TO: The Academic Senate
FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee
SUBJECT: Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Participation in Administrative Review
PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate

ACTION REQUESTED: Approval by the Academic Senate of the attached proposed changes to the Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Participation in Appointment and Review of Administrative Officers and Department Chairs of the California State University, East Bay (Administrative Review document)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: On February 14, 2011, the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) was charged by then Senate Chair Dianne Rush Woods to review our Administrative review document for clarity and efficiency. As Chair Woods wrote, “Due to the decrease in regular and tenured faculty over the years, it is increasingly difficult to fill the needed seats, especially for reviews.” We were asked to consider combining committees, the possibility of reducing the number of administrators under review, and how to balance our role in shared governance with faculty workload.

FAC began to discuss possible solutions to these problems in spring of 2011. In fall of 2011, the chair of FAC met with Presidential Appointee Linda Dobb and Senate Chair Michael Mahoney who provided suggestions that FAC discussed at meetings on February 1 and 15. On February 15, FAC formed a subcommittee (Barrett, Bicais, and Ginno) that met several times between FAC meetings, reviewed the list of administrators and the organizational chart, solicited opinions from other committee chairs, and discussed options to reduce the number of committees. This subcommittee made recommendations that were discussed by FAC on March 7 and on April 18th. At the April 18 meeting FAC voted (8 yes, 1 no) to recommend these changes to the review process (not to the search process) of administrators:

1. Reduce the number of administrators to be reviewed from 25 to 19. Remove Associate Deans, Director of Faculty Development, Director of the SCAA, Coordinator of the Online Campus (currently does not exist), Associate Director of Academic Programs and Graduate Studies, Assistant Vice President of Enrollment Management. (See attached organizational chart which highlights those administrators who would be reviewed.)

   Rationale: Faculty should participate in reviews of those at the level of Vice President and/or those who have responsibilities over significant budgets.

2. Elect a “super committee” to be called the University Administrative Review Committee (UARC). Members will be elected in the spring, convened by the President in the fall, and serve for two years. (During the first election only, half the candidates would run for a one-year term. This will ensure a crossover of new and experienced members). The committee is responsible for all the scheduled administrative reviews. During years in which a college dean or the University Librarian is scheduled for a review, a subcommittee shall be formed and additional members elected.

   Rationale: The review of administrators would be done by a committee similar to the University Tenure and Promotion Committee. Our review of the schedule revealed that the UARC would be responsible for...
no more than four reviews during any given year. Since the committee would be elected during the prior spring and commence its work in the beginning of the fall quarter, we believe the workload would be comparable to or less than the work of other University and Senate committees.

3. The UARC shall be composed of one tenured faculty from each of the four colleges, one tenured librarian, and a Presidential appointee (who may be from another CSU campus).

   Rationale: The UARC would have a similar composition as the current individual review committees.

4. Subcommittees for review of college deans will be composed of one UARC faculty member from the college of this dean, one UARC faculty member from outside the college of this dean, the UARC Presidential appointee, and two to three tenured faculty members elected by the college of the dean who is to be reviewed.

   Rationale: The addition of two or three college faculty to the UARC for the review of a college dean would be consistent with the current committee memberships for review college deans.

5. Subcommittees for review of the University Librarian will be composed of the UARC faculty member from the library, one UARC from outside the library, the UARC Presidential appointee, and two tenured library faculty elected by the library.

   Rationale: The addition of two tenured library faculty to the UARC would be consistent with the current committee memberships for review of the University Librarian.