

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of April 3, 2013

Present: Jeanette Bicais, Kelly Fan, Liz Ginno (chair), Dave Larson, Danika LeDuc (secretary), Vish Hegde, Tony Lima, Carlos Solomon, Carl Stempel

Absent: Linda Dobb

Guests: Endre Branstad, Sophie Rollins

1. Approval of the agenda

M/S/P (Larson/Bicais)

Passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of March 6, 2013

M/S/P (Lima/Fan)

Passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair

Ginno emailed committee members earlier today about UARC. She explained that Mitch Watnik has requested a waiver from holding elections for this committee at-large and instead holding the elections at the College level. This passed unanimously. Ginno suggests that UARC should eventually be a standing committee and members elected along with the members of other standing committees in College elections. The committee also asked if they would have a set time to meet or if meetings would be ad hoc and how that would affect teaching schedules.

Ginno reported that the SET subcommittee has a sample form that will undergo changes and discussion with feedback from the campus community. Now the committee is ready to look at the policy. Ginno asked if FAC wants to look at policy first? Larson asked what the possible consequences would be if we don't see first. Ginno responded that she couldn't think of any since FAC has final say anyway. Stempel commented that going to SET would seem to be more efficient, but FAC might notice or highlight something such that in the long run, it might actually take longer. Ginno will provide the committee with the link. Rollins reported that FAC9 (revisions to Constitution and Bylaws) was passed by Academic Senate – constitution and bylaws and that the FAC10 (faculty awards) were approved.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee

Dobb was not present.

5. Old Business:

- a. Academic calendar revisions

FAC was asked to expand the holiday schedule to list observed holidays of major religions, regardless if it affects the University's open or closed status. FAC was also asked to look into the possibility of redoing the academic calendars for 2015-2016 and 2018-2019 such that the first day of classes does not fall on Yom Kippur. We were asked to also look at the 2016-2017 calendar as it has two Monday holidays in two of the quarters.

Ginno prepared a draft expanded holiday schedule using that of CSU Bakersfield as an exemplar. Handouts were distributed to the committee for review. Ginno put major holidays of five major religions (Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Judaism, Muslim), state, and federal holidays on the list and indicated how the date of observance is determined (in most cases) and whether the University is open or closed. The schedule serves an informational purpose so faculty and students know it is official. The Provost requested that only one holiday per religion be listed. Ginno has currently listed three for each. Hegde asked what the implication would be to list many holidays if the University is not observing them. Bicais asked what is our task. Ginno explained that the holiday schedule approved by FAC and any changes to academic calendar would go to ExCom, Senate, and to President. Ginno noticed that she needed to add Leave Accrual Usage Day. LeDuc asked if this would change the Academic Calendar in Catalog. Bicais asked if Easter needs to be listed since it is always on Sunday. Ginno explained that the library has been open on Easter. Stempel remarked that it is good to have more holidays listed so people know what is going on. Stempel suggested that Kwanzaa and Hannukah be included. LeDuc suggested the decision of what to include should be from people who observe these holidays. Ginno said that we should seek feedback.

Discussion then turned to the problematic academic year schedules. Several suggestions were made and considered as described below. To prevent the first day of class falling on Yom Kippur in 2015, Ginno and Watnik made a draft in which the Fall quarter would start one week later. Stempel raised the concern that the Winter break would be very short since we would start on January 4th. He suggested instead starting just one day later and not observing the Veteran's Day Holiday to have a normal break. Fan said it was a good idea but it might be confusing for faculty and students to not observe one year. Hegde expressed concern that this would be making exceptions for a religious holiday now. Where do we draw the line when it comes to scheduling exams? LeDuc was concerned about contracts for staff that state they have Veteran's Day as a holiday. Ginno suggested the possibility of the Friday after Thanksgiving. Larson said that the recognition of Veteran's Day is more complex and part of a CSU-wide effort to welcome veterans and military. Stempel made another suggestion of pushing Winter to January 11th. This would push Spring to end on June 19th and then Summer quarter to end on September 11th, giving only one week between Summer and Fall. LeDuc asked if we could start Fall a week earlier instead. Stempel asked if we can start one day later. Larson said that we used to always start on Thursday before observation of Veteran's Day. LeDuc and Stempel began to consider that any of these changes would result in more problems. Perhaps including Yom Kippur on the official holiday schedule and alerting faculty would go a long way to dealing with the problem, e.g. not dropping students from classes. Larson pointed out that this is an issue for more than just students but also faculty and administration.

Stempel moved we follow schedule for 2018-2019 but keep 2015 – 2016 the same. Fan seconded. After more discussion, Ginno suggested that we keep both calendars as is. Ginno will pass on the many suggestions that were discussed and how no solution was found. Passed unanimously. With regard to 2016/2017, it was proposed to start a week later to avoid two Monday holidays in two quarters, but this again would result in only a week break between summer and fall. Fan asked about Wednesday before Thanksgiving, and it was confirmed that it is not treated as a special day. Bicais

and Lima moved and seconded to keep 10 year academic calendar as is. Larson abstained; rest agreed. Motion passed.

6. New Business

a. Appointment and Review document discussion

It was brought to ExCom's attention that the Provost wanted to bypass search procedures for Director of Concord Campus. In this particular case, no one had an issue with person to be appointed. However, it was revealed that the campus has no policy about how we should handle such cases in the future. Ginno explained that many campuses have a waiver that the administration can submit. Other campuses have explicit procedures on how to conduct an internal search. We have neither. Ginno said that as part of the revision process we might separate the Policy on Faculty Participation in Administrative Appointment and Review into shorter, easier to understand sections. We have already been asked to examine appointment and review of department chairs and separate that from the rest of the document.

Ginno asked how the committee feels about putting UARC into Constitution and Bylaws as a Standing committee? Hegde asked about UARC, and Ginno gave the history of this new committee. LeDuc asked about the ramifications of UARC becoming a Standing committee. Bicais asked if standing committees are committees that make policy since that is not the role of UARC. Stempel said that one advantage of making it a standing committee would be a set meeting schedule. LeDuc looked up the definition of "standing committee" in the Senate Glossary – a permanent committee that meets regularly. UARC is different from a University PTR committee because the work is continuous throughout the academic year. The primary advantage to having it as a standing committee would be that elections for its membership would be consolidated with that for other committees. Ginno will speak to Mitch Watnik and ExCom about advantages/disadvantages of UARC becoming a standing committee.

The committee next turned to discussing the revision of the document. Ginno had earlier provided a link to the document from CSU Channel Islands. Her argument is that shorter documents are easier to revise. Fan agreed. Stempel asked how else would we split it, other than just the chairs. The idea would be to have one policy on faculty participation in appointment of administrative officers and a separate policy on faculty participation in the review of administrative officers. This is because the group of administrative officers faculty are involved in appointing is different and larger than the group they are involved in reviewing. Stempel asked if we would split the policy on chairs into two, one for appointment and one for review as well. Ginno said that section is only three pages, so it is probably not necessary. Stempel volunteered to rewrite language of that section. Next, we will need to look at the appointment section more carefully and include a process for waivers and internal versus external searches. Ginno asked if the policy for internal versus external searches listed for department chairs an overarching policy. Bicais said that is her understanding.

Stempel then brought up the last Senate meeting. The Senate held the first reading of the Emeritus policy put forward by FAC. There appears to be some desire for appeal rights to be explicitly included in the policy. We are waiting for the second reading. It is not clear that the President would support an appeal other than the implicit appeal, which is directly to the President. Mark Karpus expressed interest in having the ability to appeal at each level of the

process, similar to that of the PTR process. However, FAC does not want the bestowal of Emeritus status to require the same level of documentation as a PTR process. Ginno expressed that she was fine with a single sentence about appeal to the President but concern that more than that may prevent the document from being approved.

7. Adjournment
(Lima)