Faculty Affairs Committee
Approved Minutes
October 30, 2013, 11:00-5:00
Anacapa

1. Approval of Agenda
Moved item 8.8 to 8.2. Agenda approved.

2. Approval of Minutes – 11 October 2013
postponed, approved via email on Nov 1, 2013.

3. Member Announcements
Eudey noted that at the Statewide Services for Disabilities committee meeting it was announced that the
Chancellor’s Office will be distributing information to faculty about identifying students with mental health needs,
and indicated there will be one-hour faculty development trainings available. Resources information will be posted
directly to faculty hard drives. We will keep an eye on how this comes across and is implemented.

Several campuses are concerned as to whether a movement from quarter systems to semester systems is mandatory,
and wish Chancellor White to clarify this. Some provosts are acting as if this is finalized, but faculty have not seen
it in writing. White has indicated some willingness to hear campus arguments against conversion, but seems like his
default is to make it happen.

We discussed the increasing workload taken on by department chairs, ASCSU last had a task force on chairs in early
2000s, culminating in a report in 2002. The committee will review the 2002 report and consider whether we should
revisit this topic given changes that have occurred over the past few years.

4. Reports
4.1 Chair: Manzar Foroohar (SLO)
Chair Foroohar shared several issues raised at the Extended Executive Committee meeting including issues related
to resolutions under development in other committees, concerns about changes to Cal State Online, recognition for
Trustee Cheyne, the academic conference, the visit by Trustee Fagin at the Plenary, and legislation about the
appointment of a faculty trustee.

We discussed the lack of a general counsel until January. FA has two issues under consideration that require legal
review, and we will benefit from meeting with counsel ASAP. We discussed the benefits of selecting/adapting
language for our resolutions and policy recommendations that have been taken from other campuses as we know
these have already been vetted by legal counsel. If we find wording that seems appropriate, we decided it was better
to replicate than create our own.

We briefly discussed the questions raised at our last meeting reading faculty rights to syllabi, as raised by nursing
faculty at Dominguez Hills. There are some questions as to the relationship between syllabi and AB609, and this
may be something FGA needs to be involved with. We will need to wait for counsel before we can take substantive
action on this but will consult with others in the meantime.

Foroohar reported that Chair Guerin talked to Chancellor White about concerns related to shared governance,
especially as related to Cal State Online and the Board of Trustees agenda. White agreed we need to work to make
this better.

We discussed the benefits of inviting Ruth Black to speak at a plenary and will recommend this to the Executive
Committee. We discussed asking EVC Smith about the impact of unit caps on students participating in international
programs.

Foroohar offered a listing of the campus-based faculty awards we have recently approved to be posted to the
Chancellor’s Office Website, as some of these approvals occurred outside of regularly scheduled meetings:
Awards approve by FA on September 18:
Channel Islands - President's Award for Innovations in Teaching and Learning
Dominguez Hills - Excellence in Service Award
East Bay - Outstanding New Researcher
East Bay - Outstanding Mentor of Students
East Bay - Outstanding Contributor to Community Engagement
Fresno - Distinguished Achievement in Assessment of Learning Award, 2012-2013
Humboldt – Outstanding Professor Award
Humboldt – Outstanding Service Award

Awards approved by FA via email:
Cal State LA: FOUR Outstanding Professor Awards
Cal State LA: ONE Outstanding Lecturer Award

President's Award for Research and Creative Activity (Sac State) (approved- virtual meeting, 11 October 2013)

Approved via email (Oct. 15, 2013):
Cal State San Bernardino: 5 awards

Approved via email (Oct. 16, 2013):
Cal Maritime: Cropper Family Distinguished Professorship
Cal Maritime: Jacobsen, Stevens, Aspland Families Distinguished Professorship

Approved via email (Oct. 29, 2013)
San Marcos: President’s Award for Inclusive Excellence and Diversity (Alternating faculty/staff)

4.2 Chancellor’s Office Liaison: Gerard Hanley (time certain: 11:00-11:30- Joint meeting with AA)
Hanley met in a joint meeting with Faculty Affairs and Academic Affairs, as both committees have a stake in the course redesign issues being addressed including QOLT, digital ambassadors, Quality Matters, bottleneck initiatives, and faculty development funding.

Hanley indicated that over the summer during review of the Promising Practices proposals, he, Jeff Gold, Eudey and Guerin discussed the need to have course redesign funds reach a broader audience, and this led to a proposal to EVC Smith to put aside $500K for faculty development from the $10 million allocated. This was as much as could be carved out given other allocations. Hanley met with the FDC last week, and they discussed what could be done, the type of support that would be helpful to campuses to help disseminate and scale up projects. They recommended two activities:
- Faculty development associates – support with release time faculty who can reach out and developed FLCs within campus culture.
- Funding to support the faculty development program itself – campuses need more than a person doing work, but budget to help however campus might want to do that.

Hanley wants this initiative coming not just from the Chancellor’s Office, but by ASCSU, FDC, etc. Academic Affairs needs to be involved because of curriculum redesign aspects, and Faculty Affairs because of the faculty development support. Hanley wants to create a process/program for support for long term, with flexibilities to meet specific campus needs, and roll out to make headway in spring semester. There needs to be sustained commitment and ongoing support for the types of curriculum redesign we’re engaging in now, and financial support to individuals who are participating. Hanley values there being faculty compensation for participation in these activities. Typically the RFP would go to Provosts for dissemination to the campus.

Academic Affairs has talked about types of trainings that are mandatory for campuses to provide, with voluntary participation by faculty. This is especially a need with regard to online teaching. We briefly discussed providing certificates for participation, but discussed consequences of voluntary certificates becoming mandatory by system or legislative action. We also discussed the need to even the playing field for faculty development across campuses, and the benefit of cross-campus disciplinary groups meeting for course redesign purposes. We also discussed how to
let campuses know about resources available to them (QOLT, Quality Matters, etc) and the role ASCSU might play in sharing information.

We discussed how student success would be defined, and concerns when the standard is either graduation rates of post-graduation salaries. Hanley indicated that course completion and degree completion can be one element but key for him is defining appropriate learning outcomes for programs and courses and seeing if students walk out with skills, knowledge, attitudes, and the energy needed to be a graduate in that discipline.

We discussed the need for faculty participation in the RFP process, and some control over how money will be used once it reaches a campus. There were suggestions to have guidelines or conditions that require faculty participation in planning and implementation, and funds for faculty working on projects. We appreciate the availability of this funding for faculty development, and hope that this will allow campuses to extend supports already available to faculty.

4.3 Executive Committee Liaison: Susan Gubernat
(time certain: 3:30-4:00)

Gubernat shared information about the plenary visit by Schneider from the AAC&U, discussions with Karen Y-Z about co-sponsored legislation related to the faculty trustee, Trustee Fagin’s visit and the process for information sharing, and the brainstorming meeting for the Academic Conference. We discussed the benefits of a joint meeting with FGA addressing legislation related to academic freedom. We also discussed the status of the MOOC/Online teaching report that was briefly available today but has now been returned to the task force for revision/completion. Gubernat confirmed that the project will not be allowed to go unfinished.

4.4 Jim Till, Interim/Acting Assistant Vice-Chancellor, Research Initiatives and Partnerships (time certain: 2:00-2:30)

The committee had a very productive conversation with AVC Till. He provided us with a brief history of RSCA funding from the Chancellor’s Office, especially after the financial crisis of 2008. He provided us with a handout chronicling this history, and the language from the Master Plan that calls for RSCA support. Statute seems to indicate that RSCA must be funded, but it’s also important to recognize that RSCA is connected to the entire teaching and learning vision of the CSU and therefore the degree to which “targeted” funds must be available is not explicit.

Till noted that the statute does not mandate that faculty engage in research, although authorized to do so, but that it has increasingly been important for promotion and tenure purposes. We discussed how retention, promotion and tenure policies can be developed that do not require RSCA, which can counter an unstated “fact” that research is expected.

We discussed how as a body the ASCSU can work with local senates to get RSCA funding restored. The data Till provided indicates how far behind we are compared to 1987 standards. Till said RSCA funding has not been on the senate’s mind in recent years, but he is happy that we are bringing the issue to the table. Till noted that from the 1987 document, the recommendations are available online and we can read for ourselves the rationale for how funding levels were calculated. He’s not sure we’d want to use the same methodology, but it’s a place to start. Restoring the $2.5 million that was most recently in the budget is not sufficient even if a start. The 1987 recommendations for $14.5 would be at least $29.8 million in 2013 dollars. We will continue to work on our resolution and consult with Till on this topic.

Till also spoke to us about Intellectual property, and he shared a handout on this. EO 644 from 1995 indicates each campus has a responsibility to generate policy that will be up to date and comprehensive regarding intellectual property. Till noted these policies vary markedly by campus. Not even close to the same. Copyright is Article 39 of CBA. In the article ownership issues are not fully settled, but unless university objects have a separate agreement, faculty are free to use what they produce in non-CSU activities, and if paid for by grant or hired by an auxiliary the University may be entitled.

Andy Merrifield joined our conversation as we discussed who owns a syllabus. Merrifield indicated that absent extraordinary resources, faculty own what they produce. If a department chair asks and administration says you
have to comply, you have to do so unless it’s dangerous. If you feel compliance is unjustified, you can grieve.
Merrifield indicated that Till correctly indicated that Article 39 was not fully resolved during bargaining and was left
in a “no harm no foul” status. He noted that intellectual property is a major concern for faculty in the CSU and
elsewhere. Till and Merrifield will continue to be useful resources for us as we move forward on our work on
intellectual property and syllabi.

4.5 CFA Liaison, Andy Merrifield (time certain: 2:30-3:00)
Merrifield noted that since last talked CFA has had an assembly meeting, and is especially dealing with preparations
for new contract as the current one expires June 2014. They’ve also been working on the 30th anniversary of the
union.

On Friday CSU and CFA submitted sunshine proposals – proposals each side sends out for public comment as to
issues they want to talk about as part of bargaining progress. Merrifield noted that the process has gone well so far,
and that we seem to want to reopen on many of the same issues even if we have different interests around these
issues. Issues include compensation, benefits, appointment processes, evaluation processes, intellectual property,
discipline and grievance, healthy and safety and nondiscrimination. He’s hoping for a quicker and less antagonistic
bargaining process. The list of issues CFA has raised comes from the surveys to the membership, as 38% of
members responded to the survey (about 5000 total). He noted in the current contract lots of people benefitted from
small changes in parental leave and fee waivers – things with minimal cost.

Merrifield noted that this is Equity Week, and all 23 campuses have at least one event to recognize inequity issues
for faculty. He noted that article 31.14 addresses compression and inversion and is an area he hopes will get
addressed.

Merrifield indicated that there is an attempt for a ballot initiative that would change public sector pensions, and the
CFA is watching this as it could negatively impact new hires and younger faculty. So far it has not qualified for the
ballot. CFA met with CalPERS regarding the Affordable Care Act, and are staying on top of the relevant issues.
CFA has also been reviewing white papers from the Committee for the Future of Higher Education and the most
recent Little Hoover commission report on higher education.

Responding to questions, Merrifield noted that the survey included lots of comments about workload, and raises
questions about what is unreasonable, excessive and grieveable. He noted we need a better definition of reasonable.
Responding to our pending resolution on lecturers, Merrifield said that from a CFA point of view “lecturers should
be defined as faculty for governance purposes” and that since lecturers are faculty, polices on campus that identify
‘faculty’ should apply to lecturers as well. He noted that who votes in governance elections is a purview of the
senate, and who votes in department elections may have contractual implications.

Merrifield was asked if the domestic partnership language in the contract would change now that marriage in
California is available to same- and opposite-sex couples. Merrifield indicated that there are no plans to alter
definitions to detriment of same or opposite sex couples.

5. Review of Chancellor’s Office Response to Faculty Affairs’ Committee September 2013 Resolutions and
follow-up on Faculty Affairs Committee resolutions from September 18, 2013.

AS-3142-13/FA: Addressing the Urgent Need for New Tenure-Track Faculty in the California State
University (CSU)
The need to hire additional tenure-track faculty is well documented and the Chancellor has publicly
discussed this problem. The Board of Trustees is aware of the issue and they understand the goals outlined
in ACR 73 and the various resolutions from the Statewide Academic Senate. Regretfully, the cuts to higher
education in California have been unprecedented and the continuing problems created by losing
approximately one-third of state funding to the CSU since 2007 are evident throughout the system.
However, with the passage of Proposition 30 the CSU budget has been somewhat stabilized and we have
received modest increases. With an influx of additional funds a systemwide executive plan to implement
ACR 73 may not be necessary and we are now hiring many new tenure-track faculty. Nonetheless, the
Chancellor’s Office will work with the Senate to monitor the gains in tenure-track hiring as we strive to
reach our goal. If modest gains are not realized as our budget is restored, we will revisit the issue.
We have decided to rebut the Chancellor’s Office response, as we do think a plan is needed, and are not convinced that new tenure track hires are occurring at an appropriate rate, especially given retirements. We haven’t gotten anywhere near the goals of ACR73, and our clear advice is to develop a new plan to reach the goals. We find it unacceptable to avoid developing a plan. We discussed ways to rebut the feedback, and will monitor this to see if an additional resolution is needed.

6. Second Reading Resolutions

None

7. Potential New Resolutions

7.1 Urging Faculty status for Lecturers system-wide – Karen
We did not yet move forward on the resolution for faculty status for lecturers, but are first proposing a resolution, drafted by Davis, to provide lecturers with the opportunity to obtain emeritus status. We will add in a reference to the 2012 emeritus status policy and take out specific recommendations for content of the policy at each campus. What we want is for lecturers to be acknowledged for recognition. Davis and Eudey will revise the resolution adding in new information related to number of campuses already offering this opportunity, and combining several resolved clauses into one. A draft will be made available for consideration at the plenary.

7.2 Urging enhanced research support for faculty (David, Saeed, Lillian)
We received and revised the resolution somewhat based on the information we learned from AVC Till. We especially highlighted the need for funding to be reinstated and established at a rate that drew upon a reasonable methodology, attending to the real costs of release time, and the need for faculty at all ranks to be eligible for funding. The draft is ready to send to the senate as a first reading item.

7.3 Faculty Trustee Resolution (FGA)
The resolution was not available for review before the meeting ended, so we did not make a commitment to this resolution.

8. Additional topics for discussion

8.1 Clean up the bylaws (FA responsibilities)
We will continue to review the bylaws to determine if any changes are needed

8.2 Sub committee on academic freedom (Manzar, Mark, Shane)
The sub-committee posted to dropbox several examples of academic freedom statements from within and outside the system, and from the AAUP. We agreed that we would prefer to develop a statement that is the same as or similar to one that has already been vetted by faculty and legal counsel elsewhere, as it will make it easier to be approved by our counsel and also connects our work with others nationally. The sub-committee will continue to review the examples and make a recommendation to the full committee.

8.3 Sub-committee on faculty hiring (Betsy, Karen)
The sub-committee continue to move forward on the resolutions related to lecturer emeritus status and lecturer “Faculty” status, and will monitor response to the rebuttal related to AS-3142 noted above.

8.4 Sub-Committee on support for research (Saeed, Lillian, David)
The committee has developed a draft resolution available to Senate as a first reading item.

8.5 Free and open dissemination of research and scholarship (CSUN)
http://scvnews.com/2013/08/19/csun-opens-floodgates-on-faculty-research/
Shane updated us by email and in the meeting, and we will continue to keep this item on the agenda in case there are ways in which Faculty Affairs should become involved.

8.6 Student evaluations (Betsy)
No new information to share, but we’ll keep this on the agenda so that we’re keeping track of the status of student evaluations of teaching.
8.7 Course syllabi: Intellectual property of faculty? (Manzar)
(See documents in Dropbox)
Case of Department of Nursing at Dominguez Hills
“The upshot is, faculty have been told they must turn over copies of syllabi for all courses in Nursing to
someone who has requested them via the public records act, and faculty are questioning if there are
intellectual property or other protections that might justify not complying with the request. They are
reluctant because the requester is some sort of consultant for education start-ups.”

We obtained some information from Till and Merrifield related to this topic, and in January will ask legal counsel
about the issue of intellectual property rights to syllabi.

8.8 Possibility of setting a limit on number of faculty awardees from each campus highlighted on the
CSU new web page
We agreed we do not want to limit the numbers of awards. We want to focus on how to make website more easily
updated so that management of the website is easier on staff.

8.9 CSO and shared governance
We received a draft resolution and agreed we would like to co-sponsor the resolution. We offered some suggested
revision to language, although we supported the overall intention of the resolution. Most of the resolved clauses
have relevance to Faculty Affairs.