Minutes of Meeting of April 4, 2001

Members Present: Dee Andrews, Judy Clarence, Julie Glass, Kathy Hann, Valerie Helgren-Lempesis, Scott Stine, Vincenzo Traversa (Chair),

Members Absent: Hadi Behzad, Shyam Kamath, Bruce Trumbo

Guest: Myoung-ja Lee Kwon

The meeting convened at 2:51 PM.

1. Approval of the agenda: Approved unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes of meetings of February 21 and March 7: Minutes of February 21 were approved unanimously; minutes of March 7 were revised to omit the phrase “Faculty Organization” after “Library” on p. 2, line 2, and approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Chair:
The Chair reported that the Executive Committee (ExComm) of the Senate discussed 00-01 FAC 6 at its meeting on March 27. See New Business below for elaboration.

Regarding earlier FAC action items: the Academic Senate approved 00-01 FAC 5, Proposed Revisions to the Ten-Year Academic Calendar. The Senate discussed 00-01 FAC 4, Proposed Revisions to the Promotion, Tenure and Retention Document, which was then held over to the next meeting of the Senate. Concern was expressed by Senators regarding FAC’s proposed changes in Section 4.1.2 of the PTR document regarding documentary evidence for instructional achievement.

4. Report of the Director of Faculty Development:
The OFD’s schedule of spring workshops has been released. The lunch series continues.

5. Old Business
   A. Revision of the Library Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policies and Procedures
      The Chair welcomed University Librarian Myoung-ja Lee Kwon to the meeting, and invited her response to the proposed revisions of the Library PTR document. Judy Clarence took questions regarding section 3.5.2 of the document. In consultation with the Library Faculty Organization, this section had been revised with the aim of clarifying that only non-management Library Faculty are eligible to serve on the Library PTR Committee and the Library Subcommittee of the University PTR Committee. The University Librarian agreed with this change.

      It was moved (Hann/Stine) to approve the revised Library Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policies and Procedures document. The motion passed unanimously.
6. **New Business**
   A. **Review of Administrators**

   In a March 1 referral, Academic Senate Chair Emily Stoper reported that ExComm had questioned the need to convene committees of review for administrators other than, for example, the AVP of Curriculum and Academic Programs, Deans and Associate Deans, the University Librarian, and Directors of Faculty Development and of Research and Sponsored Programs. Ex Comm had discussed the difficulty of recruiting faculty members to serve on these committees and notion that many faculty had insufficient expertise in various administrative areas to assess administrative performance.

   The Chair of FAC noted that he had conferred with the Provost regarding this matter. The Provost agreed with the sense of the referral, that some administrative performances were best reviewed by other administrators.

   A lively discussion ensued. Judy Clarence questioned why some administrators were considered suitable for review and others not. Kathy Hann noted that the decline in faculty numbers should not be grounds for reducing the numbers of faculty committees, and that while we had strong administrators in various of these positions now, weaker appointments might be made in the future. Valerie Helgren-Lempesis agreed, especially in light of possible upcoming retirements. Dee Andrews pointed out that review committees served as a point of contact between faculty and administrators, and maintaining this avenue of communication was important. Judy Clarence suggested further that input from faculty should help administrators carry out their work. Julie Glass emphasized that working with the faculty was a critical part of administrators’ responsibilities.

   It was moved (Stine/ Helgren-Lempesis) that FAC recommend to ExComm that all university administrators continue to be reviewed by faculty committees as outlined in Sections III A & B of the Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Participation in Appointment and Review of Administrators. The motion passed unanimously.

   B. **Non-Grade-Related Student Complaints (return of 00-01 FAC 6)**

   The Chair reported further on ExComm’s discussion of this action item. ExComm especially asked for the precise outlines for the position before sending the item on to the Academic Senate. Professor Traversa had explained to them that FAC preferred ExComm’s input before elaborating on the details. ExComm in particular asked whether or not other CSU campuses had ombudsmen. The Chair noted that other issues relating 00-01 FAC 6 are outlined in the Professor Stoper’s memorandum of March 28.

   Professor Traversa noted that FAC had three options: to add the information requested by ExComm; withdraw the document; or postpone responding to ExComm’s original charge until next year.

   Discussion followed regarding the intent of the original charge, focusing particularly on the powers of an ombudsman position. Scott Stine stressed that the purpose of an ombudsman is to resolve conflicts rather than mete out punishments.

   FAC concluded it had received conflicting directives from the Chair of the Academic Senate and the Assistant Vice President of Instructional Services regarding this referral. Members also requested that Professor Traversa invite Professor Stoper to attend our next meeting to clarify this issue.

7. **Adjournment**: Approved unanimously at 4:11 PM.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Dee Andrews (Recorder)