CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Approved as Corrected

Minutes of Meeting of March 7, 2001

Members Present: Dee Andrews, Hadi Bazad, Judy Clarence, Julie Glass, Scott Stine (recorder), Vincenzo Traversa (Chair), Bruce Trumbo

Members Absent: Kathy Hann, Valerie Helgren-Lempesis, Shyam Kamath

The meeting was called to order at 2:53 PM. Chair Traversa announced that, in light of FAC’s motion of February 21 concerning non-academic-related student complaints about faculty members, he will prepare a letter to the Senate expressing FAC’s desire to reestablish an Office of the Ombudsman. Future senate actions on this will then be referred back to the FAC.

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

2. Approval of the minutes of February 21, 2001:
   A motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair:
   Chair Traversa has been informed by the Senate that FAC will need to consider policies and procedures for the review of university administrators. This matter will be taken up as new business at the FAC meeting of April 4, following Professor Traversa’s consultation with the Provost.

4. Report of the Director of Faculty Development:
   Julie Glass noted that the Office of Faculty Development is sponsoring its final lunch gathering of the quarter on Wednesday, March 14th, from 11:30 AM to 1:30 PM. She asked that we remind our colleagues of this event.

5. Old Business--Librarian Promotion, Tenure, and Retention Document:
   In her memorandum of September 25, 2000, Senate Chair Emily Stoper requested that FAC consider the changes proposed by the Library Faculty Organization to its promotion, tenure, and retention process. These proposed changes are outlined in the draft PT&R Policy and Procedures document dated December, 2000. Professor Traversa explained that the Senate expects FAC not only to approve/disapprove the proposed changes, but to assess, and briefly report on, their philosophical basis and intrinsic value.

   Chair Traversa then asked FAC member Judy Clarence of the Library Faculty Organization to provide background information on the proposed changes. She explained that they were driven less by philosophical considerations than by two practical concerns: First, that the Librarian PT&R Document be brought in line with the policies and procedures used by the rest of the campus...
(indeed, the campus protocol served as the template for the proposed library document); and
second, that the library document reflect the present operating structure of the Library (a number of
structural changes--including the elimination of the Supervisor@positions, and an increased emphasis
on teaching and reference responsibilities--have been made since 1984, when the Librarian PT&R
document was last amended).

Turning to the draft document itself, FAC members pointed out a small number of typos and
inconsistencies of format, and asked for clarification on a number of points. In most cases Ms.
Clarence was able to provide such clarification, though in a few instances she expressed a desire to
consult with her colleagues in the library to gather more information. Professor Trumbo stated, and
other members agreed, that Sections 3.5.2 and 3.5.3 of the draft document were ambiguous, and
needed to be rewritten both for clarity, and to insure that Deans and Associate Deans are not eligible
to serve on the Library=PT&R committees.

With that need for further clarification in mind, it was unanimously agreed that the discussion
should be tabled until the next FAC meeting on April 4. Professor Trumbo then suggested that
University Librarian Myoung-Ja Kwon be invited to the April 4th meeting to give her views on the
document. This suggestion met with general approval, and so Chair Traversa will extend an invitation.
In response to a question on procedure, he noted that the draft document will now be sent back to
the Library PT&R Subcommittee with our preliminary comments and requests for clarification. It will
then be sent to the Senate, and then returned to FAC for final consideration.

6. New Business--Lecturer Service on Committees:

In a memorandum (Alecturer Service on Committees@to Vincenzo Traversa dated February
21, 2001, Senate Chair Emily Stoper requested that the FAC consider the following question: As it
right to permit lecturers who do not receive assigned time for service to the University to serve on
committees?@As background, Chair Traversa read aloud several critical passages from the
memorandum. In summary, while most 1.0- and some 0.67-time lecturers receive some assigned
time for service to the University, Ahe vast majority of lecturers never receive any assigned time.@As
a result, Ahe vast majority of lecturers are not remunerated for ... [committee] work, nor can it help
them in their applications for Range Elevations or FMIs because it is not part of their job
description.@Professor Stoper requests that the FAC Arecommend a policy concerning lecturer
service on the Senate and on committees.@

Professor Traversa then read from Section 20.3.b of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (July
1 98-June 2001), which states, in part, that

“In the assignment of work load, consideration shall be given at least to the
follic
substantive changes in instructional methods, research, student teacher supervision,
thesis supervision, supervision of field work, and service on a University committee
[emphasis added].”

A lengthy discussion ensued that focused on several key elements of the problem: a) the spirit
and letter of the CBA; b) the benefits/detriments of having lecturers serve on committees; c) the
desirability and necessity of ensuring that lecturers have access to committees; and d) problems of
voluntary membership on committees. Each is summarized in turn:

a) Spirit and letter of the CBA. There was general agreement that Section 20.3.b of the CBA
requires any “workload”, including “service on a University committee”, to be compensated. The
consensus was that no uncompensated person shall hold membership on a committee, and that if the University, or a School or Department, wishes lecturers to participate as members on committees, it must compensate them.

b) Benefits/detriments of having lecturers serve on committees. All members acknowledged the dedication and importance of lecturers on the Hayward campus, their past participation on committees, and especially the role that they have played on the committees of small departments. There was a feeling amongst most members, however, that lecturers are here to teach, rather than to perform other university functions. At least three members worried that while lecturers may have the best of intentions at heart, they typically have little experience, and little actual stake, in the long-term functioning of the university.

c) The desirability and necessity of ensuring that lecturers have access to all committees. All FAC members recognized the need for lecturers to have access to all open committee meetings of the University, and for lecturers to be heard on matters related to their special needs and interests. Several members emphasized that lecturers need not be members of a committee to participate in, and be taken seriously by, that committee.

d) Problems associated with voluntary membership. Professor Traversa reiterated that uncompensated membership on University committees is against both the spirit and letter of the CBA, even if that uncompensated membership is voluntary. The problem of voluntary membership is not only the lack of remuneration, but the social and professional pressures that can be brought to bear under such circumstances. As Professor Stoper stated in her memorandum, “volunteering” may be done under pressure from department chairs. There is a danger of creating a new informal norm that will result in more pressure on ALL lecturers. It is tempting for regular faculty to ask lecturers to do this work because they are overworked themselves, as their numbers shrink.” The sense amongst the FAC members is that the potential for abuse in a system that condones voluntary membership on committees is strong, especially if lecturers are attempting to secure long-term employment for themselves on the Hayward campus. There was thus widespread if not unanimous agreement within the FAC that uncompensated membership of lecturers on committees, even if “voluntary”, must be prohibited, and that all administrators and department chairs must be made aware of this prohibition.

It was agreed that the FAC might benefit from a meeting of the Subcommittee on Lecturer Policy and Procedure, so the discussion of Lecturer Service on Committees was tabled until FAC reconvenes on April 4. Chair Traversa requested that member Dee Andrews contact Michael Schutz, Chair of the Subcommittee, and arrange a fact-finding meeting. At that meeting the Subcommittee should consider, among other things, how other campuses and universities deal with lecturer service on committees, and whether funds could/should be made available to support membership of lecturers on committees.

A motion to adjourn passed unanimously at 4:49 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Scott Stine, Recorder