

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

APPROVED Minutes of the Meeting of November 21, 2012

Present: Jeanette Bicais, Linda Dobb, Kelly Fan, Liz Ginno (chair), Dave Larson, Danika LeDuc (secretary), Tony Lima, Carlos Solomon

Absent: Vish Hegde, Carl Stempel

Guests: Sophie Rollins, Kaamelah Wesley

1. Approval of the agenda
M/S/P (Larson/Lima)

2. Approval of the minutes of October 17, 2012
M/S/P (Bicais/Larson)

3. Report of the Chair

Ginno talked to Dianne Rush Woods who will talk to the President next week about his comments and questions about the make-up of College Dean Review Committees. At ExCom, the Provost reminded faculty about sending in their A2E2 equipment requests to their College deans (deadline last Friday). The Provost announced that CSUEB will not be participating in Cal State Online – it does not currently make fiscal sense for us. There was a long discussion about Planning for Distinction. The Provost recommended that questions that are better sent onto him, Lori Erdman, and/or Brad Wells (especially questions about the funding of the project), other questions were about closed versus open meetings, providing more transparency in communicating to campus community (i.e. ensure that the web site is easily discoverable and that it is updated daily re: calendar, news, etc.), and that all faculty governance/curricular recommendations will be vetted and wind their way through Senate and Senate committees.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee

Dobb reported that Academic Affairs is moving forward with new faculty hires for the 2013-2014 academic year. The call will go out soon for 2014 – 2015 positions. Faculty should be reminded that they can ask for travel reimbursement for going to other CSU campuses.

5. Old Business

- a. Revisions of the RTP documents (Library & University), Policy on Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (University & Library)

Chair line was missing from documents (found by Larson) so that was fixed. These are now ready to go forward.

6. New Business:

- a. Discussion regarding online student evaluations

- i. Online evaluation process document

Ginno presented document that had previously been sent out to FAC via email. Eileen Barrett had previously sent comments about her hesitation of going to all online so quickly. Bicais was curious about speed of culture change but is okay with

it. Lima said phased-in process is good. Fan wondered if two courses can be done by paper (perhaps those most important to the department) and which online. LeDuc thought that it will be slightly unfair if people did more than two courses because research shows numbers are higher on paper versions. Bicais said it will be chair's responsibility to choose two courses with faculty member. Dobb was concerned about administrative assistant workload. LeDuc wondered if Testing Services was going to be reorganized such that they wouldn't be able to run these scantrons, i.e. are they planning not to have any to run? Bicais brought up that response rate increases with knowing that feedback matters. Dobb said there is a need for incentivizing students to respond. Dobb says Fan's suggestion can be done, but students will receive both online version and print version so that there is no effort in cherry picking. Ginno will add phrase with Fan's suggestion of the option of two print versions and about involving ASI in the process. Larson said it is good as a back-up, citing "law of unintended consequences." Politically it makes sense because departments are different. Fan wondered if it will be possible to analyze differences in online and paper and see what process should be done.

Motion for Ginno to send to Linda, then to committee, and then to ExCom.

M/S/P (Bicais/Fan)

b. Referral from Chair Watnik regarding ballot issues

A concern came from ExCom that an issue was put on the ballot that did not go through Academic Senate. Should all three methods of getting on the ballot (2/3 Senate, President, or 5% regular faculty petition) be discussed in Senate even though only first method involves Senate. Should faculty names on such petitions be published on the website? Names are currently available in Senate office according to Rollins. The concern is does the method by which the initiative got to the Faculty need to be listed. Bicais suggested including within the ballot a link to how the initiative got there as well as any pertinent background information. Dobb was emphatically against publishing names and reaffirmed the three ways of getting a measure on the ballot. Rollins will make notes for changing the ballot to include links out to "further" information regarding the individual items. Names of faculty will be kept in the Senate Office for faculty review.

M/S/P (Bicais/Larson)

c. Referral from Chair Watnik regarding Constitution and Bylaws task force issues

The subcommittee will consist of Jeanette Bicais, Linda Dobb, and Liz Ginno. Bicais previously volunteered to join the COBR Subcommittee on the quarter-to-semester conversion via email.

d. SSAC faculty training on PeopleSoft advising

Dobb said that each College will have a Student Services Center using money from a student fee. CBE has had such a Center for decades. Other colleges have not yet hired anyone to staff, and their role remains unclear. Dobb will meet with Associate Deans and get back to us. Watnik wants efforts to be faculty-driven, but Dobb indicated that the centers would be staff-run, so FAC's role is unclear. Dobb will bring back any issues she feels require FAC comment.

e. Discussion of disbursing College and Library Outstanding Faculty Awards

Provost sent a memo for Susan Correia seeking the creation of faculty awards without money attached. Rollins said that there is \$30,000 in the Sue Schaefer fund, and we might be able to use money from the principal. Dobb suggested possible awards, such as Outstanding Researcher of the Year, Outstanding Community Outreach, Outstanding Mentor, etc... Ginno asked about workload (i.e. the need for more committees) and developing criteria. Dobb did this at Bowling Green. The process was to put out the call, collect nominations,

choose, and have a ceremony. The nominated faculty member was not required to submit anything. Larson pointed out that it is a good idea to have recognition at college level as it is good for morale and the University wastes money on catered food that could be used to fund the awards. CBE already gives awards for Outstanding Teaching and Outstanding Research. Ginno asked what does FAC have to do? Larson thought this process needs to go through Academic Affairs, Provost to Deans, and then that the Dean would recognize faculty members. Dobb was fine with this and will talk to Provost to encourage other colleges and the Library to develop similar programs. Lima said that in CBE the College RTP committee is usually involved in choosing awardees. LeDuc recommended that, once established, past awardees could serve on future committees.

f. Scheduling for policy reviews

The question is if there should there be a schedule for reviewing policies so that the need to tackle many huge changes, potentially on several documents, might be avoided. Bicais suggested we find history of other policies and then project. Rollins will determine policies for which FAC is responsible and their review history.

7. Other Business

8. Adjournment
(Fan)