Members Present: Eileen Barrett, Carol Lauzon, Tony Lima (Secretary), Julie Glass (Presidential Appointee), Cesar Maloles, Anne Pym, David Stronck, Vincenzo Traversa (Chair)

Members Absent: Jennifer Laherty, Juan Robles

Guest: Prof. Don Sawyer, Chair, Academic Senate

Meeting called to order at 2:45 p.m. Chair Traversa noted that no quorum was present. Therefore the meeting was confined to presentation and discussion. (However a quorum developed later in the meeting as additional members arrived.)

1. Approval of the Agenda

   M/S/P (6-0) to approve the agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes of the previous meeting

   M/S/P (6-0) to approve the minutes of the December 1, 2004 meeting.

3. Report of the Chair

   Chair Traversa reported that the FAC approved revisions to the University constitution and bylaws and the proposed changes to the review process and procedures had both been approved by ExComm.

4. Report of the Director of Faculty Development

   Glass reported she met with representatives of Associate Students to start a discussion on having a CSUEB student initiated teaching award for faculty. She also hopes to discuss this with the Chair of the Academic Senate soon. She also announced that we would be having a workshop about funding opportunities for faculty using Service Learning and/or Civic Engagement. The workshop will be on Wednesday February 9th at 2:45 pm.
5. Report of the Subcommittees

a. Subcommittee on Promotion, Tenure and Retention: Barrett commented that the WASC report raised some larger issues that the subcommittee would continue to discuss.

The first meeting of the PTR Procedures Subcommittee of FAC was convened by FAC Chair Vincenzo Traversa on Friday, January 21, from 3-5pm. All members were present: Eileen Barrett (ALSS and FAC), Hongwei Du (Business), Julie Glass (Presidential Appointee and FAC), Jennifer Laherty (Library), Carol Lauzon (Science and FAC), Shira Lubliner (Education &AS), and Vincenzo Traversa (ALSS and Chair of FAC). Eileen Barrett was elected chair of the subcommittee.

The committee has two issues to consider. The first issue, raised by Professor Traversa, is to make references to promotion, tenure, and retention committees consistent throughout the document. Professor Traversa will provide a copy of the PTR document that highlights the inconsistency of this language in the current document to our next meeting.

The second and larger issue, raised by Professor Barrett, arises from the recent work on the Faculty WASC Report. In the conclusion to the recent Capacity/Preparatory Review Report for WASC, our campus promises that by May 2006, “a faculty committee will conduct quantitative and qualitative research to investigate faculty experiences with the PTR process and to determine its ability to reflect the new university commitments. A report summarizing the research will be presented to faculty governance for deliberation and action.” See the conclusion at the campus WASC web site http://www.csuhayward.edu/wasc/pdfs/CONCLUSION%20041205.pdf

Barrett proposed that the PTR subcommittee work with this faculty committee to develop recommendations about the kinds of information we would like collected from faculty about their experiences with the PTR process. The committee spent the remainder of the meeting discussing this proposal. We discussed our experiences of the PTR process from positions as current or recent candidates for promotion, tenure, and retention as well as from positions as departmental, college, and university reviewers of materials submitted by others for promotion, tenure, and retention. Our discussion covered three main issues: the document itself, the process outlined in the document, and the effect of the process on faculty morale.

The consensus among the committee members was that problems that arise are not problems with the document itself but rather problems with knowledge and interpretation of the document. Chairs and review committees change regularly; perceived expectations for PTR change with the changes in the reviewers. Faculty members currently in the PTR process see the need for more consistent
guidance about expectations. Committee members also agreed that there needs to be better training about the document and the process for chairs and faculty members who serve on the review committees.

Barrett asked all members to discuss these issues with their college colleagues. She will invite Gale Young, chair of the WASC committee, to report on the discussions about the PTR document and process that have been taking place on various WASC committees at our next meeting. Barrett has done some preliminary research on qualitative discussions of issues about faculty evaluation. (See two sources below). Professor Glass will provide PTR documents from other campuses that might represent innovative approaches and other “best practices.”

The committee scheduled its second meeting for Friday, Feb. 18th from 3-5pm in the Office of Faculty Development (Library Complex, 2300).


b. Outstanding Professor Subcommittee: Maloles reported the subcommittee would meet February 8 at 2 p.m. He noted that student representatives had been appointed, but he was uncertain about whether they would attend the meeting.

6. Old Business

There was no old business.

7. New Business

a. Revisions to the Promotion, Tenure and Retention (PT&R) document. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows the President to appoint members of the committee (article 15 paragraph 35). Chair Traversa suggested adding this paragraph directly to the PT&R document.
Sawyer noted that language exists somewhere that does not allow a majority of the committee to be FERP members. This raised the issue of whether FERP members have to be employed all three quarters at the University. Stronck noted that if that was a requirement there would not be many FERP members eligible for committee work since virtually none of them actually teach all three quarters. However all the department really needs is members teaching during the fall and winter quarters. Glass added that she has a memo from Pablo Arreola stating that the deans have agreed that FERP members must be employed all three quarters to serve on committees. Maloles noted this makes sense because when a PT&R dossier is revised the revisions must be reviewed by the department and college committees; this sometimes takes place during the spring quarter. Glass added that negative recommendation letters from committees will also have rebuttals and replies to the rebuttals, lengthening the process beyond the fall and winter quarters.

Chair Traversa suggested that FERP members should be available and willing to serve all three quarters. He noted that the nature of University faculty contracts means FERP members are always employed for the full three quarters of the academic year. However they may not be teaching during one or more quarters.

M/S/P (7-0) to add the following language as section 10.1.2.c. (Current section c becomes section d.)

At the request of the department the President may agree to include faculty participating in the FERP who are available and willing to serve on this committee. However members participating in the FERP may not comprise a majority of this committee.

Discussion then moved to the college PT&R committees. After some debate a consensus was reached to include the above language for department committees only and allow ExComm to decide whether or not to pursue the issue for college and university PT&R committees.

8. Adjournment

M/S/P (8-0) to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Tony Lima, Secretary