

Faculty Affairs Committee
APPROVED Minutes
May 17, 2017

In attendance: Linda Dobb, Pat Jennings, Maria Gallegos, Kimberly Kim, Michael Moon, Linda Smetana, Diana Wakimoto, Jim Murray (Chair)

Absent: Vish Hegde, Holly Vugia

Guests: Sophie Rollins, Mark Robinson

Called to order with quorum at 2:03 pm.

1. Approval of Agenda

Murray/Jennings/approved unanimously as amended

Murray proposed amending the agenda to include Lecturer Subcommittee Recommended Changes to the CSUEB Bylaws as Old Business 5a and move the other Old Business Items down.

Murray proposed amending agenda to include discussion of a proposed Amendment to RTP from the Ad hoc Sustainability Committee as Discussion 6b.

2. Approval of 5/3/17 Minutes

Murray/Moon/approved unanimously

3. Reports

3a. FAC Chair

Murray emailed his report, the text of which is below:

Roger Wen noted that the new URTP policy changing access to electronic dossiers requires that he do so for each dossier separately, so they can't all be done at the exact same time, and he was not clear on what time of day it should occur. Roger suggested 8a-10a the day after the deadline.

Excom passed Bylaws changes so they will be on the Fall ballot. And I will add the two small changes I emailed on the floor of the Senate.

Excom discussed but did not vote because they ran out of time on Appt and Review of Admin Officers.

At Excom there was some concern expressed concern over the revision of Appendix A for search committees to allow searches to go forward with faculty from only 3 entities instead of requiring all 5. Some suggested that I provide examples of searches that were delayed by problems recruiting faculty. I think Linda Dobb said that this year the ORSP search was delayed for this reason. I can confirm with her. Do you know of other examples?

Some in Excom said we should stick to 5, and faculty will rise to the task; others said the fact that faculty as not filling these positions is evidence we are understaffed and need higher tenure density.

And others suggested that we stick to 5, and perhaps give up on the two positions below to help recruiting effectiveness.

The President asked today to justify the two positions below but I did not provide any specific examples, so I will want to come up with more before it goes before Senate. The President said SCAA was not under AVP Student Support, so I need to research that again.

Appendix A, added new position "AVP Student Support & Development" because faculty often interact with student support organizations such as EOP, SCAA, and GANAS.

Appendix A, added new position "VP Campus Life" because faculty are involved with co-curricular student organizations and involvement affects faculty retention.

[an excom member suggested I give the example that faculty serve as advisors to these student orgs, and therefore should be involved in hiring the admin over student orgs, so I can be more specific about 'faculty involvement']

SET subcommittee met Monday and made some changes to parts 4.7 and 4.8. Please let us know if this is more clear.

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/13UnOIIAb877LztUGaWol2YbLY9RjRDmyapVYeUoU1zc/edit>

Hope to have an agenda sent off tomorrow.

Also, you may recall that the Lecturer Subcommittee voted to recommend the Lecturers have a seat on CIC, FDEC, CR, and CAPR standing committees of the Senate. We decided at that time to hold off sending these forward until we sent forward our semester changes to bylaws. Those semester changes will have their first reading at Senate tomorrow.

I'm not sure if it is too confusing to have two sets of changes to vote on at the same time, but here is what we approved last time. I will move to amend the FAC agenda Wed so we can discuss how to proceed. [end of emailed portion of report]

Murray asked for input on amending Appendix A on the Senate floor. Dobb suggested letting ExCom send the document back to FAC and have the committee review it next year. One of the concerns raised was over faculty being on search committees that do not directly impact faculty. However, Moon noted that to say that faculty should be search committees that only have to do with roles that directly affect faculty, or that faculty will be involved with regularly, is a limited perspective on the role of faculty. The point of faculty being on the committees is partly on the interest of faculty, but it is also a shared governance issue. The problem is, if we only include faculty on committees pertaining directly to faculty matters and follow this logic through to its end, then the administration could decide to start expanding commitment of campus in ways that do not include faculty or faculty input. Smetana also agreed that it made sense to have the document sent back to FAC.

Murray noted additional feedback from ExCom that some were concerned about the reduction of faculty numbers on committees as FAC suggested 3 to 5 faculty members on most committees. ExCom members for whom this was a concern stated that faculty would fill these positions. Dobb noted that it was a balancing act between asking that faculty be included on more search committees and the number of faculty on each committee. Murray noted that there wasn't a large increase in number of search committees with the changes in the document because of the deletion of some obsolete

positions. After further discussion, all agreed that the document should come back to FAC for review and revision.

Murray noted that Watnik caught several mistakes in the revised Bylaw document. Murray will send his proposed amendment correcting these changes to the Senators and the Chair of the Senate did not feel this would be a difficult change to make on the Senate floor. There was discussion about changing the date of the election deadline, which was the only change of substance according to Murray (Article vi, Section 1). Rollins explained the schedule for elections and noted usually the tightest schedule that works is a month. Moon noted that the change to March 15 will move the elections around spring break and César Chávez Day, which may or may not impact voting.

Murray also sent out a copy of the FAC to-do list to review goals and accomplishments for the year.

Murray noted that many positions on Senate and standing committees were not filled, especially by College of Science representatives.

3b. Presidential Appointee

Dobb noted that the workload recommendations document has been presented to Senate. It will go to Academic Affairs Budget Committee for review. Dobb said that it should be sent to everyone on FAC. Murray noted that if it is passed in its current form, then FAC will have to determine how to enact the policy, specifically how faculty members will be able to apply to have 6:2:2 load (classes/research/service) or 8:2 (teaching/ research & service together) allocation. The Faculty Workload Taskforce was charged by ExCom and the Provost to explore issues pertaining to faculty workload. With the current recommendations, an individual faculty member would be able to apply for either 6:2:2 or 8:2 and FAC would need to determine the application process and how to handle faculty members who wanted to switch tracks. Colleges and departments would have to come up with criteria for RTP for the different apportionment tracks. Smetana asked about RTP. Murray noted that it wouldn't impact URTP document very much as the requirements are fairly general and vague, with teaching being the most important. However, departments would have to document what is a good record under both apportionment tracks for evaluation for RTP.

Jennings asked for clarification about the status of these tracks and workload for semesters. Murray noted that the recommendation had been sent out, but it doesn't mean that the policy won't be changed before being approved as it still has to go to the Provost and other committees before coming to FAC for implementation. The document that finally comes before FAC could be very different than the recommendation that has been sent forward, as noted by Murray and Moon; there is no way to tell right now. Kim asked about how the apportionments were created. Murray noted that they were created based on what is practice at other universities and seemed reasonable to the taskforce. Dobb stated that the recommendation has to go through a budget review before anything else is decided, but Murray noted that the taskforce's work was over.

3c. Semester Conversion Steering Committee (SCSC)

Murray noted the SCSC had recently met and work is progressing. Dobb reminded members of the visit from CSU Los Angeles on May 24th to discuss semester conversion. At 12:30 pm there will be a general session in Biella Room, then breakout sessions. She encouraged all to attend.

4. New Business

4a. Specify post-tenure review requirements

Murray noted that Zinovy requested that FAC review the requirements for post-tenure review. As of now, 4.2 only mentions that “supporting documentation” is included for review, but does not specify what this should include. Smetana asked if the post-tenure review could be submitted online and Dobb stated it could be via the creation of a Blackboard shell as is done for the RTP process.

Jennings noted that historically it has been a much lighter documentation burden than the RTP process and would not like to see it become too onerous. Dobb suggested that the post-tenure review might be required by the CBA. She noted that no one wants to state that a colleague is not doing their work, but if the faculty member’s performance is very bad then some record needs to be created. This has happened rarely in Dobb’s time at Cal State East Bay.

Murray asked for suggestions on what could be included as examples of supporting documentation. The committee members suggested: CV, syllabi, course evaluations for last five years, as a start. Murray asked to be emailed other suggestions.

Murray also noted that the current post-tenure review process states that the memo will be forwarded to the Dean to sign, but has no procedure as to what is done if the Dean does not agree with the memo. Dobb also asked about adding the Chair to the document. More work will be done on this document next year.

4b. Semester changes for URTP

Murray/Smetana/approved unanimously to forward to ExCom

Murray reviewed the document with the committee and suggested that this year it could get a first reading so that in the fall it would be ready for a second reading. The rest of the committee agreed that the document should be sent forward.

Old Business

5a. Lecturer Subcommittee Recommended Changes to the CSUEB Bylaws

Murray/Moon/sent back to Lecturer Subcommittee

This document had already been discussed and voted on to forward to ExCom, but was held back so that two bylaw change documents wouldn’t be before Senate at the same time. Murray wanted to keep the two bylaw change documents separate, but thought they both could go on the fall ballot.

Dobb questioned if explicit language about service by lecturers being voluntary had been included in the document; it had not. She suggested putting such language in as she did not want the document to open up the question of payment for service by lecturers on the four standing committees. Murray suggested adding to Section 1 the sentence: “Service by lecturers on Senate and/or standing committees shall be considered voluntary.”

Jennings asked what would happen if the seats for lecturers went unfilled. Dobb stated the same that happens now when seats are not filled. Dobb also raised the issue of including something about service being evidence of showing currency in the field for cases of range elevation for lecturers. Jennings voiced concern about grievances if it was voluntary and then used in the evaluation. Dobb noted that the range elevation policy needs revision for semesters so this could be looked at as an addition to that document instead.

Wakimoto raised the issue of needing to inform the Lecturer Subcommittee of this change or refer back to the Subcommittee because this was an amendment to an already approved document and Reevy voiced strong opposition to any language such as this that singled out lecturers. It would be poor form, if nothing else, to blindsides the subcommittee with such a change.

It was decided to refer this document back to the Lecturer Subcommittee with this proposed change. It will be discussed further next year.

5b. Sue Schaefer award letter update

Murray/Smetana/approved unanimously

Rollins incorporated the template into the call letter and it is very clear. Dobb asked about the procedure for announcing the award winner. Rollins noted that it will be announced at the final Senate meeting of the year by the Chair of the Senate.

5e. SET policy latest edits

Murray/Wakimoto/no vote, FAC needs to gather more information about how aggregated data is used before deciding final language

More discussion ensued over the revised document, especially 4.7 and 4.8. Murray noted that the latest edits should address some of the ambiguities that were noted by ExCom. More discussion ensued about who should have access to aggregated data and for what purpose. Smetana and Kim voiced concern about who would have access to the data and if it could be truly anonymized. Wakimoto asked for clarification for whether there were concerns about 4.7 or 4.8 as 4.8 discusses use of aggregated, anonymized data to improve the evaluation instrument and not for any other purposes. Discussion continued about how 4.7 was now too vague and dissimilar, to some, to 4.8 in who was using what data. Moon noted that the term “aggregated” was vague and asked for clarification from the Subcommittee.

Murray asked what the committee wanted to do in regards to this document. Moon asked if anyone knew currently who requested and used aggregated data. He noted that we were discussing hypotheticals, but it would be useful to know specific examples of current use in order to create more specificity in the policy. Murray agreed to look into the current uses of the aggregated data. Dobb explained the current collection and dissemination of course evaluations: Testing sends out the evaluations and then sends the results to the faculty member, Academic Affairs (for inclusion in the faculty member’s PAF), and the department chair. The evaluations are currently used in RTP, lecturer evaluations, 5-year reviews, and annual reviews, according to Dobb. Murray report back research into this issue next year to the committee to assist with further refinement of the policy.

5d. Lecturer Subcommittee report

Murray emailed the report from the Lecturer Subcommittee to the members of FAC. Dobb noted that the Subcommittee had discussed the Policy on periodic evaluation of temporary faculty, but they were still debating the specifics of the changes as there was disagreement on appointing versus electing faculty members and the number of faculty reviewers.

Discussion

6a. Office Hour draft survey questions

Moon sent out updated office hour policies chart based on the office hour policies he could find from other CSU campuses’ websites. Murray asked if anything looked like it might be a good model. Moon noted some policies were confusing and they varied widely in their specificity. Fresno was very explicit in

their policy on office and consultation hours. No other policy was close to that level of explicitness. San Bernardino's policy included virtual office hours. Moon noted there was always a clause about varying office hours with approval of chair or dean, even in explicit policies. For some campuses, Moon couldn't find any policy. Some had recently updated, including San Jose.

Murray asked about Part II of Fresno's policy that states no specific requirements for office hours for part-time faculty. Jennings voiced concern about needing two tracks of office hours in semesters because of the proposed teaching load of 1.0 lecturers. She suggested a cap of 4 hours and some percentage online because 5 hours would impact the lecturers' workload too much without a cap. Murray requested more feedback for revising the policy in the coming year.

Moon noted it would be difficult to draft the revised policy as there is so much variation across the CSU campuses. Murray liked the explicitness of Fresno. Moon voiced concern that whatever the committee recommends for the revised policy it shouldn't decrease faculty availability to students. He doesn't want to increase workload, but was concerned about maintaining access for students. Murray suggested perhaps having a minimum number of hours for full-time and part-time faculty, as well as an acknowledgement of consultation via email, etc. Dobb stated that her office receives calls when faculty members are not in their offices at the posted times. She suggested everyone be required to have information posted with their office hours by their door noting how to get in contact via email or phone. noted that get in trouble when called when not in office. Jennings suggested that the office hour requirement should be lower for lecturers as they are not doing mentoring or advising beyond dealing with issues pertaining to the classes they are teaching. Then there would be three categories (full-time tenure-track, full-time lecturers, and part-time lecturers) with different requirements for office hours under semesters. FAC will continue to revise this policy next year.

6b. Proposed Amendment to RTP by Ad hoc Committee on Sustainability

Murray noted that some faculty members feel that they cannot be adequately evaluated in a college. Dobb stated they should write a letter to include in their dossier, if that was the case. She also noted that we may have already addressed this issue in the added language about Affinity Hires. Smetana noted that this may also impact those who are not Affinity Hires, but do a substantial amount of their work in clinical or off-campus settings. Murray suggested that FAC invite the Ad hoc Committee Chair to a meeting next year to answer questions. Dobb suggested sending the new Section 9 from URTP to the committee to see if it addresses their concerns as Murray noted they may have missed these proposed changes.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:49 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by
Diana K. Wakimoto