

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

APPROVED Minutes of the Meeting of December 5, 2012

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

Absent: Vish Hegde, Carlos Solomon, Carl Stempel

Guests: Sophie Rollins, Dianne Rush Woods

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

2. Approval of the minutes of November 21, 2012
M/S/P (Bicais/Fan)

3. Report of the Chair

Ginno reported that Jiansheng Guo, Associate Dean of CLASS asked Mitch about differentiating the terms “interim” versus “acting” at the College level. Dobb said that it is in the policy for the appointment and review of administrators. This is discussed further below. FAC has been asked to look at the academic calendar with respect to religious holidays. Bakersfield has been held up as an exemplar and acknowledges the holidays on their calendars but does not seem to have made any modifications in their calendar because of them. Dobb mentioned that Yom Kippur seems to fall on the first day of the fall quarter, which could lead students to get dropped from classes. Lima is opposed changing the academic calendar because of religious holy days as there are too many days to consider. LeDuc suggested including a link to a list of holidays (not complete) and the policy so that faculty can be aware and provide students with some kind of accommodation. Bicais was wondering why we start on Wednesday for Fall quarter anyway. Lima mentioned that this might be moot when moving to semesters.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee

a. SSAC: faculty training on PeopleSoft advising

Dobb mentioned CBE and CEAS already have their centers. CLASS is hiring with a place in Music/Business and COS will open one in Math department. Dobb reports that there are no issues for FAC to deal with currently.

5. Old Business

a. 11-12 FAC 6. Appointment and Review of Administrative Officers Policies and Procedures discussion (Dianne Rush Woods)

Rush Woods, Presidential Chief of Staff, was invited by Dobb. Ginno had previously sent out a paragraph with comments from Rush Woods. Fan did not understand. FAC had previously proposed sub-committees for the reviews of Deans and the University Librarian. The current suggestion is to have UARC add two people from the appropriate

college or library rather than make a new sub-committee. The other needed change is to add “University Librarian” under 3.A.III, which was inadvertently left out in the previous version. Fan asked to clarify from which college they would be elected, and Ginno responded by amending it to read “appropriate college.” Rush Woods explained that this is a streamlined and balanced proposal. Ginno also removed the term “subcommittee” in the title and changed it to simply “committee” within the text. Rollins and Ginno will check to make sure that there are no other references to the term “subcommittee.” Rush Woods will bring this paragraph back to the President. Dobb mentioned that CEAS did not put anyone forward for the UARC. Bicais confirmed that another email calling for a CEAS representative from UARC has gone out to the faculty today.

Dobb revisited the fact that we have a policy for interim and acting chairs, but not for other administrative positions, such as Associate Deans. Should we use these same policies/general principles for other positions? Larson says that “acting” refers to someone filling a temporary and defined absence. “Interim” applies to when a position is vacated. In Senate, Mitch mentioned that “interim” should be no longer than a year for chairs, i.e. search and hiring process needs to be initiated in a timely fashion. Should this same rule be applied to Associate Deans? The committee felt that would be appropriate. Fan mentioned that other Universities have a limit on terms you can be chair. Do we have such a limit? Ginno replied that she didn’t see any limits in our document. Fan is not comfortable with current review process in COS since it is in person. LeDuc mentioned that Dean allows written comments.

6. New Business:

a. Emeritus faculty policy

Ginno has received three recommendations to once again attempt to revise the emeritus faculty policy. Provost and President both asked for a more rigorous procedure for faculty to gain emeritus status. The other issue FAC dealt with last year was the eligibility of lecturers for this status. Larson asked about the specific criticism on our document last year. Ginno mentioned that they want it to be an honor rather than an automatic conferral. FAC had proposed having the Chair write a letter. Lima asked if that is not sufficient, what is required, a dossier? Ginno also asked what is the honor? Fan said the title itself. Bicais recalls that there were two problems, 1) removing the process from faculty hands and 2) lecturers were not previously eligible. LeDuc asked how we can move forward if we don’t know precisely what evidence the Provost and President will require for evaluation. Larson recalled that when he was previously on FAC, our former President Qayoumi would not approve the policy then and gave no direction. Dobb said that this is her fourth consecutive year on FAC and will ask the Provost exactly what is being sought in this policy. Larson said that if we made the standard “full professor”, one could argue that they had been fully evaluated. This will still allow faculty that are not full professor to be eligible. The thinking is that Full Professors would get emeritus automatically, but Dobb cautions that if something inappropriate is done, they should not automatically get emeritus status. Dobb said that inappropriate behavior would be something that is recorded in the faculty member’s PAF that represents a reprimand and/or disciplinary action. Ginno said that this seems to be beside the point as the President still has final say and can revoke. Bicais returned to the issue

of adjunct faculty, and the term “lecturer” is mentioned in the document. They are indeed eligible under point 2.

The plan is for Rollins to create a clean pdf of this document for review by the committee and for Dobb to discuss with Provost. Larson asks what a desirable outcome of this process would be? A lot of work has gone into this and it was approved by the Senate. This version is much better than the current one which remains in place as long as a new one has yet to be approved by the President. Dobb agrees that this policy will be a compromise document. For faculty, the benefit is that more members of the faculty will be covered by this document since only 10 years of service would be required rather than 12 and lecturers are included. For administration, the benefit is that they gain the right to say no. Ginno asked if faculty will have the right to grieve if not granted. Dobb said yes. Ginno noted that the committee will revisit the document at the first meeting in January by which time Dobb will have discussed the issue with the Provost and can report back.

7. Other Business

8. Adjournment

(Fan)