

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Meeting notes, January 21, 2003

Members present: David Baggins, Diane Beeson, Cal Caplan, Alex, Cassuto, LeAnn Christianson, Jennifer Eagan, Stevina Evuleocha, Karina Garbesi, Susan Gubernat, Mark Karplus, Michael Lee, Chris Lubwama, Penny McCullagh, Bill Nico, Julie Norton, Sue Opp, Norma Rees, Bill Reuter, Carl Stempel, David Sandberg, Don Sawyer, Mike Schutz, Bruce Trumbo, Steve Ugbah, Alison Warriner, Don Wort

Members absent: Veronica Aguilar, Dee Andrews, Paul Bassen, Fabiola Camarillo, Chastity Cansino, Evette Castillo, Dana Edwards, Nancy Fegan, Alison Germaine, Matt Johnson, Terry Jones, Jennifer Laherty, Rita Liberti, Frank Lowenthal, Marco Marquez, Russ Merris, John Ostarello, Chung-Hsing Ouyang, Evelyn Padua-Andrews, Pamela Parlocha, Sylvia Ramos, Henry Reichman, Emily Stoper, Susan Sunderland, Veronica Vasquez, Jessica Weiss, Donna Wiley

Guests: Carl Bellone, Emily Brizendine, Tom Hird, Bill Langan, David Larson, Michael Leung, Frank Martino, Tom McCoy, Dick Orsi, Janet Patterson, Sonjia Redmond, Richard Symmons

The Academic Senate held a special meeting to discuss Assembly Concurrent Resolution 73. No actions were proposed or taken at this meeting. The following is a summary of the presentations by three speakers:

Don Wort, representing the Statewide Academic Senate

Gary Hammerstrom representing the Office of the Chancellor

George Diehr representing the CFA

In September 2001 the legislature adopted ACR 73. ACR 73 is not a binding document; it is a resolution that carries no legal force or financial guarantees. The document urges, rather than requires. A working group, consisting of six representatives of each of the three interest groups cited above, was formed to create a blueprint for accomplishing the objectives set forth by the legislature. This report was completed in July 2002 and made available to all interested parties. Individual campus meetings were to be held at all CSU campuses to discuss this report. The underlying assumption of the analysis was that tenured and tenure track faculty are, and will continue to be, the backbone of the CSU. These faculty take the lead in student advising, program development, revision of existing programs and shared governance. Temporary faculty, while playing an extremely important role in the CSU, do not normally have these functions as part of their job descriptions.

ACR 73 has two clauses. The first calls upon the CSU to study its “faculty hiring practices over the past decade in order to effectuate improvements in those practices.” The second calls upon the Trustees, the Academic Senate and the CFA to jointly develop a plan to accomplish four goals:

- Raise the percentage of tenured and tenure track faculty to at least 75% of total faculty, with the definition of total faculty left to the three groups to decide.
- Assure no lecturers are denied employment as a result of this plan
- Assure lecturers that they will be seriously considered for all tenure track openings
- “Provide for the continued improvement of faculty diversity”

The presentations brought out the following major issues. They are listed in order of presentation rather than in anything that might resemble importance or stress.

- This year the CSU will undertake 1200 searches.
- In order to achieve its objectives the CSU will need to hire between 1,320 and 1,515 new tenure track positions per year. Given the current CSU success rate for searches, this would require annual searches ranging from 1760-2020.
- Since faculty have many other duties to perform, the time available to faculty to participate in the search process is limited by existing faculty availability.
- System wide, the success rate of tenure track searches is approximately 75%.
- The pool of available faculty searching for tenure track positions in any given year seems to have remained fairly static.
- The CSU wants to hire more high quality prospective faculty candidates. It does not want to dip further into the pool to accomplish its objectives.
- The average cost of hiring new tenure track faculty is greater than the savings from retiring or separating faculty.
- The CSU needs to make better offers. It needs to increase marginal cost funding, lower SFR from 19.4:1 to 18:1 to improve faculty workload and build search costs directly into its budget.
- The savings from faculty leaving the CSU is estimated at about \$82,000. This includes salary and benefits.
- The cost of hiring a new tenure track faculty member is estimated to be \$88,700. This breaks down to \$70,200 salary and benefits, \$11,000 search costs and \$7,500 in hiring costs.
- The plan calls for 600 FTEF new hires each year to replace retiring and separated faculty.
- In order to provide for enrollment growth, an average of about 580 new tenure track hires per year are needed.
- Between 141 and 221 new positions would be needed to lower the SFR from 19.4:1 to 18:1.
- To achieve the 75% goal, the CSU needs to replace lecturers as they separate or retire with tenure track hires. The range of new hires for this purpose varies from 0 in the first year to 120 in the last year of the plan.
- The plan calls for an eight-year implementation period with a total cost of \$101 million.
- \$35.6 million would have been needed in the first year’ budget, 2003-04. This funding did not survive the governor’s budget cuts.

Discussion on a wide range of issues followed the formal presentation.

To read the entire report, go to http://www.cs.csustan.edu/~john/postings/swas/acr_73

Respectfully Submitted
Alex Cassuto, Secretary