

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

APPROVED Minutes of the Meeting of October 3, 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: Joseph Geha, Sophie Rollins, Mitch Watnik, Keely Wong

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

2. Report of the Chair

Ginno brought information from ExComm's meeting. A Committee on Educational Policy, directed by the Chancellor's office, will be reviewing all programs to make sure that degrees can be completed in 120 semester or 180 quarter units. There will also be new committees: Informational Technology, A2E2, and Faculty Support Services Advisory.

The general framework of the administrative review was passed but inconsistencies in document must be addressed. Issues are discussed later under old business.

3. Report of the Presidential Appointee

Dobb reported that our documents must be made consistent with the new CSU/CFA collective bargaining agreement. For instance, there are now changes to our evaluation procedure, i.e. all classes must be evaluated. The feasibility of doing so must be evaluated – both for scantrons and the possibility of going to all online evaluations. Current testing office capacity for handling scantrons may not be sufficient. However, student response rate is lower with online and inhouse IT infrastructure may not be robust enough to handle it. This is a separate issue from the question of whether we are asking the correct questions, which the subcommittee on student evaluations is tackling, as pointed out by Ginno. Dobb suggested a timeline of doing scantron evaluations for all classes in Fall quarter and then moving to a pilot with one college all online for Winter. That way, by Spring we should know what to do. Ginno mentioned that this is also a budget item. Dobb says this is one of the highest priorities in academic affairs so the money will be there. Larson said moving to online evaluations, with the lower student response rate, is at odds with the value on instruction we have placed in the newly passed RTP. Bicais commented that we need to change the culture, to show that we place value on the content of the evaluations such that they are completed. LeDuc commented that online has value because it will allow for evaluation of all classes, including those for which we have not been necessarily collecting data, such as her large Chem 1101 class. Also, this will make it easier to have materials in the dossier and to collect written student

evaluations. Students may put more meaningful comments when done on their own time, even if there are fewer. Dobb reflected that maybe the pilot could be on a volunteer basis.

5. Old Business

a. RTP/CBA revisions

Ginno combed through the document, and two minor changes are required to sections 3.6.6 and 11.2.7c. One has to do with calendar days. The other is that the terms “meets, exceeds, does not meet” was left out. Sophie will highlight the changes and send to ExCom for review. Dobb pointed out that CSU met with CFA, and the outcome is two changes are needed to the RTP document. She suggested making all four changes and giving it to Senate at once. Ginno will revise the documents and bring to the next meeting for committee review.

b. President’s response to 11-12 FAC 5, Range Elevation Policy and Procedure

The President wants a definition of “consistently effective.” LeDuc recommended it be returned to the lecturer subcommittee since this was their language, not FAC’s.

c. President’s response to 11-12 FAC 6, Administrative Review Policy and Procedure

The President’s comments were mostly editorial on the background part. For example, he suggested we remove the actual numbers of administrators. There was no issue with the UARC itself. However, with respect to the review of College Deans, he recommended that the two faculty members be nominated by the Senate and approved by the President, whereas previously there were 2-3 faculty members elected by the college in which the Dean was under review. Additionally, this category was expanded to include the University Librarian. Bicais stated that the new language would take the election of faculty members chosen out of the control of the college. The President also felt the “other senior managerial positions” to be reviewed should be listed. Watnik mentioned the use of phrasing similar to “newly created positions will be evaluated as to whether or not they fall under administrative review.” This was in response to the concern that changes in titles would require new review of the whole document.

d. Constitution & Bylaws revisions

i. C&B task force report

This will be presented on the Senate floor next week and brought back to us. Rollins said that this is informational. Watnik said that the changes needed to remove inconsistencies will haunt this committee. He mentioned that a subcommittee might be needed and suggested a move to a mandatory five year review to minimize future problems in making documents agree. This was last looked at in 2004. Although there are some committee specific issues, most of the work will need to be done by FAC.

6) New Business

a. FAC Policies and Procedures

It was reformatted this summer. Watnik had some comments and corrections after looking through it. It will be posted for committee review.

b. Subcommittee membership

Outstanding Professor: Dave Larson, Danika LeDuc, Derek Kimball (previous winner), ex-officio (Liz and Presidential Appointee). Another faculty member and student member still need to be found.

Lecturers: Carl Stempel will be asked to be the FAC representative. Margaret Rustick, Gretchen Reevy, Mark Karplus, and Diane Mukerjee (now as a faculty member) will continue to serve on this committee. Jeff Newcomb will now serve as a lecturer member. Liz Ginno and a Presidential Appointee will serve in an ex-officio capacity.

RTP Procedures: This committee is not anticipated to be needed for this academic year.

Special Subcommittee on Student Course Evaluations remains intact from last year with the replacement of Eileen Barrett by Liz Ginno as an ex-officio member.

Sue Schafer Award: FAC committee as a whole.

c. Preparing/reviewing FAC work in light of semesters

FAC will need to determine what work will be required of FAC if the campus switches to semesters and how much that will cost. Lima asked if it is a “done deal.” The responses from Watnik and Dobb were that it would not be done unless adequate financial remuneration was offered. CIC will face a serious workload increase, and FAC will probably face the next biggest increase because of its work on the academic calendar. Since the financial cost is being determined at this stage, this falls under COBRA’s purview. Watnik said that there will be a sub-committee and that he suggests FAC have a representative on that committee. Larsen mentioned that last time this change was discussed, the faculty was allowed to vote. Geha asked if this all wasn’t a move to allow for a CSU-online degree program. Dobb commented that the current Academic Calendar has the academic year starting on Yom Kippur for three of the next 10 years. Watnik stated that FDEC is reviewing the calendar with respect to other holidays and religious observances and will bring their findings to FAC. Fan asked what the motivation is to move to semesters. Lima responded that it supposedly will save money from having only three registration and grading periods rather than four and also helps with transfers since most community colleges are on semesters. Geha brought up the online degrees again. Watnik commented that semesters are not really needed for online degree programs so that does not fully explain it. He said that our state senator is Denise Fleming and she may be more knowledgeable regarding the motivations behind this move.

d. Academic reviews

Dobb mentioned that we may have heard of processes called “planning for distinction” and “program prioritization.” This year the criteria are being established for both academic and administrative programs. LeDuc asked how this will relate to the current CAPR reviews. Dobb answered that this is to be figured out and that committee members will have training October 24th and 25th. Watnik said that annual reports are a high priority for the administration and that there is a push to get more compliance with reports by making a standardized template.

7. Other Business

None

7. Adjournment (Lima)