Minutes of the meeting of March 5, 2003

On March 5:

Members Present: B. Trumbo (Chair), E. Barrett (Presidential Appointee), J. Bhadury, J. Clarence, R. García, M. Hedrick, J. Lopus, E. Padilla, L. Ramirez, V. Traversa (Secretary)

Guest: F. Lowenthal, Dept. of Accounting and Computer Information Systems

When reconvened on March 12:

Members Present: B. Trumbo (Chair), J. Bhadury, J. Clarence, R. García, M. Hedrick, J. Lopus, L. Ramirez, V. Traversa (Secretary)

Members Absent: E. Barrett (Presidential Appointee), E. Padilla

The meeting was called to order at 2:47 p.m.

1. The agenda was approved after the order of items was changed as follows:
   New Business 6. a. to be discussed after agenda item 4.

2. Minutes of the meeting of February 19, 2003 were approved.

3. Report of the Chair
   The Chair gave information about a faculty member’s visit and the need for a closed session concerning one of the agenda items.

4. Report of the Director of Faculty Development
   There was no report.

6. New Business
   a. Sue Schaefer Award Nominations. The Chair provided material relative to the nominations for the award. The committee voted by secret ballot and the result will be forwarded by the Chair to the Office of the Academic Senate.

5. Old Business
   a. Evaluation of Temporary Faculty. This item is still being discussed by the appropriate subcommittee.
b. Policy on Faculty Search Committees. Prof. García forwarded to FAC a set of recommendations that will be discussed at a future meeting.

c. Student Evaluation of Faculty. The discussion of this charge continued. Some of the points raised in the previous meeting were revisited after the consultation with Dr. M. Strait on Feb. 19, 2003. At least two main opinions prevailed during the discussion:

   a) The current basic rules established by the CBA are quite sufficient and indeed go beyond the policies of a great number of other institutions of higher learning outside the boundaries of the CSU. Furthermore, the concept of “customer satisfaction” (please see c. b) is considered inappropriate and irrelevant when applied to non-quantifiable disciplines or students’ opinions when expressed non-numerically.

   b) The current, basic rules established by the CBA should be implemented as required, of course, but ought to be expanded and complemented by further information (such as G.P.A. and others) that should facilitate the “quantification factors” regarding “students’ satisfaction.”

   The discussion on this issue will continue in the next meeting(s).

d. FAC Regular Subcommittee referral. Several aspects of this issue were discussed at length, such as, for example, chairmanship of subcommittees, liaison between subcommittees and FAC, position of FAC Chair in relationship to subcommittee activities, etc. An idea was aired concerning the possible formation of a committee comprising lecturers reporting directly to the Academic Senate. The discussion will continue.

6. New Business

b. Unsatisfactory Post-tenure Review. Prof. Lowenthal suggested that, should a faculty member receive a particularly negative post-tenure review, said faculty member should not be granted extra quarters for pay.

c. Library PT&R document changes. The Library Faculty Organization Faculty Affairs Committee forwarded a document concerning Changes to Librarian Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and Procedures document. The changes were made for the purpose of updating said document to be in concert with the University’s Promotion, Tenure and Retention Policy and Procedures document. The document will be forwarded to the Academic Senate Office.

At 5:12 p.m. it was unanimously decided to continue this meeting on Wednesday, March 12, at 2:40 p.m. in WA 800.

The meeting begun on March 5 was reconvened on March 12, 2003, at 2:43 p.m.

5. Old Business
b. Policy on Faculty Search Committees. The committee resumed discussion of a document written by Prof. García concerning the FAC Campus Policy Recommendation on Formation of Search Committees. There were some modifications made to the original document, after which it was moved to approve the document as amended. The document was MSP unanimously.

d. FAC Regular Subcommittee referral. The committee discussed at length the item concerning the membership of the Subcommittee on Lecturers. The main point of the discussion was the structure of the subcommittee, namely its number of members: Regular Faculty and Lecturers. After a failed motion, the committee MSP unanimously to retain 3 Regular Faculty and 3 Lecturers for the membership of said subcommittee.

Subsequently, the committee revisited Article V. Subcommittees, Section 4. of FAC Policies and Procedures for Committee Operation, concerning the election of regular and special subcommittees. It was proposed to modify the language of the current document as follows: “Each regular and special subcommittee shall elect its own chair, and shall designate one of its members as reporter to the Faculty Affairs Committee. The chair of a regular subcommittee must be a regular member of the faculty.”

After some discussion, it was MSP unanimously to approve the above indicated amendment.

e. Staff representative on the Academic Senate. A document originating from Anna Powers, Interim Chair, Staff Connection, and addressed to the Faculty Advisory Committee dated March 5, 2003, referring to Staff Representative for the Academic Senate, was distributed. There was some discussion and it was decided to resume consideration of this issue at a future meeting.

The committee addressed its attention to the California State University, Hayward Promotion, Tenure, and Retention Policy and Procedures document. Two types of modifications were made on this document: non-substantive and substantive. The non-substantive modifications were carried out sua sponte by Chair Trumbo on the copy of the document provided by the Provost’s Office and distributed subsequently to the entire committee. They concerned the updating of the terminology used in the document that, before Chair Trumbo’s revisions, presented cases of inconsistency and lack of precision. Thus, for example, the acronym “MOU” (Memorandum of Understanding) had to be replaced with “CBA” (Collective Bargaining Agreement), the noun “School” had to be changed and replaced by “College,” and other terms and references had to be reviewed and corrected. It is quite clear that such revisions entailed hundreds of changes that were made by Chair Trumbo in a sedulous and altruistic fashion. After Chair Trumbo led the committee members through a point by point review of his work, Professor Hedrick, in a burst of irresistible and contagious enthusiasm, proposed to acknowledge the Chair’s labors, and the committee followed his lead with a thunderous applause.

The substantive modifications had originated from several issues raised by Professors García and Traversa during the committee’s activities of Fall 2002 and Winter 2003 that had been forwarded to the Subcommittee on PT&R. These issues concerned a number of situations, such as rank of department chairs writing letters of recommendation for promotion, deans’ professorial rank and promotion recommendations, early promotion cases to be specifically indicated in promotion recommendations as well as degree of importance of the various criteria to be satisfied in cases of promotion and/or tenure, etc.
In order to review each one of these issues, the committee recessed for some time in order to give the Subcommittee on PT&R, chaired by Prof. Traversa, the opportunity of finalizing the language of the proposals and voting on them. When this phase was concluded, the results were taken up by the entire committee and were MSP unanimously, point by point.

6. **New Business**

   d. Whistleblower Policy referral.

   e. Policy on Electronic Communication referral.

   After very brief discussion, these two charges will be incorporated in the Old Business section of the next FAC meeting.

It was MSP unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincenzo Traversa, Secretary