Minutes of the Meeting of October 4, 2000

Members present: Hadi Behzad, Judy Clarence, Julie Glass, Kathy Hann, Valerie Helgren-Lempesis, Shyam Kamath (Recorder), Vincenzo Traversa (Chair), Bruce Trumbo

Members absent: Dee Andrews, Scott Stine

The meeting was called to order at 2:53 p.m.

1. Introduction

Vincenzo Traversa (Chair) introduced the two new members of the committee who were present, Hadi Behzad (Department of Management and Finance) and Julie Glass. Dr. Glass is the Presidential Appointee to FAC and the Director of the Office of Faculty Development and the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching.

2. Approval of the agenda

A motion (Hann, Kamath) to approve the agenda was passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair

Vincenzo Traversa reported that he had attended the Academic Senate meeting earlier in the week and had nothing to report. He handed out the draft of a memo on the Call for Applications for the Wang Family Excellence Awards for 2000-2001 and went over the procedure for selection briefly, clarifying that FAC members vote for the selection of the CSUH nominees for the award. Judy Clarence pointed out a typographical error in paragraph 3, last sentence, where the amount of $20.00 mentioned at the end of the paragraph was to be corrected to $20,000. The memo to all faculty was so modified and approved for distribution to all faculty by a motion (Behzad, Glass) to that effect passing unanimously.

4. Report of the Director of Faculty Development

Julie Glass handed out the Fall Quarter, 2000 schedule of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and other material from the Office of Faculty Development. She mentioned the availability of an on-line teaching course on a cross-CSU campus basis and the switchover to Blackboard from Web-in-a-Box that is currently under way. Judy Clarence requested that the announcements regarding the courses at the center be sent well in advance instead of the current practice of the schedule being circulated well after the quarter had started when some of the courses had already been completed. Julie Glass promised to do this and welcomed new ideas and suggestions under the center’s open door policy.
5. **Old Business**

Vincenzo Traversa revisited the issue of Department Chair training. He pointed out that, subsequent to the report of the previous chair of FAC on this issue, he sent out a fact-finding questionnaire to 35 department chairs, the school deans and administrators in Academic Affairs. He had received 11 excellent responses, which he planned to summarize and provide the FAC members to restart the discussion. He pointed out some of the problems that existed in the status quo and urged committee members to focus their single-minded attention on this issue once he presented his report.

6. **New Business**

   a. The Chair provided the committee with the draft of a call of nominations for the 2000-2001 Outstanding Professor Award and requested that a volunteer from FAC submit her/his name to serve on the committee. Hadi Behzad offered his name as the FAC and SBE representative. Professor Daryl Preston, last year’s recipient, will serve on the subcommittee with the other members to be elected/appointed soon. Dr. Traversa praised last year’s committee for their fine choice of Dr. Preston as last year’s recipient.

   b. Vincenzo Traversa requested suggestions for nominees to the Lecturer Subcommittee. He suggested that he and Dr. Hann work on this together. Dr. Hann agreed, her schedule permitting.

   c. The Chair presented a memo from Academic Senate Chair Emily Stoper containing the changes to the PT&R Appeals process bringing the process in conformity with the MOU. On a request for clarification from Hadi Behzad, he pointed out that the new procedures would provide the individual initiating the appeal with more time to respond to the Appeals Committee. A motion (Helgren-Lempesis, Clarence) approving the changes was unanimously passed.

   d. With regard to the issue of representation on Administrator Review Committees, Vincenzo Traversa pointed out that, due to the perception of one of the school deans that a certain school has gone under-represented in the past, he had conducted a study of all Administrator Review Committees over the 1995-1999 period in order to investigate this issue. He provided the data collected by the Academic Senate Office staff to the FAC members which showed that the situation of the school in question, concerning representation, may not be as wanting as originally perceived. Valerie Helgren-Lempesis and a number of committee members were concerned at the (random) pattern of no representation in selected cases visible in the data and suggested that a procedure that remedied the situation be put into place. Judy Clarence pointed out how the current system of first-few-past-the-post campus-wide elections led to under-representation from the Library. Hadi Behzad suggested that a system of one-person representation for each of the five administrative units of the university be implemented with all university faculty at large voting on the candidates from each school rather than the first-few-past-the-post system that was currently in operation. Julie Glass and Shyam Kamath both pointed out that the question of representation be separated from the committee members’ view of why some administrative divisions were more likely to volunteer for service on these committees. They opined that a system that ensured representation from all schools
would be desirable from a procedural standpoint. Dr. Helgren-Lempesis raised some questions regarding the problem of departmental nominees rather than voluntary nominees being put up for committee membership. The Chair thanked the committee members for their suggestions and pointed out that the discussion of this issue will continue and the matter will be taken up in future meetings. On a request from Judy Clarence that she would like to show the data on this issue provided by the Chair to her library colleagues, he pointed out that the data was in the public domain and could be shared with anyone.

e. The Library PTR document was taken up next for discussion. Judy Clarence said that the current document was woefully inadequate in many ways and that part of the document was in violation of the MOU. The Library Faculty Affairs Committee that had been formed for this purpose had decided to proceed by making the Ao brainer changes first, followed by more difficult changes at a later date and was requesting approval at this stage. Shyam Kamath inquired whether the document could be considered after all the changes had been made rather than in piece-meal fashion. Judy Clarence clarified that the Library FAC approach was to get the document approved in stages so that the obvious problems with the existing process could be dealt with in a sequential manner. Later, more difficult revisions would be submitted for approval. A motion (Helgren-Lempesis, Clarence) to approve the changes was put to vote and passed by an overwhelming majority of the voting members present (Behzad, Clarence, Helgren-Lempesis, and Hann) with Kamath abstaining due to non-receipt of the document.

7. Additional New Business

Valerie Helgren-Lempesis raised a question regarding the procedure for evaluation of professional work of colleagues by other colleagues on PTR Committees with a terminal degree below that of the promotion/retention/tenure candidate, based on an e-mail she had received from a concerned candidate. She requested clarification of the procedure by which this individual could bring up this concern with the appropriate oversight committees. Vincenzo Traversa clarified this procedure as follows: The concerned person should express her/his concern in a letter/e-mail to the Chair of the Academic Senate. The Chair of the Senate would refer the matter to the Executive Committee. If required, Ex Comm could refer the matter to FAC to provide its views on this issue.

8. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn (Clarence, Behzad) passed unanimously at 4:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shyam Kamath (Recorder)