CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Minutes of December 6, 2006

Members present: Mayling Chu, Jennifer Laherty, Carol Lauzon (chair), Tony Lima, Ann McPartland Fung-Shine Pan, D. Xeno Rasmusson, David Stronck (substitute for Rita Liberti fall quarter), Arthurlene Towner (Presidential appointee).

Members absent: Dee Andrews.


Meeting was called to order at 2:56 p.m.

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

2. Approval of the minutes of November 1, 2006. M/S/P to approve.
   Approval of the minutes of November 15, 2006. M/S/P to approve.

3. New business
   a. CBE request for FAC affirmation of college policies
      Gary McBride gave some background on the CBE FAC proposal. The American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) requires that universities define “academically qualified” (AQ) and “professionally qualified” (PQ). Then they must live with their definition. At the fall CBE retreat the faculty voted 53 to 5 in favor of the CSU CBE AQ and PQ standards defined in these documents. CBE FAC then went on to draft documents that would link the standards to the PTR, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty, Periodic Evaluation of Temporary Faculty, and Range Elevation documents. (All CBE faculty, including lecturers, were sent drafts of the documents making the connections and invited to a CBE FAC meeting for discussion. Few faculty who were not committee members attended). CBE FAC, after consulting the faculty, connected AQ and PQ to the PTR, Post-Tenure Review, and Lecturer review process. An FAC meeting to which faculty were invited allowed participation (a few tenured faculty attended and two lecturers). Tony Lima asked whether AACSB required that AQ/PQ be part of the PTR document? AACSB standards require that monitoring, support and evaluation of the AQ/PQ standards to be a part of the organizational processes. Lima then asked McBride to characterize the AACSB standards for AQ/PQ.

   Eric Soares asked how changing the requirements for post-tenure review
would affect CFA collective bargaining and whether it was consistent with the current contract. Hank Reichman replied that one alternative is for CBE to adopt its own set of PTR standards. Reichman believes this would be disastrous for both CBE and CSUEB, FAC is being asked to determine whether using the standards in the aforementioned review processes is consistent or inconsistent with our current University policies. Post-tenure review has two components: satisfactory teaching and currency in the field. The latter requirement has been very loosely interpreted at CSUEB. Can the AQ/PQ standards be incorporated into currency in the field? There are campuses in the CSU that have much more rigorous standards for post-tenure review including specific numbers of publications.

Frank Lowenthal stated that he believed incorporating AQ/PQ into the PTR and post-tenure review standards should have been decided in a meeting of the full CBE faculty. The issue was not mentioned at the fall CBE faculty retreat. He proposed that FAC refer the matter back to CBE for consideration by the entire faculty. Nan Maxwell pointed out that CBE FAC bylaws allow the faculty to petition for reconsideration of any FAC recommendation to the Dean. If 25% of the faculty sign such a petition there must be a meeting of the full CBE faculty to discuss and vote on the issue.

Joy Bhadury pointed to the language in the preamble to the AQ standards passed by CBE faculty at the fall retreat. This document clearly links the AQ standard to the CSUEB standard of maintaining currency in their field.

Mark Karplus pointed out that no lecturer representatives have been consulted about this issue. Maxwell replied that the Dean is adamant that any policies developed to support AQ and PQ standards for faculty will apply to all faculty, including lecturers because AACSB includes lecturers in their evaluation of faculty.

David Stronck asked what the consequences would be to a professor who failed to maintain currency. Arthurlene Towner replied that the result would be communicated to the faculty member, emphasizing their responsibility to the community.

Jennifer Laherty stated that she believes we need more time to study these documents. Bhadury replied that CBE's AACSB self-report would be compiled in Fall 2007 and as is frequently done by an accrediting team, data from the previous academic year is often requested as secondary evidence. Therefore it would be desirable to have policies in place and understood by Winter, 2007. Laherty asked why FAC was involved in this process. Reichman replied that any modification of requirements for review processes must begin with action by FAC.

Lima asked about the other two groups that accredit business universities.
McBride replied that the AQ document clearly indicates CBE faculty want AACSB accreditation. Lima replied that he believed that was stretching the intention of the faculty vote. Reichman noted that he was troubled by the increasing intrusiveness of accreditation requirements. However these requirements are part of the world we live in.

M (Stronck)/S (Rasmussen) to accept all four of the proposals for local interpretations of PTR, post-tenure review, range elevation and periodic review of temporary faculty forwarded FAC by the Dean of CBE.

The motion passed 6-1-1.

b. Question of interpretation of PTR document
Reichman stated that a question has come up in the College of Education. A faculty member is coming up for promotion and tenure. The department has so few tenured faculty that the PTR committee was divided into PT and R sections. The candidate faculty member served on the retention committee but not the promotion and tenure committee. The question is whether this is legitimate.
M (Lima)/S (Rasmussen)/P (8-0) to state that the procedure used by the department in question is a legitimate interpretation of the CSUEB PTR document.

4. Old Business
   a. Discussion of Lecturer representation on Academic Senate
      M (Stronck) to follow the model of Long Beach, with one lecturer representative from each college except two from CLASS. The motion died for lack of a second.

      M (Rasmussen) /S (McPartland) to change the Senate bylaws to include one lecturer per college. The motion passed (7-1).

5. Adjournment
   M/S/P to adjourn the meeting at 4:13 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Tony Lima (acting secretary)