Members present:  B. Trumbo (Chair), E. Barrett, J. Bhadury, J. Clarence, R. Garcia, (Secretary), J. Lopus, V. Traversa

Members absent:  M. Hendricks, E. Padilla, L. Ramirez (all excused)

The meeting was called to order at 2:55 p.m.

1. The agenda was approved
2. Minutes of the April 16, 2003 meeting were approved with minor changes.
3. Report of the Chair:

   FAC Lecture Subcommittee unanimously approved the “Policy on Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty” at their meeting of April 10, 2003. It was sent to FAC for discussion and approval.

   FAC discussed document and made only Form changes, but no content ones. Revised “Policy Document” was to be held over until approval at May 7, Meeting. (See Attached Revised Doc.)

   Academic Senate passed the following FAC Recommendation:
   1) Early promotion letter format

   Academic Senate did not pass the following two FAC Recommendations:
   1) Only a Full Professor Dean can write letter of promotion for PTR candidates
   2) Change of PTR Profile format giving primary emphasis to Teaching and Publication categories over University and Community Service

4. Other Reports by Committee Members:
   E. Barrett, Report on Outside Firms for Search Committee Hiring. Deferred comments to M. Hedrick’s Report.

   R. Garcia, Report on “The Use of Course Evaluations for Effectiveness.” This Document, drafted by M. Strait, Director of Assessment and Testing, outlined the reasons that Student Course Evaluations should be examined only as one measure of Faculty evaluation given the different reasons the students evaluation might be skewed, i.e., race, ethnicity, grades, etc.

   Recommendation: That the draft be made succinct and sent to Senate Executive Committee, after FAC approval, and with the recommendation that it be sent to the Faculty Chairs, Administrators, and Faculty.
M. Hendricks: Report (Read by B. Trumbo) on the use of Search firms. Search firms have been used in a limited capacity by the University, primarily at the level of Dean and above. Search firms cost the University approximately 30-100% on one year salary for a successful search. For certain specialty positions, Search firms may be very beneficial. However, some question as to the cost-benefit of using Search Firms since the cost is relatively high and, historically, search committees have ineffectively filled positions.

Recommendation: FAC would not like to see an increased use of Search Firms, particularly in the current budget climate. However, Search firms can be used for some specialty searches, and searches above the Dean level, if deemed fit.

Vincenzo Traversa: Report on Regulation of Electronic Communications. Presented two Documents: 1) American Association of University Professors document on “Academic Freedom and Electronic Communications,” and 2) Academic Senate of the California State University document on “Policy on E-mail.” Traversa pointed out that these documents provided for “freedom of speech,” curbing of the use of sexually explicit material (except for research purposes), and established guidelines for the use of e-mail, especially during work hours. These documents could provide general language for FAC policy proposal to ExCom.

Recommendation: none (although there was general agreement that policy could simply be a recommendation to Excom that FAC endorses these two documents as the stated policy on “Regulation of Electronic Communications”).


FAC Recommendation: that existing Documents be used, as the basis for the FAC policy and that Human resources be the unit to handle its implementation. General agreement by FAC that this recommendation be sent to Excom for general approval.

6. Old Business discussed above in FAC Members Report, except for the following report by John Charles, VP for Information Technology.

J. Charles discussed the different problems and laws of CSU e-mail and computer policies. Stressed the following:

1) All CSU policy is governed by three basic principles, recognition of individuals’ academic freedom, guarantee of individuals’ privacy, and individuals’ freedom of expression.

2) CSU cannot disclose any information in the computer system under the Public Records Act, unless ordered by civil litigation or court order, but, this must be done with the advise of the CSU legal counsel and on a case by case basis.

3) CSU is in complete agreement with the American Association of University Professor’s Policy on Academic Freedom and Electronic Communication (1997) Document, and the current Academic senate Resolutions Policy on E-mail Privacy.
4) CSUH has backup systems on all university computers and every evening there is a “snapshot” taken of e-mail traffic. Computers (and contents) are open to all facilitators, theoretically, but for practical purposes (or because of need) there has to be a “specific” and “adequate” complaint that is first checked by CSU legal counsel before access to computer “files” can be given, even under U.S. Patriot Act. No one, even the CSUH President has access, without the CSU legal counsel approval.

5) CSUH Administrators, Staff, and Faculty should be aware that all information (including e-mail) can be globally distributed and/or intercepted – “amplification factor.”

6) The central policy of CSUH is in support of individuals’ privacy, academic freedom, and freedom of expression as stated within AAUP and CSU Policy on E-Mail Privacy, but subject to requirements by State and U.S. Laws and mitigated by CSU Legal Counsel.

7) In theory all electronic communication is protected, but in practice there is no “real privacy.” Therefore, all electronic communication should be used with the idea that there is “no privacy.” Everything (can be) is “public.”

   Recommendation: Submit the AAUP and CSU documents as the basis for CSUH Senate Academic Policy. FAC, generally endorsed Charles’ recommendation, and was in general accord that these two documents should be sent to ExCom as the basis for FAC policy recommendation electronic communication safeguards.

7. New Business: None

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Richard A. Garcia, Secretary