Force. The definition and criteria proposed for the Scholarship of Community Engagement are extremely vague. The definition and criteria must be defined by faculty. What traditionally has been defined as service is being recast into Boyer’s model of scholarship. Is this what faculty desire?

There was a question about who decided that this is what we wanted to do before we set about doing it. Access to Excellence was cited as well as questions that have arisen from a number of individual campuses. It was emphasized that engaged scholarship includes reciprocity from the community. It was noted that the review document does not include any reference to reciprocity and this should be addressed.

There will be a need to make it clear that faculty will be in charge of any review process that relates to this topic and that RTP processes belong to campuses.

There were a number of recommendations:

- Disband the Task Force completely.
- Significantly revamp the membership of the Task Force to be much more inclusive of faculty and alter its mission to address concerns that have been raised.
- Add the FAC chair to the membership of the current committee.

It was decided to request the ASCSU chair to send a letter to Gary Reichard outlining our concerns and suggesting a revamping of the Task Force and its mission. Also, we might consider a resolution regarding faculty participation on system-wide task forces.

**5.2 ATAC Report (Thobaben/Reichman):** Reichman offered a brief report regarding the on-line campus currently in development at East Bay, which is comprised of a number of primarily Master’s degree programs and undergraduate degree completion programs. A policy was passed at East Bay regarding an approval process for such programs, with a caveat that if over 50% of the degree program is on-line, it also must obtain WASC approval. Questions of accessibility to the on-line courses have arisen, for example whether

residential students should be taking on-line courses. There also are concerns regarding faculty workload. Additional information will be made available to the committee.

It was recommended that a draft resolution be prepared on transforming course design that might be co-sponsored by Academic Affairs. Bob Buckley, who has had considerable contact with this issue, offered his help in drafting a document.

**5.3 Faculty hiring practices (Baaske):** Deferred to October meeting.

**5.4 Faculty satisfaction survey:** Deferred to October meeting.

**5.5 Overlap between CFA contract and ASCSU responsibilities:** One of the overlapping issues relates to intellectual properties, also matters related to on-line courses. This item came from Chair Tarjan and we need more input regarding the specific concerns we may wish to address. We will discuss this further, and it would be advantageous to have CFA input in such discussions.

**5.6 Residual “votes of no confidence” issues:** Deferred to October meeting.

**5.7 Study of on-line evaluations (Brodowsky):** Deferred to October meeting.

**5.8 Support for professional development (from ExCom):** Do we wish to explore the level of professional development support on each campus? There is a Faculty Development Council that may be able to provide some help. More specific information is needed regarding what the ExCom wishes FAC to address.

**5.9 Campus practices regarding governance (Cheyne):** Deferred to October meeting.

**5.10 Role of campus administration on local senates (Foroohar):** Deferred to October meeting.

**6. Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.