

**FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE – AMENDED Meeting Minutes**  
**Meeting Date: 11/04/15**

PRESENT: James Murray (Chair), Nidhi Mahendra (Secretary), James Ahiakpor, Maria Gallegos, Lindsay McCrea, Linda Smetana, Diana Wakimoto, Michael Moon, Linda Dobb, Holly Vugia.

ABSENT: None.

GUESTS: Sophie Rollins, Mark Robinson, Mark Karplus, Michael Hedrick (Chair of Academic Senate)

Called to order at 2:03 pm with quorum.

**1. Approval of the agenda**

Murray motions to approve the agenda. Wakimoto seconds. Murray suggests making 5 a. (Emeritus Policy) a time-certain discussion at 2:30 pm.

**2. Approval of the 10/21/15 minutes**

Murray moves to approve the minutes. Moon seconds the motion. Moon suggests he should have abstained from minutes of 10-7 minutes, similar to Dobb's abstention. All agree; Ahiakpor abstains from voting to approve the 10/21/15 minutes.

**3. Reports**

**FAC Chair Report**

Murray sent rubric for evaluating proposals for Exceptional Service to Students to Dobb for sharing with applicants. He removed points attached to each category so it comes across as a rubric, not a scoring card. Dobb asks for clarification on this. McCrea suggests leaving points on the rubric so folks know our evaluation system. Murray says he'll be calling for a lecturer subcommittee meeting. Two documents in senate yesterday (FAC documents)- first reading went fine as reported.

**Presidential Appointee**

Dobb reported that ExCom has been reviewing FAC documents and the committee is getting lots of referrals. She recommended there be a process for these specific referrals today from senate to FAC. Michael Hedrick joins us to discuss these current referrals.

**Semester Conversion Steering Committee (SCSC) report**

Friday 11/6- SCSC Steering committee meeting coming up; Faculty subgroup of the administrative support committee (includes Donna Wiley, Cesar Maloles, Liz Ginno, Eileen Barrett)- will be making referrals to FAC

Referral made to ExCom for a time module meeting; committee convened by Michael Hedrick; Mitch Watnik is chair of that committee and committee will meet every Friday except SCSC Steering Committee meetings. McCrea asks if her report here is accurate; Hedrick agrees and mentions that time module committee has faculty, administrator, and student representation.

Back to McCrea: Academic Senate passed course numbering system for Q2S. Funding model for GE and Graduation Requirements was passed.

#### **4. Unaddressed 14-15 docs for 15-16 committee approval:**

**New 4 a) 14-15 FAC 17:** Proposed recommendations for shorter sessions under semesters

Per Chair Murray- Back to the document on Revisions for Shorter Sessions. Change will be **Minimum of 4 weeks** under SUMMER SESSIONS.

Murray proposed; Ahiakpor seconds; all agree; none abstained.

**4 b) 14-15 FAC 6:** Request for Reconsideration of a Waiver of External Search within the Appointment and Review document

Dobb has done much research; refers to executive directive put forward by President on process for MPP hires. This directive suggests there be a process for waivers when hiring administrative officers. Dobb refers to language in a paragraph provided by Mitch Watnik where it says 'waiver for the recruitment of MPP positions reviewed by the UARC, *needs to be vetted by the ExCom of the Academic Senate*'. This added language (in italics) was not accepted by the President. Much discussion on this; FAC is not clear about reason for President's objection. Chair Murray asks if Michael Hedrick can talk to President specifically about his objection to our waiver process. Per Murray, this topic is postponed to next FAC Meeting until Hedrick gives us feedback on President's opinion on specific objection.

**14-15 FAC 7:** Resolution to redress the inequity across colleges of 'assigned time'

for special registration courses such as Independent Study, Senior Thesis, Graduate Thesis, and Practicum

Murray: Move to change select language; Smetana seconds. Change 'teaching responsibility' to *instructional workload*. Will this document apply to tenure-track faculty (as part of the 12 wtu for teaching) as well as

to lecturers? Or should this only be for entitled lecturers? Dobb says no good basis to differentiate between entitled and unentitled lecturers. Should this special assigned time be limited UP TO 4 wtu a quarter or 3 wtu a semester, when we switch to semesters? Hedrick says most campuses have limits and use a workload K factor to count these up.

Moon asks if we should further subdivide probationary and non-probationary faculty? Maria G and Nidhi suggested this was not a good idea. Hedrick agrees that such differentiation between faculty is not consistent with CBA rules/regulations. Murray asks if we should send forward this document without resolving all details. Hedrick advised FAC that the more detail we put into this document, the better it will be. Moon reminds group that when FAC first discussed this issue last year, we considered a joint resolution with ASI. This may be worth pursuing as this issue is not just about equity in assigning faculty workload but also equity in providing student opportunity for mentoring and unique instructional experiences across colleges

## 5. Referrals:

### a. Emeritus Policy [referral](#)

#### i. [Current policy](#); not updated since 96-97 BEC 11

Time-certain at 2:30 pm. Policy on Emeritus Faculty. Ten years of full-time service at CSUEB including faculty and lecturers. Mark Karplus advocates for us to adopt an emeritus faculty policy similar to CSU-LB and SFSU.

ExCom would like FAC to revisit the University Emeritus Policy and examine the issue of possible emeritus status for lecturers and review the procedures for granting emeritus status for regular faculty. Murray discussed this issue with Interim Provost Nelson and she had no strong feelings/opinions. Murray summarizes two issues to deal with:

1. Should lecturers be considered for emeritus status?
2. Should there be any other criteria for consideration of Emeritus, besides length of time served (12 years currently?)

Hedrick recalls this discussion last year in the academic senate, which resulted in this referral to FAC. He mentions that committee may consider whether criteria for emeritus is years of service or years of service plus honorable service or distinguished service. Karplus provides past context that proposal before President Qayoumi was that emeritus status be conferred at 10 years of service and lecturers be included. This proposal was vetoed. Ahiakpor responds that when he read the original document on emeritus faculty, he saw it as two things required for emeritus status – 12 years of service PLUS faculty record of scholarship.

Ahiakpor asks for specification on what the proposal will look like for lecturers – what will lecturers have to demonstrate besides years of service? In terms of scholarship and research, what would lecturers have to show? McCrea asks for clarification about ten years of requirement—isn't that too little? Mahendra asks question about possible options to modify policy on granting of emeritus status. Murray summarizes possibilities to be addressed as follows:

- Currently there is no provision for lecturers to get emeritus status
- Separate requirements for lecturers vs. academic faculty to acquire emeritus status
- Granting of emeritus status when years of service have not been met.

## 2. Constitution and Bylaws [referral](#)

Discussing discrepancies in the constitution and by-laws of the academic senate. Murray proposes he will develop a draft document.

### **Referral regarding hiring processes for faculty – FORTHCOMING FROM ACADEMIC SENATE**

Hedrick says there were problems last year with new faculty searches and applications using an online system. Apparently, after last year's hires there were a set of concerns raised on the system used for online applications, with no subsequent action taken. All problems still persist this year.

Hedrick recommends there be a formal faculty response to this situation, maybe jointly from FAC and ITAC. Dobb provides context and says IT was given a long list of things to do and fixes to pursue, and did not come through. She doesn't think no action was taken. She also informed the group that other solutions (e.g, InterFolio) are being explored actively in time for next year's searches.

### **Referral regarding emergency appointments for search committees – FORTHCOMING FROM ACADEMIC SENATE**

This referral is about elected search committees for hires. What happens when someone is elected and can't serve? When someone can't serve, you have to have a new election to replace the person who can no longer serve. Perhaps there should be a contingency for emergency appointment through ExCom so they can make an appointment. ExCom does this regularly for other committees, but does not have ability to do this for elected members who are elected by each college.

## **CSU IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIR RESEARCH- forthcoming from academic senate**

Per Michael Hedrick, no CSU has a stated term limit of more than one year for an IPC. 11 campuses and the ASCSU specify a 1-year term for the IPC. 6 campuses have no IPC. 2 campuses have an IPC, but only if the individual's senate term continues into the prospective IPC year (i.e, if their term is over, there is no IPC). 2 campuses (CSUEB and one other) do not clarify term limit. Hedrick asks for this to be clarified going forward.

## **REFERRAL FROM INFORMATION TECH ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ITAC)**

FAC request APGS/Testing Office to drop students from being sent course evaluations electronically if they have withdrawn from the course. Dobb recommends we contact Roger Wen (Online Campus) about this issue since online course evals go out from his office. Wakimoto suggests also addressing whether course evaluations go out via Blackboard or not via BB.

3. CSU East Bay Teacher Scholar Program [referral](#) from former Provost to FAC and

CR – Meeting scheduled for 11/12; FAC to be represented by Vugia and FAC Chair at that meeting.

### 6. Business Items:

1. Development of form/rubric for Guidelines for Distributing Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service (as promised in [14-15 FAC 18](#); on 10/20 Senate agenda)
2. [14-15 ITAC 1](#): Referral to FAC on which students should be eligible to fill out evaluations

### c. Suggested changes to the RTP document

- i. [With changes visible](#)
- ii. [Without changes visible](#)

3.3.4 b 4–In ‘without changes visible

Key issue is adding provost to the procedure and that documents (review letters) have to be destroyed after tenure/promotion decision.

### **14-15 FAC 8: Proposed Amorous Relationship policy**

- i. New [draft language](#) of Executive Order from Chancellor's Office
- ii. No need for CSUEB policy anymore

Spread this far and wide the PROPOSED AMOROUS RELATIONSHIP POLICY—  
derived from Executive Order

e. Discussions:

i. Philosophical statement on Evaluating Teaching (a combination of self- evaluation, student evaluation and peer evaluation)

Nidhi asks don't dept committees, dept member, office of fac dev already do this?  
McCrea points out that issue is not consistently implemented across depts. Ex. Nursing has their own form and do it consistently. Moon says we should look at other frameworks for evaluating teaching. Dobb responds she will send us a thought piece she has recently read on this topic.

Adjourned 3:53 pm.