Members present: Dee Andrews, Eileen Barrett (Chair), Doug Highsmith, Rita Liberti, Rich Luibrand, Tony Lima, Lynn Paringer, Vincenzo Traversa

Members absent: Pablo Arreola, Carol Lauzon

Guests: Arthurlene Towner (substituting for Pablo Arreola), Don Sawyer, Melany Spielman

Meeting was called to order at 3:07 p.m.

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P to approve the agenda

2. Approval of the minutes of May 3, 2006
   M/S/P to approve the minutes as corrected. Lynn Paringer noted that she should have been credited with preparing the minutes of that meeting.

3. Report of the Chair
   The Academic Senate suggested some changes to FAC’s proposed document on faculty office space. The Goals and Recommendations toward a needed Policy regarding Faculty Office, Laboratory, and Studio Space was approved by the Senate.

   There was some discussion of the matter referred to FAC by the faculty of the College of Business and Economics. The question is about University policy on post-tenure review. The Chair and Prof. Towner noted that different colleges were allowed to have different policies as long as those policies are approved by FAC. For example, the College of Education has its own FAC approved policy on post-tenure review.

   Prof. Paringer inquired about whether university FAC or college FAC was the appropriate venue for discussing this question. College FAC committees would be the appropriate venue for developing departmental or college-level procedures. Departments and Colleges must then submit their proposed procedures to the University FAC for review. FAC shall ensure that these procedures are consistent with the CBA.

   Prof. Traversa expressed concern about different colleges having different standards for post-tenure review. His concern focused on equitable treatment among the faculty in the various colleges. He predicted there would be
difficulties even defining the minimum acceptable level of performance, much less what is acceptable.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   No report

5. Old Business

   a. Student evaluation of on-line courses.
      Decision is to use Blackboard as a pilot program, setting up separate parallel “courses” for evaluation purposes only. That will retain student confidentiality and allow online evaluation of courses. FAC also decided to use only the questions from our approved student course evaluation forms.

      The problem is that the online questions available are canned and can’t be easily changed. For example, one question asks whether the class met “regularly, when scheduled.” In the context of an online class this question will probably promote confusion.

      The lack of evaluations is a special problem when lecturers are teaching an online class because there is no evaluation system in place.

      Prof. Andrews reminded the committee that this was a pilot program. She recommended that we simply go ahead and use the survey, worrying about what might go wrong after it actually goes wrong.

      Prof. Liberti expressed support for including other aspects of peer reviews in addition to student evaluations. There was a general consensus that such peer reviews were essential, but the mechanisms for performing them were unclear.

   b. Professional Leave Committee
      Discussion of the issue. Prof. Traversa pointed out that one university committee is a lot of work. Making sure each college follows rules would be difficult. In addition there would be increased workload on faculty as each college will need its own professional leave committee.

      Prof. Andrews reported that she had submitted the request for the change as a spokesperson for her College. In CLASS a number of deserving individuals did not get leaves. Also leaves are paid for from the colleges’ annual allocations. She reported that Prof. Arreola told her a number of CSU campuses make professional leave decisions at the college level.

      Prof. Andrews opined that it would be helpful for the faculty to become more informed about the process and standards for professional leaves. A college-based committee will have members better able to judge the quality of proposals.
Prof. Traversa proposed allowing the current system to remain in place for another year then revisit the issue. The Chair pointed out that it was too late to put anything in place for the next academic year and that we were really talking about the 2007-2008 academic year.

Prof. Andrews pointed out that the increasing number of younger faculty will also increase professional leave applications. Some changes to the current system may be in order because of the increased future workload.

Prof. Andrews suggested that the committee ask the incoming administration to review the current procedures, taking into account the rising number of younger faculty.

Prof. Andrews noted that budgetary considerations had also influenced professional leaves over the years. Prof. Traversa noted that the professional leave committee does consider seniority and gave some preference to younger faculty. Prof. Andrews responded that the system works best when there is a match between budgetary considerations and the number of applications. She argued that the current problems were not a single year difficulty but represented a trend.

The Chair asked Prof. Traversa to write down his thoughts on this issue for next year’s committee to review. Prof. Traversa added that the current system has worked well for about 50 years. We should not change the system because of the negative experiences from one year.

c. The use of “school” as an organizational unit
Prof. Sawyer noted that the issue ultimately revolved around the titles “chair,” “dean,” and “director.” There are many on campus with the title “director” who are not heads of schools.

Prof. Andrews noted that if the issue was whether a school could include a department, that was only one sentence in the draft proposal. Could we not simply remove that sentence? Committee members agreed that the head of a school should be equivalent to a department chair and that a school should be treated in roughly the same manner as a department.

Other issues that were discussed include salaries and benefits for the heads of schools and whether allowing schools might create a “super-department” that would acquire excessive power. Prof. Sawyer noted that the Department of Speech Pathology could easily split into two departments and place themselves under the School of Speech Pathology.

It was agreed to leave this issue for next year’s FAC to consider.
d. Lecturer Representation on the Academic Senate

The Chair reported that when the proposal for increased lecturer representation on the Academic Senate was brought up the referral to FAC was unanimous. Prof. Traversa suggested looking at what is going on at other campuses with respect to lecturer representation on the Senates. Prof. Andrews expressed some concern that the proportion of regular faculty on the Senate appears to be dwindling. One alternative is to simply run an open slate among all faculty including lecturers.

There was nothing to be voted on today. All discussions were for the purpose of the annual report to FAC06-07.

6. New Business
   a. Prof. Liberti suggested the committee commend the departing chair for a job well done. The motion passed unanimously and enthusiastically.

7. Adjournment

M/S/P to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tony Lima (acting secretary)