FAC had a productive year that included finishing work on complicated issues and items from the previous two years. Our committee included continuing members Scott Hopkins (CLASS), Ching-Lih Jan (CBE), and Luther Strayer (CS) and newly elected members Jeanette Bicais (CEAS), Liz Ginno (Lib), Dave Larson (CLASS), Danika LeDuc (CS) and Tony Lima (CBE). Thanks also to Mitch Craig (CS) and Steven Peng (CBE) who served as fall quarter replacements for Luther Strayer and Tony Lima. As chair of the committee, I appreciated the excellent service of Liz Ginno (fall), Jeanette Bicais (winter), and Danika LeDuc (spring) as committee secretaries. Their timely minutes provided a thorough record of our meetings.

Senate Chair Mike Mahoney regularly attended our meetings, providing key information and advice. He consulted regularly with me and presented clear charges to the committee. Once again, FAC benefitted from the counsel of Associate Provost Linda Dobb, our Presidential Appointee, who guided us through many complicated matters.

Our committee also appreciated the support from Senate staff. Tamra Donnelly, the new faculty governance coordinator, and Sophie Rollins, the new assistant coordinator, helped us revise and organize documents, and to keep our records throughout the year. They also maintained and updated our website and created online, user-friendly formats for documents. Sophie attended and provided valuable support at our meetings. We thank them both.

FAC convened two standing subcommittees—Outstanding Professor Subcommittee (chaired by Dave Larson), and Subcommittee on Lecturers (chaired by Gretchen Reevy). We agreed to reconvene the Special Subcommittee, which we renamed the Student Evaluation of Teaching Subcommittee (chaired by Sharon Green). We did not convene the Retention, Tenure and Promotion Policy and Procedures Subcommittee, deciding that FAC would handle the changes to the RTP document.

We reviewed the faculty roster and approved the number of faculty from the colleges to serve on the 2012-13 University RTP (Feb. 1 meeting) and we met with VP Linda Dalton to discuss strategic planning documents (Feb. 18 meeting). We selected Associate Professor Derek Kimball as CSUEB Outstanding Professor and Associate Professor Dianne Rush Woods as recipient of the Sue Schaefer Award.

We completed seven action items described below that were approved by the Academic Senate.

2011-12 COMPLETED ACTION ITEMS

**FAC 1: Proposed Subcommittees**

We recommended and received ExCom approval of the memberships of the FAC Subcommittees for 2011-12 and for the special subcommittee on Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET).
FAC 2: Revisions to the Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy and Procedures (RTP)
At several of our fall quarter meetings, FAC worked on the revisions to the RTP policy and procedures document that had been considered by the committee during AY 09-10 and 10-11. We outlined and recommended six changes to the document. We made changes to ensure the candidate’s right to receive letters and respond as well as rebut at all levels of review, including the University level. We recommended that reviewers use consistent language. We modified the section about the development of departmental guidelines for professional achievement. We clarified expectations for promotion to full professor. We clarified terminology about days. The proposed changes for approved by the Senate (February 28th) and approved by the President (March 21st).

FAC 3: Revisions to the Faculty Office Hour Policy
The Lecturers Subcommittee recommended language to resolve a concern with the Faculty Office Hour Policy. FAC voted to recommend this language for Senate approval. The proposed changes were discussed and approved by the Senate (April 24th) and approved by the President (May 2nd).

FAC 4: Revision to the RTP Policy and Procedures
FAC considered a charge from the Senate Chair regarding a possible conflict with our RTP document’s language about the right to file a grievance and the CBA article 10. We recommended that deleting two sentences from the document would bring our policies and procedures in compliance with the CBA on the issue of grievances. At the February 28th Senate meeting, this item was subsumed into FAC 2, which was approved by the Senate and approved by the President (March 21st).

FAC 5: Revisions to the Range Elevation Policy and Procedures
In fall 2011, FAC was charged to review the Range Elevation Policy and Procedures document to ensure its compliance with 2010 ruling. An arbitration decision about range elevation at one of the CSU campuses ruled that candidates for range elevation cannot be required to have a degree beyond the degree they held upon their appointment.

FAC referred this item to the Subcommittee on Lecturers. The subcommittee met several times during winter quarter to discuss our policy and to review how other CSUs had revised their range elevation documents to comply with this ruling: Long Beach, Cal Poly Pomona, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Jose, and Monterey Bay. The committee forwarded its recommendations to FAC. FAC discussed these proposed changes at our meetings on April 4th and April 18th. At our April 18th meeting we voted to approve the changes and recommend them to the Senate (7 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention). The proposed changes were approved by the Senate (June 5th) with one additional change.

FAC 6: Revisions to Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Participation in Administrative Review
In winter 2011, FAC was charged with considering how to provide clarity and efficiency in our administrative review process. We considered combining committees, reducing the number of administrators under review, and balancing our role in shared governance with faculty workload.
On February 15, FAC formed a subcommittee (Barrett, Bicais, and Ginno) to review the list of administrators and the organizational chart, solicit opinions from other committee chairs, and discuss options to reduce the number of committees. The subcommittee’s recommendations were discussed by FAC on March 7 and on April 18th. At the April 18 meeting FAC voted (8 yes, 1 no) to recommend five changes to the review process for reviewing administrators. The proposed changes were approved by the Senate (June 5th).

**FAC 7: Revisions to the Library Faculty: Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Policy and Procedures**

FAC member Liz Ginno worked with faculty in the Library to revise the Library Faculty RTP document in light of the changes to the RTP document changes approved by the Senate. In April, the Library faculty voted to approve these recommended changes. On April 25, FAC voted unanimously to approve the changes recommended by the Library faculty. The proposed changes were approved by the Senate (June 5th).

Ongoing charges and discussions:

1. Policy on Emeritus Status
   For a second year, FAC was unable to resolve differences with the Provost regarding our Policy on Emeritus Status. FAC reviewed other CSU Emeritus Faculty policy documents, focusing on documents from Chico and Fresno.

   During winter quarter we formed an ad hoc committee of Barrett, Jan, and Larson that prepared new language. Chair Barrett shared our proposed changes with the Dave Stronck, who represents emeritus faculty on the Senate. Throughout our discussion there was consensus that emeritus status should be for all faculty, including lecturers, and that we opposed including in this faculty document the granting of emeritus status for administrators (See Fresno document). Our responsibility is for faculty affairs, and we agree that the process of granting emeritus status should be the purview of the faculty.

   To address the Provost’s concern that the process as currently described makes the granting of emeritus status automatic, FAC members proposed language that would require a departmental review: “Upon retirement from California State University, East Bay Hayward, a tenured regular member of the faculty who has a minimum of ten years of full-time service to the University and the recommendation of his or her department shall be granted emeritus/emerita status. The recommendation shall be in the form of a letter written by the department chair after consultation with the department faculty.”

   The Provost provided several comments on our proposed changes that we discussed at our meeting April 18th meeting. Our conclusion was that this should be referred to next year’s FAC. Here is our latest draft of the Emeritus faculty document.

2. Policy on Providing for Student Evaluations of Teaching
   The SET subcommittee worked on this topic through AY09-10, AY10-11, and AY11-12 (See FAC annual report AY10-11). Chaired by Sharon Green, this year’s committee addressed
numerous concerns from the work of previous committees, reviewed and discussed the most recent research on student evaluations of teaching, and renamed itself the Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) Subcommittee. The committee began aligning new evaluation questions to the well-known Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education with the goal of developing student and faculty forums for discussion of these questions.

SET was also impressed by the IDEA Center, a nonprofit organization that has been developing student reaction survey questions to instruction and courses since 1975, and decided to look more closely at how their services might meet our needs at CSUEB for student evaluations of faculty as well as Faculty Development. On May 24, we held a conference call with Sally Garvin and Bill Pallett from the IDEA Center, who provided background, reviewed examples, and answered questions about their Student Rating System.

As a result of this meeting the SET committee hopes to organize a Pilot Program this fall. The subcommittee has copies of the IDEA Center Training CD, which contains 6 modules including completing the Faculty Information Form, reliability and validity, and report interpretation. Since educating faculty on how to complete the Faculty Information Form is vital to receiving useful data, IDEA is willing to set up a training webinar with the faculty members involved in the pilot. We can also arrange with the IDEA Online (Angie Simons) for an over the phone training session on how to load in data, monitor response rates, and other tricks and tips.

The subcommittee hopes to continue its work on this project in AY12-13.

3. Consideration of the Lecturer Service on Standing Committees of the Academic Senate
At their 1/10/2012 meeting the Senate Executive Committee referred to the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) a request to review whether or not lecturers should be able to serve on Senate Standing Committees. FAC discussed the charge at our meetings on Feb. 1, and as chair of the committee, I wrote an email response to Senate Chair Mahoney (see appendix A). I also met with Subcommittee on Lecturers Chair Reevy to discuss FAC’s concerns. Reevy requested that this item be referred to the subcommittee with the partial assumption that the lecturers would be doing this work with compensation. At our May 2 meeting we discussed this item and agreed to ask the Subcommittee on Lecturers to consider this issue next year.

4. Consideration of the Faculty Office Hour Policy
During our review of the Faculty Office Hour Policy document, members of ExCom raised additional concerns. Chair Mahoney charged FAC to review the policy with attention to full-time faculty. He noted that concerns had been raised at the Senate meeting on April 3 about whether our policy is in conflict with the CBA. Specific concerns focused on our language that “Full-time faculty members will maintain a minimum of three office hours per week and will also make provision for meeting with students by appointment at a mutually convenient time beyond the stated office hours. The full-time faculty member’s office hours shall be held over at least two days and at least in half-hour blocks” (emphasis added). Some senators argue that this is in conflict with this language from the CBA: “The composition of professional duties and responsibilities of individual faculty cannot be restricted to a fixed amount of time, and will be determined by the appropriate administrator after consultation with the department and/or the individual faculty member” (emphasis added).
FAC discussed this topic thoroughly through email exchanges in April and at our May 2 and May 16. We reviewed the office hour policies of other CSU campuses. We learned that several campuses require four to five office hours per week, and no one sees a conflict with this specific time assignment and the CBA. We also agreed that office hours for full-time faculty are not tied to the course being taught during the quarter. Throughout our discussions we returned to our important instructional role outside of the classroom and our responsibility to be accessible to our students. We agreed that the policy need not be changed at this time.

5. Proposed changes to the FAC Policies and Procedures document
At our May 16th meeting, FAC discussed changes to our Policies and Procedures for Committee Operation. Our proposed changes are to Article 5, section 7B, and regard the process for selection of the outstanding professor. In particular we propose including information from and modifying the calendar in the Guidelines and Calendar for Selecting CSUEB Outstanding Professor document. As Chair, I drafted the changes and distributed them for an email vote. (as we had agreed to do at our May 30 meeting). FAC approved these changes unanimously. The 2012-13 FAC Chair should submit them for ExCom approval in the fall quarter. See appendix B for the changes to the FAC policies and procedures that we approved.
APPENDIX A

TO: Mike Mahoney, Chair of the Academic Senate  
FROM: Eileen Barrett, Chair of FAC  
DATE: February 2, 2012  
RE: ExCom Charge to Review Composition of Senate Standing Committees

At our meeting on February 1, FAC discussed the charge for ExCom “to review whether or not lecturers should be able to serve on Senate Standing Committees.” As you note, the Constitution/Bylaws of the Senate says that “Faculty members of Standing Committees shall be regular members of the University Faculty” (Article XVI, Section 2). The constitution also defines regular members of the faculty:

The following definitions are to be used in determining the eligibility of a faculty member to hold status as a regular member of the University Faculty: "Full-time" - a person is employed in the University at full salary for his/her position; "Annual" – the employee of the University is appointed to serve for a full academic year (three or four quarters) at a time; "Academic" - an employee of the University who is assigned to teaching or research or to departmental administration. (See Constitution: Article II, Section 2; Article III, Section 2.)

Since lecturers are not regular members of the faculty, the simple answer to the question is that lecturers are not eligible to serve on standing committees of the Academic Senate. Thus FAC requests clarification of this charge. Are we to research the issue of lecturer participation on Standing Committees with the possible purpose of amending the Senate constitution and bylaws to allow for such participation?

Our initial discussion of this topic raised several issues. We have enormous respect for our lecturers and value their dedication to our students. Yet while we appreciate the willingness on the part of some to serve the University, we understand that such service is not included in the work assignments for lecturers. We are concerned, on the one hand, that lecturers would be assuming service responsibilities for which they would not be compensated and, on the other hand, that such service on the part of some lecturers would change the expectations for all lecturers.

We also believe that it is the role of the regular faculty to be fully engaged in faculty governance and University service. Currently, we are in a period of depletion of our regular faculty—this year, there are 296 regular faculty, a number that includes deans and associate deans, and approximately 350 lecturers. We are nowhere close to the ratio of 70% tenure-track to 30% lecturer faculty that was once considered a University goal. We are concerned that expecting the work of faculty governance to be done by those who are not compensated for their time and effort will diminish the important role that full-time tenured and tenure track faculty play in the life of the University.
Appendix B

B. Outstanding Professor Selection Subcommittee

1. The membership of this Subcommittee shall consist of four faculty members (at least one of whom must be a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee and one of whom shall be the recipient of the prior year’s Outstanding Professor Award, if s/he is still a regular member of the faculty) and one student. The membership shall be chosen to be broadly representative of the University faculty. The Chair of the Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Director of Faculty Development (or Presidential Appointee to FAC), shall be ex-officio non-voting members of the Subcommittee.

2. The FAC chair convenes the Subcommittee at the beginning of winter quarter. At this meeting, the Subcommittee elects a Subcommittee Chair, discusses procedures, establishes a timeline for deliberations, and schedules meetings. A quorum shall consist of three members of the Subcommittee.

3. The Subcommittee will review and recommend revision of the current policies and procedures for campus and system selection of Outstanding Professor.

4. The Subcommittee will support and assist in the following nomination process through and communication with applicants and potential applicants:
   a) During week five of winter quarter, the chair of FAC will invite submission of nominations in a widely distributed call letter to the faculty and the campus community, with copies to departments and colleges to post in places where all in the campus community can read them. Nominations shall be due on Monday of week ten of winter quarter.
   b) No later than Wednesday of week ten of winter quarter, the chair of FAC will notify all nominees in a letter that includes the criteria for review, a list of recommended items for applications, and the deadline of Monday during the second week of spring quarter for submission of materials.

5. The Subcommittee will use these criteria to evaluate these recommended materials from the candidates:

   **Criteria**
   a) A nominee is expected to have a record of superlative teaching.
   b) The nominee’s professional accomplishments shall be evaluated to ascertain their quality.
   c) The nominee’s services to the campus and the larger community shall be evaluated to ascertain their relevance.
d) A significant part of each nominee’s record of accomplishment shall have been established while a faculty member of California State University, East Bay.

**Recommended Material**

a) A cover letter indicating the nominee’s contributions to teaching at CSUEB.
b) A curriculum vitae indicating courses taught at CSUEB, professional achievements, campus and community contributions, awards, and other relevant information.
c) Two course evaluations from each of the last 5 years, including written evaluations.
d) Letters from students and/or colleagues (any number) supporting the nomination: useful information might include the nominee’s contributions to the department’s mission, variety and innovation in course offerings, accessibility to students, fairness in grading, availability for counseling, and/or other relevant information.

6. The Subcommittee Chair presides over the final meeting to deliberate on the choice of a finalist from among the nominees.

7. The Subcommittee Chair recommends a finalist to the Faculty Affairs Committee, for a vote of the committee.

8. The Chair of FAC notifies the Senate Chair of the committee’s selection of CSUEB Outstanding Professor.

9. The Senate Chair notifies the Vice President of Academic Affairs of FAC’s selection.

10. The finalist is the recipient of the George and Miriam Philips Award, and will be honored at an appropriate University-wide event.

6. The Subcommittee will assist the campus nominee with preparation for statewide competition.