

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of March 6, 2013

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

Absent: Jeanette Bicais, Kelly Fan, Vish Hegde,

Guests: Endre Branstad, Sharon Green, Sophie Rollins, Mitch Watnik, Donna Wiley

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

2. Approval of the minutes of February 20, 2013
M/S/P (Larson/Stempel)
Larson suggested Eileen Barrett's full name should be used in the minutes.
Unanimously passed with suggested change.

3. Report of the Chair
Ginno reported that the emeritus/emerita policy with the minor change (sent via email) went through ExCom and was approved to go forward to Senate next week. There seems to be some interest on their part to request some sort of appeal process again. Ginno explained that the committee will need to take another look at the appointment and review document, including, for example, the process of department chairs and dealing with the need for language about internal vs. external searches. She also mentioned the need for a discussion about the Student Affairs Liason Officer, which is seen as having more of an ombudsman role.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
None

5. New Business:
 - a. Approval of Sandip Basu as CBE rep on the Student Evaluation Subcommittee to replace Sharon Green
M/S/P (Mashaw/Larson)
Passed unanimously.

 - b. Memo regarding membership for Tenure and Promotion Committee for FAC consideration from Provost Houpis
In looking at the document, Larson noted that there are 285 tenure/tenure-track faculty members on campus according to this document. When he started there were 485. Mashaw asked for statistics for part-time faculty members, i.e. breakdown by college as was given in the memo for tenure/tenure-track faculty. Watnik said they

the difficulty is that they are listed as University faculty rather than College faculty and does not include Library faculty. Dobb said there are about 400 lecturers and that number differs each quarter but is down from a previous high of about 600. Watnik confirmed that that is a headcount, rather than full-time equivalents. Mashaw asked if Dobb knew percentage by college. Dobb did not know, but she said their distribution is similar to that of tenure/tenure-track faculty. Stempel would like to see how the number of lecturers breaks down by college by full time equivalent faculty number. Watnik said General Studies faculty and coaches are considered lecturers but are not associated with any college. Dobb requested Ginno look under Institutional Data, Faculty & Staff. It was found that lecturers constitute 162.5 full time faculty equivalents. Mashaw commented that Science is underrepresented, but to change would require amending 12.1.1. The committee is composed of 5 members, each College getting 1 or 2 members. As such, the largest college, in this case, CLASS, has 2 members and the rest 1. It is not directly proportional. The committee accepted the accounting and approved the representation presented in the memo. M/S/P (Stempel/LeDuc) Passed unanimously.

c. Constitution and Bylaws:

The committee went through all changes made. The minutes below are confined to only those changes which warranted discussion. These refer to the Constitution. Article II Section 2 was revised because previous text conflicted with itself. Under Article III Sections 5 D and E, regarding College Assemblies, were eliminated. This is okay because they are referred to specifically in Section 7. Dobb asked if anyone has a College Assembly. At this point, no one does. LeDuc inquired about Article IV Section 5 E which was deleted and refers to “academic members of the University staff.” To whom does this refer? Dobb says they are faculty, although not regular faculty. They are members of Unit 3. Ginno said that a glossary of terms will go to Academic Senate; there is an obligation to define these terms as they are used. Watnik said that if that is the definition than E has to stay. The document was revised to bring this point back. The new point “E” will become F. Watnik provided some history on Article VII Section 7, regarding recall of a Senate staff representative. There used to be a staff governing body, but there is no longer. As such, there is no group for ExCom to consult about staff representation on Academic Senate. Watnik said there is a process for election; staff members self-nominate, and Senate elects from the pool. Mashaw said it should say “a petition.” LeDuc asked if rather than require 20 staff members, perhaps it could be a percentage of staff to be consistent with other points in the document. Stempel said that a number might be better because an argument might occur over what constitutes the percentage. Dobb said that there should be a description of duties, i.e. that the staff representative should attend meetings and report what is going out to Senate to staff. However, if we define responsibilities for staff representative, we would have to define other representatives’ roles similarly. Rollins mentioned Senate Office could send out information to staff. Dobb suggested that staff be invited to Senate meeting at end of year. Mashaw said percentage will eliminate the question of where the number 20 came from. Later in the document, there is a requirement for 5% of the faculty to petition for something to go to Senate. It was agreed to use the same number here. Watnik wanted to discuss proposed changes under Article 9. Previously a majority of

faculty had to vote to change the constitution. The change to section 3 makes the process for changing bylaws consistent with the process for changing the constitution. Section 2 does not actually need to be changed since it describes the original adoption. Sections 4 and 5 are brand-new to provide a process to amend the bylaws which is consistent with Constitution. Ginno put specific dates in the document so changes won't have to be made upon transition to semesters. The word "Constitution" was misspelled in Article XII and subsequently corrected.

The following discussion refers to the bylaws. Article IV Section 7 discusses Organizational Meeting Voting for the senate. Language needed to be revised because it did not accurately reflect those who could vote. For instance, "middle of two-year term" does not include statewide senators, who have a three year term. Wiley suggested the term "continuing." Also, lecturers, students, and emeritus faculty are "representatives" not "senators." Watnik's interpretation would be that everyone on the Senate gets to vote. This was taken care of by calling them "members of the Senate." Language was changes to "new and continuing members of the Senate." Under Article VI, Section 1, the date of March 15th is given as a deadline. Stempel asked if these elections could be moved earlier since College elections can't be held until the University-wide ones are concluded. That way department chairs would know committee composition by Spring for scheduling for following academic year. Watnik was concerned about moving it earlier because if we move to semesters school would start only last week of January. Mashaw asked about fairness of having at-large committee members with the idea that faculty from smaller colleges have less chance of getting such a seat. There are 10 at-large members. Watnik said college seats are apportioned by the relative sizes of the colleges. Ginno commented that library faculty have won at-large seats. Watnik said only 38% faculty voted so a "get out the vote" is in order. Watnik next turned to Section 2, B. The five year term limit for the Senate is regularly violated by people getting seats on Senate in different ways or by serving on statewide Senate. The text is now clear that one cannot hold a college or at-large senate seat for more than 5 years. Dobb said you can take a 1 year break and get re-elected. Ginno showed how point C, Balance of Alternation, could be applied to Mashaw's concern about relative college sizes. If CBE grows and COS shrinks, COS would lose two seats and CBE would elect two more seats. Watnik turned the committee's attention to the need for Article IX Section 2 D. Previously, nominations for the lecturer representative to the Senate resulted in 5 nominees: 3 from CLASS and 2 from COS. Sally Murphy, a member of ExCom, urged a GS faculty to run, but since GS and coaches are not under a college the text was revised to include "units." In Article XIV Section 3, the term "urgent matters" was present twice in the corrected text. The text will be fixed. In Article XVI Section 4, the word "as" will be changed to have a lowercase "a." Watnik explained that the change from "Presidential" to "Administrative" was necessitated by the fact that COBR has a number of administrative appointees and FDEC has an appointee from each VP. As such, it makes sense to group all such administrative appointees together rather than have separate rules for all the different kinds. It was noted that the use of both "consecutive" and "in a row" is redundant in Article XVI, Section 8B. This was corrected. Article XVI, Section 12B had been revised to conform with current practice regarding special subcommittees. Article XVII, Section 2A2 now includes updated language approved by faculty on the duties of CAPR. Article XVII, Section

4C has been revised to correct COR membership. Watnik explained that student representatives must be allowed two seats on each committee except those requiring tenure as per the constitution. Ginno pointed out that the section on FDEC does not conform to the rest of the document. Mashaw requested that revision dates at end should be deleted. Ginno agreed and explained that this document will be revised again because COBR and CAPR are listed with same responsibilities. Larson complemented everyone on the hard work on the document. Watnik asked that since some changes are benign and others are substantial, how should the revised document appear on the ballot? Ginno suggested that since Rollins made an exceptionally useful appendix with a glossary of definitions that both documents should go to Senate. She said further that we could highlight in yellow what is considered substantial but people might argue what is substantial. Mashaw asked what is the next step? Watnik explained that if we approve, ExCom will then bring to Senate. A 2/3 vote in the Senate is needed to put this on the ballot. Mashaw asks how Senate will vote (whole document, line by line, etc...) Watnik explained that the Senate will choose how it will do so, but FAC will set the tone. A motion was made to approve entire document with discussed changes.

M/S/P (Mashaw/Larson)

Unanimously passed.

d. Search Committee for the Concord Director; updated Appointment and Review document

Watnik explained that the Provost wants to remove interim tag from an existing administrator. Appointment and Review document currently states that some positions require a full search; there is no provision for an internal search. Ginno did research and found other universities have a provision to request waiver of external search. LeDuc asked who would grant the waiver. In the current case, ExCom allowed a single exception in this circumstance. Watnik explained that there is a vague mention of faculty consultation for positions not listed. Positions such as Director of Faculty Development/Concord are unlikely to be filled via a national search. There are too many search committees, and it is difficult to fill them. Instead, administrators could request a waiver from ExCom. Larson agreed that there are too many search committees with the same people serving on them which will lead to burn out. Stempel asked what ExCom was thinking with respect to mechanism. Watnik explained that since these are ultimately personnel issues, consideration of a waiver could only be done by a committee with a provision for closed meetings. So, it could not be done in an open Senate meeting, but it would have to be considered by FAC or ExCom. Stempel said this was acceptable, but he would want such a waiver to pass by a supermajority (2/3 or 3/4 vote) rather than a simple majority. Watnik said that made sense. Ginno said faculty will define the language and terms of the waiver. Dobb said can it be put on a chart. Watnik said not all titles would fall under this waiver. Ginno said the process should allow for new titles to be included. Mashaw – what would be the language? Ginno circulated waiver document from another University as an example. Ginno said language will be sent around regarding possible adoption of waiver.

e. SET update

i. Revised CSUEB SET form March 2013

Green brought copies of version 7 of SET. She has data from 60 students who completed both forms and recorded start and end time for both forms. The concern was that the longer form would be more onerous such that students won't finish it or even start it. The average extra time is 2 – 3 minutes. Green is asking around for faculty to get data: start time/end time, questions that are difficult to understand, questions they recommend dropping and, if so, why, want to keep, overall perceptions, comparisons with old one, and additional feedback. The students provided thoughtful responses. They were consistent. Almost none said they wanted to drop any questions. Non-native English speakers were clear and articulate about what they liked and said that the questions were more interesting and about what they want to say. When the document is returned to FAC, there will be more feedback from students. During the last two weeks, specific concerns were brought up by Jessica Weiss, Director of Office of Faculty Development, that these evaluations need to support probationary faculty. She brought in more research and clear arguments about the importance of shifting the perspective to the student reader. Based on the report from Channel Islands, they made changes in the latest revision, such as moving “learning outcomes” to the beginning to shift the emphasis to learning. The students’ favorite questions were those about their own learning. Since in the last meeting, the open-ended questions were deemed helpful, they were moved to the middle. A third question was added “What changes would you make in your own strategies or approach to learning...” Students appreciated being asked to think about their learning. Since students are often not in a good position to rank instructor behavior, the overall questions were dropped. Instead, the focus will be on item 28 “the course was a valuable learning experience for me.” Item 27 will be changed to say “expressed an interest in student learning.” Mashaw commented that he has done some research on teaching effectiveness. He commends the work, but he recommends compression since only 25% of the students spend time to give feedback. His argument was the shorter the form, the better. Mashaw distributed a form that he had made, which grouped items under categories of “Overall learning, Motivation, and Demotivational Factors.” He suggested compressing questions to fit on 1 page. Wiley replied that since it was all online, we shouldn't define the form by pages. Stempel said that the change in focus to the student leads to multiple potential interpretations and recommends close examination of wording. Stempel is uncomfortable with items around institutional learning outcomes since the connections to some courses are too indirect and the choice of not applicable is not sufficient, as it will be interpreted differently. LeDuc mentioned the possibility of letting programs choose which of these items are evaluated in their courses. Ginno closed the discussion as it was 4:10 – the committee will continue it's discussion at another meeting.

6. Other Business

N/A

7. Adjournment

(Ginno)