To: Julia A Norton, Chair, 2003-04 Academic Senate
From: Bruce E. Trumbo, Chair, 2002-03, Faculty Affairs Committee
Subject: Year-end Report

1. Items considered (Please refer to FAC minutes for details)

In addition to considerations that led to the items in Section 2, FAC considered the following items.
Selection of Outstanding Professor
Selection of recommended CSUH candidates for Wang Award
Method of selection of Staff Representative to Senate
Student evaluation of faculty
Eligibility of faculty with unsatisfactory post-tenure review for extra quarter with pay
Policy on Electronic Communications
Whistleblower policy
Coordination of Department faculty search committees administrative and Senate officers concerning diversity issues

2. Actions taken (Please refer to FAC, ExCom, and Senate minutes for details)

02-03 FAC 1 Proposed Membership of Regular Subcommittees on Outstanding Professor and Promotion, Tenure and Retention (Approved by ExCom)
02-03 FAC 2 Proposed Membership of Regular Subcommittee on Lecturers (Approved by ExCom along with relevant revisions to FAC Policies and Procedures concerning membership)
02-03 FAC 3 Changes to Librarian Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and Procedures Document (Approved by Senate)
02-03 FAC 4 Changes to University Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and Procedures Document (Approved by Senate with Revisions)
02-03 FAC 5 Revisions in FAC Policies and Procedures (Approved by ExCom with Revisions)
02-03 FAC 6 Document on Periodic Review of Temporary Faculty (Approved by Senate with Revisions)
02-03 FAC 7 Policy on the Use of Search Firms (Returned by ExCom for further study)

3. Continuing items for 2003-04 FAC

Student Evaluation of Faculty
Method of Selection of Staff Representative to Senate
Policy on the Use of Search Firms
Document on Range Elevation of Temporary Faculty
4. Chair's comments on new and continuing items.

A. Student Evaluation of Faculty

There is considerable empirical evidence that student evaluations are not highly associated with student learning. In 02-03 FAC consulted with Michael Strait about this issue. He prepared a brief summary of findings that might be made available to faculty committees using information from student evaluations in their own evaluation of faculty. FAC proposed some changes in the wording of Strait's document, but there was not sufficient time to resolve the exact wording before the end of the year. (It was not always clear to me whether FAC members wanted this document to be mainly factual or also polemical.)

FAC also considered whether the current questions required to be used by all departments in evaluation forms should be revised, whether departments should be encouraged to develop discipline-specific questions for student evaluation of faculty, and whether quantitative summaries other than those of student evaluations should be routinely supplied to committees evaluating faculty (for example, class GPA, class size, summary information on class standing of students--lower-, upper-division, graduate, required/elective course, and so on).

B. Staff Representative to Senate

ExCom rejected a preliminary suggestion by FAC as to the method of selection. FAC continued to feel that this suggestion was better than a straight plurality vote.

Formerly the staff representative was chosen by a staff organization and the representative played the role of liaison between that organization and the Senate. It is not clear to FAC what representational role a staff "representative" would play in current circumstances. The method of selection should be by a method that ensures majority vote and no systematic dominance by staff of any one College (or administrative division) in the selection process. Certainly, to select the staff representative from among a group of staff members selected by the President is not a satisfactory method.

C. Policy on Search Firms

Search firms have been used in only a very few instances so far. The cost of search firms is very high and so both faculty and administration realize that search firms should be used only in extreme or special circumstances. FAC is concerned that the use of search firms never dilute the consultative prerogatives of the faculty in selecting academic or other administrators. Due to the limited experience with search firms and the widely divergent circumstances in which they might be used, FAC feels that it is premature to codify a detailed policy document at this time. Perhaps the best course of action is for the administration to consult with ExCom on a case-by-case basis when the use of a search firm is contemplated.
In my personal view, another reason that this may not be the best time to codify hard and fast rules is that the use of a search firm to select a College dean appears to have been preceded by difficult and contentious times in the College and to have been itself contentious. It may be best for a detailed policy to wait until this particular instance is not so fresh in everyone's mind.

**D. Policy on Electronic Communications**

FAC interviewed John Charles at length on this issue. FAC considered that no revision of current policies on the use of electronic communications is warranted. However, a more careful look at how these policies are made does seem to be in order.

Currently there is an Instructional Technology Committee with some faculty members appointed by ExCom that considers matters of electronic communication. This is not a standing committee of the Senate, nor has it routinely reported to ExCom. *This should be changed* so that ITC reports its actions, policies, and decisions to ExCom.

Policies on electronic communications impact faculty confidentiality and privacy as well as academic freedom. But they are also intricately connected with legal and technological issues that require considerable expertise and judgment.

**E. Range Elevation of Temporary Faculty**

The Subcommittee on Lecturers was not able to consider this issue during AY 02-03 and it should be their first item of business during 03-04.

**F. Subcommittee on Lecturers**

AY 02-03 was the first year this was a standing subcommittee. FAC and ExCom did quite see eye to eye on the best criteria for membership. It may be helpful to try to understand the fundamental tensions. First, the standing committees and subcommittees of the Senate usually operate on a top-down philosophy whereby they react to charges from ExCom. But lecturers feel that they have special needs to explore issues in a more spontaneous way. And this is not always consistent with the deliberations and craftmanship required to write good policy documents. Second, it is not always clear whether the most pressing concerns of lecturers are fundamentally ones to be solved by collective bargaining or ones that can be solved by local policies within the framework of the current CBA.

Probably ExCom needs to be more open to hearing the issues that are important to lecturers, to giving FAC appropriate charges to address some of these issues, and to finding forums other than FAC and its lecturer subcommittee for discussing other issues. Two sources of appropriate forums other than FAC might be CFA and the Faculty Development Office.