

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of May 2, 2012

Present: Eileen Barrett (chair), Liz Ginno, Scott Hopkins, Ching-Lih Jan, Dave Larson,
Danika LeDuc (quarter secretary)

Guests: Sophie Rollins, Michael Mahoney

Absent: Jeanette Bicais, Linda Dobb, Tony Lima, Luther Strayer

1. Approval of the agenda
M/S/P (Ginno/Jan)

2. Approval of the April 25th minutes
M/S/P (Ginno/Larson)
Ginno requested the addition of “library faculty” to the minutes. LeDuc will make the change.

3. Report of the Chair
Range elevation policy was on the agenda at ExCom and recommended to go forward to Senate. The second item approved from FAC was Policies and Procedures for Administrative Review, and it is going forward to Senate. RTP for Library Faculty also went forward.

The Lecturer sub-committee and Outstanding Professor sub-committee are finished their work for the year. The ad hoc committee on student evaluation of teaching continues their work and meets every Thursday from 10 – 12. Chaired by Sharon Green, this group has done a lot of reading on student evaluations. They are looking at a pool of questions from IDEA center. There is a collaboration between [Faculty Development Directors and the IDEA Center](#). They wrote short articles about how to improve in areas of teaching captured by twenty questions commonly found on student evaluations. As a team, the committee is aligning the questions for student evaluations with the Seven Principles of Good Practice for Undergraduate Education with the goal of making more meaningful evaluation of Student Evaluation of Teaching. Sharon Green is the chair of the committee. Student course evaluations online have been a problem because of compliance issues. Jan brought up how at Stanford, students don't get a grade without turning in an evaluation. The other issue is how the evaluations will be aligned with the ILO's.

Report of the Presidential Appointee
Linda Dobb is not present.

5) Old Business
a) Policy on Emeritus/a Status
Nothing new to report on this issue.

b) Faculty Membership of Standing Committees

Barrett had a conversation with Gretchen Reevy. Reevy said that she would like a conversation regarding faculty membership of standing committees to happen in the Lecturer sub-committee and understands that lecturers who serve on these committees should receive support for such service, perhaps in the form of release time. She would like it to be referred to the sub-committee with the partial assumption that the lecturers would be doing this work with compensation. Our recommendation for next year's FAC is to refer it to Lecturer sub-committee.

Jan brings up the fact that the issue of Range D requiring service in Range Elevation is related to this issue. Range elevation is a raise. Ginno says there may be an issue with CBA. Reevy's other points: lecturers teach all of our students. If lecturers are not part of CIC, then they don't have a voice on curriculum. Larson asked for clarification – would there be dedicated lecturer spots on the ballot or just on the same ballot as tenured faculty? Barrett replied that this is a good question that needs to be discussed. In Academic Senate, there are four designated lecturer spots. If lecturers were elected for designated lecturer slots, this could address Barrett's concern about early career faculty who are expected to do University service but who at times have difficulty being elected to serve on committees. Mahoney said that this kind of change would require a constitutional change. He also mentioned that this year it was difficult to get self-nominations for the lecturer position on Senate, and there are only 5 eligible lecturers in Business.

Ginno motioned to refer to Lecturer sub-committee the lecturer membership of standing committees.

M/S/P (Ginno/Hopkins)

6) New Business

a) Proposed Faculty Office Hour Policy

ExCom charge to review Faculty Office Hour Policy relating to full-time faculty members from Michael Mahoney.

There is currently nothing explicit about full-time faculty having online office hours. Denise Fleming provided some draft language for full-time faculty: In consultation with their department or program chair(s), full-time faculty will establish office hours each quarter that reflect the faculty member's teaching and workload. Considerations may include the number of WTUs, class meeting dates and times, instructional format(s) (e.g., face-to-face, online, hybrid), assigned times, and service for the relevant term, as well as anticipated needs of the students and/or advisees in the faculty member's teaching and workload for the term. It is understood that, with regard to the office hours, the number of hours, days, meeting location, and meeting modalities will vary accordingly.

Hopkins mentioned the case of someone released from two classes and had an online course. Should they have to hold 3 hours on campus? Jan said that we should have rules and then be flexible for exceptions. Larson feels that office hours should be held so all students can meet with the professors confidentially. Jan says that she has a student she would like to see face to face. Ginno mentioned that she used to hold office hours at reference desk to encourage freshmen to come to office hours. Hopkins and Barrett both mentioned students not going to see

their professors over issues. Contact with professor is necessary for student success. Barrett says that if we change it for full-time faculty then it will have to be for part-time faculty as well. This is very complicated. Perhaps it should be moved to next year. Barrett will check other campus office hour policies with help from Sophie Rollins and Tamra Donnelly. Barrett will bring some draft language. Ginno will check CBA.

b) Policy and Procedures for Selection of Outstanding Professor

Faculty Affairs Committee Policies and Procedures for Committee Operation

Sophie found a document that is not part of the official guidelines and is not mentioned in the FAC documents. Could we include these guidelines as part of our formal committee operation guidelines? Committee unanimously agrees. Some changes would be necessary. Barrett pointed out that we used to have a systems-wide outstanding professor so this needs to be deleted. Ginno said that we can refer to these explicitly. Jan said we need to review it and come up with changes as needed. The timeline is not what was followed. Should evaluation materials required be revisited, specifically the number of course evaluations? This only requires the approval of a majority of the members and ExCom, rather than the Academic Senate. Committee will review the guidelines and Larson's procedure for recommendation. It was unanimously agreed to omit the language of systems-wide selection. M/S/P (Jan/Ginno)
Jan wants a student-member. If we move the formation of the committee to the Fall, ASI might have more time to get a student.

c) Acknowledgement of Faculty Achievement and Service

The idea of giving more awards to faculty was raised at ExCom. Sophie Rollins found a document from Susan Correia with ideas of possible awards. The committee will review the ideas and discuss at our next meeting. Larson asked if money can be found as a corpus from which to generate interest and fund these awards.

7. Adjournment

M/S/P (Ginno/Jan)