

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY  
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

APPROVED Minutes of the Meeting of February 6, 2013

Present: Jeanette Bicais, Linda Dobb, Liz Ginno (chair), Dave Larson, Danika LeDuc (secretary), Bijan Mashaw, Carl Stempel

Absent: Kelly Fan, Vish Hegde, Carlos Solomon

Guests: Elizabeth Bergman, Endre Branstad, Julie Marty-Pearson, Gretchen Reevey, Sophie Rollins, Michael Schutz, Mitch Watnik, Jessica Weiss, Donna Wiley

- 1 Approval of the agenda  
M/S/P (Larson/Bicais)
- 2 Approval of the minutes of January 16, 2013  
M/S/P (LeDuc/Larson)  
Marshaw wanted the minutes to read that all employees will receive “training on reporting sexual abuse.” The word “reporters” should not be capitalized.  
The minutes, with these amendments, were unanimously approved.
- 3 Report of the Chair  
Ginno and Rollins have looked over the call for the Outstanding Professor Award. The call will go out this week. The Outstanding Professor Subcommittee will review call before it is distributed.
- 4 Report of the Presidential Appointee  
No report.
- 5 Old Business:
  - a. Draft Emeritus Policy with edits suggested at 1/16 meeting  
Discussion ensued regarding the latest Draft Emeritus/Emerita policy. Watnik suggested that the title “Assistant Professor” should be eliminated, but it is technically possible to have 10 years of service as an Assistant Professor, so the title will remain listed.

Mashaw asked if this is a new procedure that we are looking at. Ginno explained that two years ago the Senate passed a policy but that the President wouldn’t sign. It was further explained that the administration has required that the new policy must contain a process by which emeritus/emerita status is recommended and then approved rather than being conferred automatically upon all faculty meeting the minimum eligibility requirements.

Schutz distributed a handout he had written summarizing the policies at different CSUs, particularly regarding long-term lecturers getting emeritus status.

Wiley had a question about Procedures, point 3, which stated that the letter nominating the candidate for emeritus/emerita status would go to the Dean for approval and then be forwarded to the Provost. Her question was if the Provost should be part of the approval process or is it forwarded to him just for his information. Stempel clarified that the intent of point number 4 is that the President can withdraw emeritus status. Watnik thought it strange for the Dean to have approval and that the President did not give an affirmative but only a negative. He would like an approval process in which the Dean might say no, but the nomination could still move forward. He suggested that the process be that the Dean makes a recommendation, then the Provost makes a recommendation, and the President could then confer emeritus/emerita status. Stempel asked if the higher level administration wants both to be part of the approval process. Dobb says that the President always asks for the recommendation of the Provost on faculty matters. Watnik stated that it is his impression that the Provost wants recommendation power. Reevey suggested that if we move to have a line of approvals that there should also be an appeal process. Watnik replied that an appeal statement in a policy on an honor seems out of place. Stempel agreed it as an honor, but it also carries library privileges that allows faculty to maintain their research upon retirement.

Mashaw asked why the procedures were needed. Dobb replied that this was decided by the state-wide senate.

Bergman asked if we can separate rights versus honors and give library privileges to all retired faculty rather than just those with emeritus status. Ginno replied that that suggestion has not been looked at favorably by the Provost in earlier conversations.

To Reevey's point, Dobb replied that there are no mentions of appeal processes in other CSU Emeritus/Emerita policies. She would prefer to have the option that the faculty member could file a grievance.

Bicais argued for the need for the complete process to be spelled out. LeDuc brought up a point from a faculty member not in attendance that the Dean's involvement may not be necessary. Watnik mentioned that the current draft was vague regarding who could nominate a faculty member since the document states a tenured professor or department chair. Stempel and LeDuc both thought one professor nominating for the honor should be acceptable. Ginno commented that it is the responsibility of the administration to investigate if someone is undeserving of this honor. Reevey mentioned the idea of people putting their name forward and separating honors from rights so that there would be a two-tiered approach. People could put their name forward for the rights but not the title. Dobb said that she currently grants library privileges to retired lecturers.

Mashaw asked about a sub-committee and wants to revise it with a more detailed procedure. He would prefer that a retiring faculty member apply for emeritus/emerita

status. Ginno replied that there has been lots of incorporation of feedback up to this point. She would be happy to have people come back with feedback and change again. LeDuc asked that we focus on issues and make progress to get it out before Spring quarter. Schutz was happy to see the addition of the review process. He felt that a “succinct” statement nominating a faculty member is preferable to a long list of criteria since faculty will be deemed “meritorious” for different reasons. He also approved of listing both a tenured professor and department chair as potential nominators to avoid departmental politics. He agrees with the idea of the nomination going to Dean for recommendation to the Provost and then recommendation to the President, who will make final approval. He also agrees with item 4 since other campuses allow the President to withdraw emeritus status and have done so. Stempel summarized the consensus of the conversation. The only issue remaining was the possibility of the inclusion of an appeal process and if doing so would provide a new basis for rejecting the policy. Schutz offered that the right to an appeal process is already understood. Ginno pointed out that there is nothing in the contract to protect an individual on this, but they could appeal directly to the President. Dobb feels that including an appeal process would be a problem since it doesn’t exist at other campuses.

Reevy mentioned the potential problem of getting a nomination from faculty whose departments have no tenured professors. Stempel felt that situation was covered by allowing nominations from the department chair, no matter their tenure status. He advocated to keep the language as is since it is the colleagues in the department who know the most about a faculty member.

Dobb said that the Provost has seen the document under discussion. It is his preference that point 2 under eligibility be deleted and number 3 made to number 2. Ginno offered the possibility of instead removing “tenured” from point 1. Dobb said that the Provost approved the list of titles as is. Stempel mentioned we need to modify the language to read “any member of the faculty with 10 years full time service or equivalent.” Larson says this is the superior document to the last two versions recommended.

Watnik observed that if FAC and Senate sign off on this policy, the clause in the faculty bylaws on emeritus/emerita status (Faculty Bylaws, Article 1, Section 4) needs to be amended. He recommended that the amendment not list new criteria but instead refer to current policy. By doing so, it will reduce work for future FAC if policy is ever modified.

Mashaw made a motion to accept the draft policy with agreed upon amendments. This was seconded by Stempel. Reevy asked if it would be forwarded to lecturer subcommittee. Ginno replied that it would be sent for information only. Schutz asked if there was a time limit for retroactive applications for emeritus/emerita status. Watnik said that without one someone who is denied may apply again year after year. The consensus was that no time limit should be included. The motion passed unanimously.

b. 12-13 FAC 5: Online Student Evaluations; revisions?

Wiley supervises the Testing Office and mentioned the increased workload and cost associated with having all courses evaluated. The possibility of moving to all online evaluations has been discussed for many years. The Senate was concerned about response rate and quality of student comments in doing so. Marty-Pearson and Wiley made minor tweaks to the proposed process for moving to online evaluations. The use of the word “pilot”, in particular, was confusing. The “pilot” actually refers to the use in Winter quarter of a new version of the online evaluation software and new servers. Winter quarter will not be used as an opportunity to assess and report on the effectiveness of online evaluations. The Winter quarter report will only assess the effect of the new software and servers. All hybrid classes will go to online evaluations in Winter quarter. This is in response to the fact that several departments have no on-ground meetings of their hybrid classes when evaluations are distributed (last week of quarter). Dobb also put out a request for volunteer departments to go all online for their student evaluations.

The tentative plan is that in the Spring evaluations for all courses will be put online. The motivating forces behind this are workload and expense, especially for large departments and the Testing Office. There is also the current limitation that written comments on paper evaluations are not being included in scanning.

The new proposal is that Summer 2013 would be when the assessment of online evaluations would be done including comparison of response rate, actual values, etc. Stempel commented that Wiley and Marty-Pearson’s changes directly respond to concerns raised in the Senate. Marty-Pearson also said that the new software allows students to complete the evaluations on their mobile devices, sends out follow-up emails, and informs the instructor if response rates are low. Dobb mentioned that the evaluations could still be completed during class time with students responding on their mobile devices. Ginno suggested creating template language for faculty use to encourage response rate. Bergman asked about authentication of the software (yes) and if instructors would still have to leave the room if administering during class time (yes). Watnik explained that he has students complete evaluations at the beginning of class to discourage them from using it as an opportunity to leave early and actively encourages comments. Marty-Pearson said that another advantage of online evaluations are that the data will be available more quickly.

Wiley clarified that the proposed procedure will undergo a second reading at next week’s Senate meeting. Watnik agreed. Ginno said that paragraph 2 needs to be edited as it does not match with Dobb’s intent. Stempel said that the confusion around the term “piloting” remains since some departments are also “piloting” by doing all online evaluations. LeDuc suggested clarifying it perhaps by adding “the effectiveness of only the technical process.” Stempel suggested changing item 3, that if the software pilot goes smoothly, all classes will be evaluated online. Marty-Pearson noted that it was departments not faculty who were asked to volunteer “for their on-ground classes to be evaluated using online evaluations.” Stempel did not understand point 5, but it was

explained that some faculty wanted to elect to do two of their courses evaluated on paper. Marty-Pearson says that would be up for departments to coordinate. Stempel clarified that the procedure involves evaluation during Summer and then a decision is to be made. Wiley explained that the report will go to Senate. Marty-Pearson said as a baseline the Fall online class response rate was 40%. Wiley mentioned that this is also a culture change for students, so a final decision should not be based on one quarter of data. Stempel clarified that a potential decision could therefore be the need to do further assessment of the online evaluations. Stempel motioned to accept the process. Mashaw seconded. Passed unanimously. Bergman clarified that the sub-committee will report to Senate. SET sub-committee will come back to FAC for approval.

6 New Business:

a. 12 -13 CR 4: Proposed Faculty Awards

i. Additional award ideas

Weiss explained that there was a call for a CSU-wide award for excellence in online classes following the Colt rubric. CSUEB only had three self-nominations. The question is if these three deserve to represent us since we don't really know what is going on in our online classes. Weiss believes there are exemplars out there. She proposed a system where voluntary submissions of best practices in online courses are juried and the best shared. She suggested a small honorarium as an incentive. It could be lead through the Office of Faculty Development but would need to go through FAC, since faculty to faculty awards go through this committee. Dobb said that as a committee we would like Weiss to bring forward a procedure and criteria that we can then discuss.

Dobb then presented the group with a list of potential new faculty awards, coming from Committee on Research. Ginno asked about the permanence of these awards. Dobb said these would be permanent and assumes that we have a Week of Scholarship every year. Ginno asked why should it be dependent on the holding of a Week of Scholarship if FAC has to do the work of developing criteria and procedures. Mashaw made a motion to have these recognitions conferred on an ongoing basis. It was seconded by Stempel. Ginno made a friendly amendment to add Weiss's proposed award to the list. Mashaw said that Weiss's idea is related to Faculty Development only, but Ginno argued with that but later withdrew her amendment. Schutz asked for clarification regarding eligibility for these awards. Dobb pointed out that the current document says they are open to tenured/tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and coaches. LeDuc mentioned that this would be additional workload for Outstanding Professor Subcommittee. Watnik said that FAC has to do faculty awards, but Provost's office can give awards if it wants to. Dobb said that the Week of Scholarship committee could be in charge of selecting rather than FAC Outstanding Professor Subcommittee. Ginno asked if the \$2,500 dollars was offered so that Academic Senate can give awards to other faculty or is it for Academic Affairs to highlight individuals. Dobb said if we want the awards to be from FAC on a permanent basis, then we should set that precedent in Year 1. Volunteers from Committee on Research and Week of Scholarship Committee could help with selection of awardees. Excom wants our approval to incorporate these into awards administered by

FAC. Mashaw modified his motion to move it to subcommittee. Stempel seconded.  
Unanimously passed.

7 Other Business  
N/A

8. Adjournment  
(Mashaw)