

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY  
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of February 1, 2011

Present: Eileen Barrett (chair), Liz Ginno, Scott Hopkins, Ching-Lih Jan, Dave Larson, Danika LeDuc (acting secretary), Luther Strayer  
Absent: Jeanette Bicais, Linda Dobb (Presidential Appointee), Steven Peng  
Guest: Mike Mahoney

1. Approval of the agenda  
M/S/P (Larson/LeDuc).
2. Approval of the January 18<sup>th</sup> minutes  
M/S/ (Larson/Hopkins). Larson had contacted Bicais that Steven Peng should be a replacement for CBE rather than COS in minutes.

Corrected minutes approved.

3. Report of the Chair  
Jeanette Bicais could not attend today.

Steve Peng was confirmed by ExComm and is the official replacement for Tony Lima for Winter quarter.

Request from Provost's office regarding formation of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee: Currently, there are 110 faculty in CLASS including Deans and Associate Deans (37%), 53 in CBE (18%), 46 in CEAS (16%), and 87 in COS (29%) with a total of 296 faculty. 2 for CLASS, 1 for everyone else. Library has a different committee. If librarian goes for promotion or tenure, subcommittee is convened (Ginno). Strayer asked if number of representatives is defined. Larson replied it is in the constitution. Committee approved the composition of the committee.

RTP document is moving forward and will be on Agenda for next week, first reading, towards end. Senate may not get to it (Mahoney).

Another charge from Senate (Mahoney) regards the difference between contract and our RTP policy. There are two sections which differ. In our RTP policy, it states: "A request for reconsideration will be denied if a grievance has been filed on the matter of reappointment and has not been withdrawn." But, in CBA Article 10: "No reprisals shall be taken against any employee for the filing and processing of any grievances." ExComm said that this can be considered as a separate issue, so the recommended changes made previously are moving forward.

Lecturer sub-committee met regarding the language regarding office hours for part-time lecturers. Based on their proposed language and discussion of FAC, FAC agreed on the following: "In consultation with their department chair(s), part-time faculty will maintain the equivalent of one office hour per week for every four (4) WTU's with a minimum of one hour and a maximum of three hours per week."

M/S (Ginno/Hopkins)

Discussion: Mahoney suggested replacing the term “units of their teaching load” with “WTU’s”.

Passed as amended; see above.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee -- None

5. Old Business

a) Policy on Emeritus/a status. Barrett met with Provost Houppis regarding Emeritus/a status. Houppis does not want an automatic conferral and would like to see “with consultation of department.” Revision of the policy was requested because lecturers want the opportunity to gain emeritus status. However, this requirement for review seems onerous to some faculty. President can withdraw emeritus status because professors at other institutions were involved in crimes and universities wanted the chance to be disassociated from the individual. (Larson) At Chico, faculty can vote for emeritus status because there is nothing over a full professor. Jan asked if the 5 year review was not sufficient? However, Larson made the point that a faculty member in their last 5 years could basically do anything and, under the current system, would still get emeritus status. LeDuc suggested that the review at the department level could be made such that there is only a letter required if it is negative, otherwise pass the emeritus. Larson and Barrett think that everyone should get a letter, both positive and negative. Ginno compared to RTP.

Barrett will post documents – revisions from last year, revisions from 09-10, existing document, and policies from Chico, Fullerton (?), and San Francisco. Committee will review and discuss at next meeting.

b) Policy on Administrative Review.

Barrett met with Mahoney and Dobb about administrative review, and it was discussed with ExComm on Tuesday. There is a proposal to form a supercommittee. Mahoney is still trying to get participation for administrative review. There is concern that there is too much work for the small number of faculty. Also, we may be drilling down too far in administrative review in that time is being spent reviewing administrators that are already reporting to other administrators. Barrett will come forward with a report and recommendations to present to committee along with the current administrative organizational chart. Under review this year are Linda Dobb, John Whitman, Brian Cook, and Glenn Perry (Assistant VP for Enrollment Management Systems). This seems to be an average number of reviews per year and appeared to the committee to be a reasonable workload if elected in the Spring and began work in the Fall, pacing throughout the academic year. Larson suggests that anyone with “Assistant” in his or her title would not be under this review. Also, the concept of a supercommittee removes the possibility that someone would self-nominate because they have an axe to grind with a particular individual.

c) RTP Policy and Procedures for Librarians

Barrett reminded the committee that once the revised RTP for faculty is completed, we need to address same concerns for librarians. The Library RTP was reapproved by Library faculty in May 2010 and subsequently stopped because of the University RTP. Library RTP subcommittee will compare their document with current University RTP document changes and see what changes might be needed. They will then bring the

document back to FAC. Upon their approval, it will be sent back to Library faculty, and then to the Senate.

#### 6. New Business

Faculty Membership of Standing Committees

Charge from Mahoney (via email to Barrett) – review whether lecturers should be able to serve on Senate Standing Committees.

Currently, Article VII, Section 3 – “Faculty members of Standing Committees shall be regular members of the University Faculty.” Lecturers are not currently recognized as regular faculty, according to the charge. Barrett suggested Lecturer sub-committee should look at it. Strayer summed up concerns – weigh need for health of tenure-track vs. desire of lecturers to participate and lack of tenure-track faculty. They are not being compensated for such work and we would not want committee work to be considered an expectation for range elevation, for instance. Larson mentions that the charge is confusing because according to the constitution, the answer is currently no and there is nothing to consider. Barrett will request clarification of charge.

#### 7. Adjournment

M/S/P (Ginno/Larson) at 3:50pm.

The FAC web page is <http://www20.csueastbay.edu/faculty/senate/committees/fac/index.html>