Minutes of Meeting of February 21, 2001

Members Present: Dee Andrews, Hadi Bazad, Julie Glass, Kathy Hann, Valerie Helgren-Lempesis, Shyam Kamath, Scott Stine (recorder), Vincenzo Traversa (Chair), Bruce Trumbo

Members Absent: Judy Clarence

The meeting was called to order at 2:50 PM.

Vincenzo Traversa announced that the FAC will postpone consideration of the Old-Business item entitled Changes to the Librarian Promotion, Tenure, and Retention Document until the meeting of March 7, when member Judy Clarence will be in attendance.

1. Approval of the agenda:
   A motion to approve the agenda passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of February 7, 2001:
   A motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair:
   Chair Traversa reported that because the Senate, in its last meeting, did not refer any new matters to the FAC, there is no new business to consider. He mentioned lingering business related to Policy and Procedures on Lecturers, and noted that FAC may have the opportunity in the future to further clarify some matters concerning the role of lecturers.

4. Report of the Director of Faculty Development:
   Julie Glass reminded the committee that on Thursday, February 22, the Office of Faculty Development was sponsoring a workshop on how to write proposals to secure internal funding, and asked that we pass the reminder to our colleagues. She advised the group that a question had arisen recently concerning the formal procedures and/or guidelines that exist for chairs and other senior faculty members to observe junior faculty in the classroom. She will keep the FAC informed on this matter, to the extent that it is appropriate.

5. Old Business--Non-Academic-Related Student Complaints:
   The FAC revisited the matter of non-academic-related complaints about faculty members by students which had been discussed at the meeting of February 7. Several members reiterated that non-academic, non-discrimination-related complaints should be heard by an Ombudsman, rather than by a committee. Most members agreed that such a person should be a faculty member, preferably one with many years of classroom experience on the Hayward campus. There was widespread agreement that every attempt should be made to resolve students' non-academic complaints at the department level, thereby minimizing the number of complaints that would ultimately be referred to an Ombudsman. Several members raised questions about the duties and powers that a campus Ombudsman would have, and about how that person would be selected (whether by appointment or election), and compensated (if at all). It was agreed that such questions would more appropriately be discussed after the Senate had considered FAC’s motion to establish an Office of the Ombudsman.

   Based on these discussions, Stine and Glass jointly moved as follows:
A. The Office of the Ombudsman at Cal State Hayward should be reestablished.

B. Student complaints of a non-academic and non-discrimination nature must be reported to the chair of the department in which the alleged incident or incidents occurred. If the department chair is the subject of the complaint, the student must address the matter to another tenured faculty member in that department. Upon hearing the complaint, the chair (or, in the contingency noted above, the tenured faculty member acting in the capacity of the chair), shall determine if the complaint is in fact a non-academic-related, and non-discrimination-related matter. If the complaint is found to be non-academic, and unrelated to discrimination, the chair, or tenured faculty member acting in the chair’s capacity, shall inform the student of the procedures that are in place to deal with such matters. Those procedures are as follows: Every reasonable attempt shall be made to resolve the matter at the departmental level, first through discussions between the student and the instructor who is the subject of the complaint, and, if necessary, through discussions between the student and the chair (or the tenured faculty member acting in the capacity of the chair). If the complaint cannot be resolved at the department level, the student may take the complaint to the campus Ombudsman. The Ombudsman, in consultation with the instructor who is the subject of the complaint (and, at the Ombudsman’s discretion, in consultation with the chair or other tenured faculty member who initially heard the complaint), shall then resolve the matter.

C. The above procedure for resolving non-academic-related, non-discrimination-related student complaints should be brought to the attention of all department chairs, and all department secretaries or other appropriate staff members. It should be described in the Campus Catalog, emphasizing that the student should first make every reasonable effort to resolve the matter with the instructor in question.

The motion passed by a vote of 7-0 with one abstention.


In a memorandum dated February 14, 2001, Senate Chair Emily Stoper asked the FAC to consider amending Section 5.3 of the PT&R document to permit the omission of the first-year retention review. This amendment, if passed, would do away with the existing requirement that first-year probationary faculty submit a dossier only six weeks after they begin teaching at Cal State. The effect of such an amendment, as pointed out in the Stoper memorandum, would be for the campus to commit itself formally to retain our new tenure-track faculty for a minimum of two years. While all FAC members acknowledged the pressures and shortcomings of the existing first-year requirement, most argued that it does have value, both for the new faculty member (the requirement insures that the new faculty member has the dossier in place early on; this provides an organizational framework that ultimately aids the new member’s quest for retention and tenure), and for the department and university (in the rare case in which, for example, the new faculty member has not completed the Ph.D.).

With Professor Stoper’s request and the resultant discussion in mind, the following motion (Stine/Trumbo) was put to a vote:

The Faculty Affairs Committee recommends that no change be made to the first-year retention deadline.

The motion passed by a vote of 7-1.

A motion to adjourn passed unanimously at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,