

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of April 18, 2012

Present: Eileen Barrett (chair), Jeanette Bicais, Liz Ginno, Scott Hopkins, Ching-Lih Jan,
Dave Larson, Danika LeDuc (quarter secretary), Tony Lima, Luther Strayer,

Guest: Linda Dalton, Mike Mahoney, Gretchen Reevy, Sophie Rollins,

- 1) Approval of the agenda
M/S/P (Ginno/Lima)
- 2) Approval of the April 4th minutes

M/S/P (Ginno/Strayer)

Jan noticed that she was indicated as quarter secretary rather than LeDuc. The corrected minutes were approved.

- 3) Report of the Chair

Faculty Office Hour Policy

As you know, the Senate on April 3rd discussed our proposed revisions and raised several questions. Thanks to all for your email messages about the issues raised, especially about updating office hour policy for the 21st century. Issues seem to boil down to different modalities and specified hours. Denise Fleming is concerned that we are in conflict with the CBA. I have done a preliminary check and found that other—I would wager to say—most campuses specify the number of office hours. I have asked Linda to check with Associate Provosts on other campus about their policies. Meanwhile at ExCom yesterday (April 10), the issue was again discussed. Our policy will move forward on the Senate floor in its second reading, and ExCom will send the document back to us for additional considerations.

Lecturers' Subcommittee

They have completed their work on faculty office hours and range elevation document. I asked Gretchen, the committee chair, to come to today's meeting to discuss the proposed changes to the range elevation document. Scott is also on this committee.

Outstanding Professor Subcommittee

We met last Wednesday to convene the committee and share the criteria. We elected Dave Larson chair, we're reviewing the seven submissions, and plan to meet from 2-3pm on the 25th. Danika and Ching-lih are also on this committee.

Student Course Evaluations Subcommittee

Sharon Green is chairing this committee which is meeting every Thursday from 10-noon. One goal is to expand the conversation about student course evaluation questions with input from faculty and student focus groups. Jeanette is also on this committee.

Senate Calendar

We have to have our items approved by ExCom before they get to the Senate calendar. On the Senate, there are two readings for each item. Our best opportunity for getting items approved this academic year is to have those items ready for ExCom's meeting on the first of May. The Senate meets on the 8th and the 22nd.

Calls for nomination went out for the 2011-2012 Sue Shaefer Faculty Service award. Deadline is May 4th, so please consider nominating someone.

4) Report of the Presidential Appointee

Linda Dobb is at a conference in Houston. She discussed her conversation with the Provost with Eileen regarding Emeritus Status.

5) Old Business

a) Policy on Emeritus Status

Provost wants to insert "at the rank of Associate or Full Professor" to exclude people who got tenure but not promotion. He is fine with ten years and "positive" recommendation. He would like to insert "based on their scholarly and service contributions to the University." Committee thinks redundant. Ginno thinks the document is becoming punitive. Provost would like to add "The President makes the final decision." Point number 3 still allows tenured assistant professors and lecturers to apply. "The recommendation shall be in the form of a letter written by the department chair after consultation with the department faculty. The president makes the final decision in such cases." A change was also suggested to point 15 – "Emeritus faculty may participate in University public ceremonies... and pay fees..." Larson points out that there are conflicting messages coming from the Provost – this exacting language on our document versus the document from CSU Fresno which allows the granting of emeritus status to administrators and staff. Jan mentions that the administration does not see the fact that granting emeritus status can lead to contributions to the University. Provost did not object to number 5, leaving lecturer emeritus/emerita status on the table. The Committee can leave it as it is but do need to change the name of the University. Dobb wants to talk to the Provost again. Barrett is against the phrase that "President will make final decision" in point 1. Mahoney says "this might be the time for compromise." Ginno says that this discussion is a microcosm of what will happen on the Senate floor, that it is not going to go forward with these changes. Barrett commented that if this is a faculty honor, it should be given by faculty to faculty. Lima mentioned that there is a limited parking pass available for emeritus. Strayer thinks we should make a statement that it is for faculty. Discussion about administrators and their appropriateness for emeritus status but it is not our purview.

b) Policy on Administrative Review

Key changes made are in membership of the committee. Proposed is an Academic Senate University Administrative Review Committee (UARC), which is parallel in its construction to the University Tenure and Promotion Committee with 1 tenured faculty from each of the four colleges and 1 librarian. They will be elected via regular election procedures to two year terms. Additionally, there will be a presidential appointee, who can be from outside East Bay. In the first year, half of the members will be elected for 1 year and half elected for 2 years to establish a cycle of new members every year. Barrett is open to adding language that would allow flexibility in increased membership if a particularly heavy year of reviews. Ginno mentioned that University Tenure and Promotion does not have that language. Recommendations were made to reduce the number of people being reviewed from 26 to 19 – for example, Associate Deans are now reviewed with Deans. Lima recommends to delete away with administrative review entirely as he believes it doesn't do any good and serves as a cover for administration doing what they want. Ginno moves to send to ExComm, Strayer seconded, and it passed. Lima opposed.

c) Review of Strategic Planning Documents

Dalton visited and discussed the continuous process of making these documents, starting with the Mission Statement and Statement of Values and Vision. When Quayoumi was President, he held Town Hall meetings. In Winter 2007, thoughts emanating from these meetings were coalesced into Framework for the Future and 7 Mandates. This resulted in more specific plans at the division level, diversity plan, academic plan, and ways of dealing with budget issues. Reviews normally occur every five years, and makes sense to do one now, particular with our new president, Morashita. Morashita held listening sessions to ask the CSUEB community “Why were they here? What they appreciated? Opinion on 7 mandates?” The idea is to have the Strategic Documents lead us forward and reflect the findings of these listening sessions.

Mandates essentially replaced Vision and Values. Academic Plan had major excerpt on expectations of CSUEB graduates. Now we have Institutional Learning Outcomes to replace the Academic Plan because notions are really the same but a deeper process was used to develop the wording. Adjustments have been made to the Mission statement and Mandates. Dalton gave out current draft of Mission Statement. She is meeting with different groups and revising it as we will do today. “Multicultural” is not as broad as “diverse”, and FDEC is okay with this change. It was made more action-oriented by replacing “provide” with “welcome, include, and support.” It also includes a new description of multiple campuses and online. Ginno asked why online was parenthetical. Why say “State of California.” Strayer suggests to replace with “and the global community.” It was suggested to shorten it by removing “serve different students...”

Changes were also made to the mandates. In mandate 4, the word “sustainable” was included. Mandate 1 was revised to explicitly include scholarship as it was not necessarily implied in the original. Two of the mandates were very contextual at the time, 3 and 5. The former has been modified to focus on the quality of the educational experience, not just numbers of students. Mandate 5 was modified to focus on collaborating across the University and being service-oriented rather than just being cost-effective. Mandates 6 and 7 have caused the most puzzling reaction. Students in particular did not know what “regional stewardship” and “quest for

distinction realized” mean. Ginno suggested to remove comma after “vibrant” on 4. Dalton shared some suggested changes following her meeting with ASI. Ginno asked if in 6 we should be more specific about how we are contributing to the community. LeDuc asked about the term “infused,” could we replace with “oriented” or “focused?” Bicais suggested the term “21st century skills.” Point 6 needs the term regional communities we serve. Jan asked who is the audience? Dalton replied that mandates help us allocate funds, listed roughly in order of priority. Barrett said they should be used to guide College and Department Mission statements, even down to faculty. Bicais mentions “social justice” should be included. Dalton said it is mentioned in ILO’s. Barrett mentioned that in the mission statement is the term “socially responsible.” Bicais said that it fits in Mandate 2. LeDuc asked if Mandate 5 could be reorganized so that “service-oriented” is first. Jan asked if ethics are discussed; they are in the ILO’s. Ginno also said that it is part of Academic Quality. Barrett suggested modifying Mandate 6 with “contributing a vision of social justice to the...” Dalton will collect more suggestions before giving to ExCom and Senate.

d) Policy on Range Elevation

Gretchen Reevy is here to discuss these changes. The changes are: replacing “exemplary” to “consistently effective” and adding “periodic evaluations”, “workshops of the Office of Faculty Development”, and “licensure”. The document needed to be reviewed because of a problem with ranges. There was a ruling that a terminal degree cannot be required for any range and conditions must be within work assignment. So, D had to be changed – course assignment is out of control of lecturer, so the requirement for upper division and graduate courses was struck out. The committee did consider not having ranges, but Dobb (in the sub-committee meeting) explained that it helps know where to hire people. Ginno asked about CBA. Reevy explained that every range elevation appeal on this campus has been won, although, of course, sometimes people do not appeal who are denied elevation. Range elevations are generally denied at the level of Dean. Mark Karplus emailed some people in CFA statewide, and they didn’t like either term, but found consistently effective less offensive. By having ranges it helps us know where to hire people. LeDuc asked how many appeals per year? Reevy replied that she didn’t have the data, but there were several appeals every year. If the stated goal of the changes is to reduce the number of appeals and grievances, this data will likely need to be provided to the Senate. Hopkins moved to pass it to the Senate, Ginno seconded. The motion passed with one abstention and one opposed.

e) Faculty Membership of Standing Committees

Issue needs to be discussed. Barrett will meet with Gretchen Reevy.

f) RTP Policy and Procedures for Librarians

President has approved the document. Barrett will help Ginno if she needs it. FAC will have a meeting from 3 – 4 on April 24th to discuss. Outstanding Professor sub-committee will meet from 2 – 3 on that date. Mahoney asked what the next process is. Ginno said it will go to the Senate and the President. The substantive change is that there is now a Chair of Library so this needs to be included in the document. Librarians are only ones that have their own RTP document.

6. New Business

Mahoney and Barrett discussed the need for conversation on faculty office hours at May meetings.

7. Adjournment

M/S/P (Ginno/Hopkins)