

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY  
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Amended Minutes of the Meeting of May 1, 2013

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

Absent: Linda Dobb, Kelly Fan, Carlos Solomon

Guests: Dee Andrews, Tom Bickley, Endre Branstad, Sophie Rollins, Audrey Wade

1. Approval of the agenda  
M/S/P (Larson/Bicais)  
Ginno requested the addition of two items from ExCom to the agenda: 1) the addition of two positions to the Appointment and Review document, and 2) details of timing for Administrative reviews.  
Amended agenda passed unanimously.
2. Approval of the minutes of April 17, 2013  
M/S/P (Lima/Hedge)  
Larson asked to remove the phrase “vote to adjourn” accidentally left in draft minutes.  
Passed unanimously.
3. Report of the Chair  
Ginno reported that the revised Constitution and Bylaws at first reading got some questions. It has not received a second reading because it was far down on the agenda. It will be up next Tuesday. Ginno invited FAC to attend this Senate meeting.
4. Report of the Presidential Appointee  
Audrey Wade came in place of Linda Dobb. Tenure track search training will be held the week of May 20<sup>th</sup>.
5. New Business:
  - a. Approval of Outstanding Professor nominee  
M/S/P (LeDuc/Larson)  
Nancy Mangold was nominated for the Outstanding Professor. FAC thanks the sub-committee for its work.  
Nomination was approved unanimously.
6. Old Business:
  - a. Proposed holiday calendar list review  
M/S/P (Larson/Bicais)  
Lima noted that the list is incomplete as it does not include all celebrated holidays. His larger point is that all days of the year are a holiday for someone,

somewhere. Hegde recommends this be a working document. Bicais said that maybe people could be invited to add their holidays to another “non-official” website. Rollins asked where it would be posted. Ginno said the purpose is to “raise awareness” and would not affect campus closures. The current campus holiday schedule is listed under Human Resources: <http://www20.csueastbay.edu/af/departments/hr/payroll/academic-holiday-calendars.html>. Holidays on which the campus is closed/or no classes are held are noted on the 10 year academic calendar on the Academic Senate website (listed on the Policies & Documents page, University & College-Level policies page: <http://www20.csueastbay.edu/faculty/senate/documents.html>), and in the Academic Calendar in the university catalog (<http://www20.csueastbay.edu/ecat/general-info/academic-calendar.html>). Passed unanimously.

b. Appointment and Review document

We are being asked to add the position of Athletic Director to the list of positions for the UARC to review, as this position oversees 17 FTES faculty and currently has no other method of review. This is a MPP position. Larson previously suggested that the position of athletic director be reviewed based purely on budgetary reasons, but somehow that position was cut from the final list. He asked what other positions were cut out that would be equivalent since wouldn’t want to single that person out. Ginno said ExCom thought that the position should be reviewed. Rita Liberti had commented that everyone likes the person in the position but wanted to ensure that this position had a review. Bicais agreed with Larson’s concerns. The previous idea was that Directors would be reviewed by the next person up. We weren’t sure to whom this position reports. Our assumption is that the request was made because this position, unlike other directors, has oversight over faculty.

The position of AVP of ITS was also brought up, but as it is an AVP position, it is already covered in the UARC review.

We were also asked by the administration to definitively determine how the UARC would be setting the calendar for reviews. The first issue is if interim service and/or partial years would count towards time served for review calendar. The second issue is if we start counting years at some set date, such as July 1 (start of the fiscal year), or hiring date. LeDuc suggested a timeline analogous to the RTP process with set dates. Anyone starting here between certain dates would be included in that review. Stempel thought it would make sense to have everything at once, so everyone has materials submitted at once. Larson suggested four full academic years before review. He then asked if the Academic Senate would be the steward of the review calendar. Ginno offered that it could be the President’s office. Larson suggested that the senate office be in charge since Provost’s office is in charge of faculty 5-year reviews.

M/S/P (Bicais/Stempel)

Ginno asked the committee about including interim time? Bicais asked what potential downside there might be to include it. Ginno replied “none.” Committee

reached consensus that it be included. For next steps, these changes will go into UARC procedures. Ginno will work with Rollins and Watnik to revise language and FAC will work on it via email.

With respect to the section on College Dean Review – FAC was asked if the language should stipulate that the two college representatives should come from departments different from the College UARC member and from each other, such that three different departments would be represented. Language to that effect will be added to the document.

M/S/P (Stempel/Bicais)

Passed unanimously.

The committee reviewed a preliminary edit of the Appointment and Review document to include a “waiver of search” section. The history behind this edit is that the Provost had come to ExCom with a request to appoint an interim as a permanent position, avoiding a costly search. Since CSUEB had no policy to do such a thing, the Provost wrote a letter of justification to ExCom and his request was approved.

Ginno looked at waiver policies of other universities. Since faculty searches are governed by the CBA, our concern at this time is only with MPP – administrative appointments.

Ginno asked the committee members to review the documents posted on the agenda and send her their preferred language or ideas from policies and forms from Northern Illinois University, Princeton, and the University of Florida pages by the next meeting.

The committee continued its discussion on the topic: Stempel asked if it would go to ExCom and then full Senate. Ginno said she thought that it couldn't work that way because it is a personnel issue, which can only be discussed in a closed meeting and Senate cannot be closed. Stempel asked if the fact that waiver had been requested could go to Senate as an informational item. This way faculty with concerns could deliver them to ExCom. The document could be worded such that waiver requests would go to ExCom. Stempel asked how much control ExCom would have, meaning could a waiver actually be refused. Bicais mentioned that the positive side of a waiver would be cost savings. LeDuc would like faculty to have some voice so that interim positions are not de facto permanent positions. Stempel asked what would constitute “appropriate justification.” Ginno read from some of the documents: external search not deemed necessary, identified successor, and lateral move or transfer. Larson pondered what sorts of abuses could result from this policy. He was unable to come up with anything definitive and sees benefits of this policy, with the expectation that it would be used only very infrequently and for particular cases.

There was consensus around the following: need for the administration to write a justification for the waiver to the ExCom and DELO. FAC will need to provide

guidelines of what should be in there. The Senate will have to be informed such that there is sufficient time and opportunity for faculty to provide input on the waiver request. ExCom would have the power to say “no.” Our focus at this point would only be on MPP.

c. SET

Dee Andrews visited the committee. She would like to see a policy in place before a new student evaluation form is adopted. She acknowledges that the current form clearly needs re-doing, but she was concerned about the current version of the SET form. Already we have seen significant changes in this process in that we must evaluate every single course (the whole concept of sampling has gone out the window) and are using technology to move to online only evaluations. SETs are of critical importance for junior faculty and the RTP process. Her first point is the need for separation of functions. A SET form should not make reference to SLO's or ILO's. That has to do with assessment, and there should be no connection between instructors, students, and assessment of programs. SLO's are about programs or courses within programs. They are not about instructors and are not mandated by CBA. On the other hand, evaluations are CBA-mandated, about performance as individuals, and go into PAF's. Andrews made two other points against including SLO's and ILO's on the SET. Firstly, the students are being inundated with questionnaires and will choose to stop answering. Also, professional terms that we use to evaluate our programs, such as oral expression, are deadening to students. If students try to interpret these terms in their evaluation of faculty, it would muddy the waters. Her second point is that she is very much in favor of electronic evaluations, but cautions that more background information needs to be collected, including how they work at other places, the role of academic affairs, technological challenges, storage, access to commentary, and response rate. Her third point was the need for a new policy in place before new SET forms are adopted.

Ginno responded to Andrews' first point regarding the SET questions referring to ILO's and SLO's. In the current iteration of the SET form, the questions have been flipped such that the student evaluates his/her own work. Bickley offered as an example, “Have you improved your understanding of...” Stempel countered that really those questions are evaluating themselves rather than the professor. Ginno replied that the two summative questions remain and that the old form will remain in place until the new document is fully vetted and decided upon. Discussion ensued regarding the pending move to all online evaluations. Spring quarter will remain a pilot phase because of technical difficulties in the Winter quarter pilot. Julie Marty-Pearson of the Testing Office plans to evaluate the data from the two pilot quarters during the summer. Andrews asked who will have access to the online evaluations. Ginno said that there are no changes planned with respect to access. Gina Traversa is in charge of keeping PAF's. Questions were raised about storage, access to electronic versions of SETs, and if they would be printed out and physically placed in PAF's.

7. Adjournment.

(Lima)