CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Minutes of April 1, 2009

Members present: Jagdish Agrawal, Dee Andrews, Toni Fogarty, Dave Larson, Luther Strayer, Arthurlene Towner (Presidential Appointee) and Craig Wilson (Chair)

Members absent: Asha Rao, Doug Highsmith, and Julia Norton

Guests: None

Meeting called to order: 2:10 PM

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P, Agenda approved as submitted

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting on 3-18-09
   M/S/P, Minutes approved as amended - In 5.a., fifth line, replace “1935” with “1985”

3. Report of the Chair (Craig Wilson) – No report


5. Brief updates from the Subcommittees
   a. The PT&R Subcommittee
      The Committee will meet on Friday, April 3, to continue its review of departmental criteria for professional achievement and to continue its discussion regarding whether or not these criteria should be articulated rather than assumed. The expected last meeting will be Monday, April 6, and the Committee expects to submit its recommendations to FAC by Monday, April 13 for discussion at the April 15th meeting. The Committee has collected input from a variety of stakeholders, including faculty and administration.

   b. The Lecturer Subcommittee
      The Subcommittee will meet again on Tuesday, April 7

   c. The Online-Hybrid Special Subcommittee
      The Subcommittee has not met this quarter. The Subcommittee submitted its recommendations regarding language changes to the PT&R and Student Evaluation Policy at the FAC meeting of February 18th.

   d. The Academic Dishonesty Special Subcommittee
      The Subcommittee expects to have its recommendations for a revised version of the policy within the next week or two. The recommendations include making clarifications and strengthening wording that calls for a more proactive and preventative role among faculty. The Subcommittee will not provide recommended language changes for the catalog since it believes that catalog copy should be created after the final policy has been approved.
6. Old Business

a. Report and recommendations of the Online Student Evaluation Working Group
   In its report, the working group identified what it viewed as the primary issues with online student evaluation: verification of enrolled student, lack of comparability between in-person and online evaluations, likelihood of increase in inappropriate comments in online evaluations, anonymity and confidentiality, and participation rate. To address these issues, the working group recommended the following: use of course Blackboard site as the student evaluation portal, timing of the evaluation should be the choice of the instructor and the week for evaluation should be clearly identified for the students, amount of time to complete the online evaluation should be the same as for the in-person evaluation, exclusion of evaluations that contain inappropriate language or comments, and the for statement from either the President of Provost regarding the importance of evaluation, student anonymity and confidentiality, and exclusion of evaluations with inappropriate language/comments.

   • After the report, FAC discussed some of the following issues:
     • Length of time for in-person and online evaluation – perhaps 20 minutes
     • Scheduling of the evaluations – ordinarily, but not before, the final week of instruction
     • Requiring students to complete the online evaluation
     • How courses will be selected for student evaluation
     • Should all courses (in-person, hybrid, online) have online evaluations

b. Administrative Review Document changes:
   (1) Clarification/revision of Article V, Sections B. & C. Acting Chairs
       Julia Norton’s suggested changes to the language were reviewed and discussed. The discussion included the following points:
       • The suggested changes in B.2. and B.3. are in conflict with A.2. A.2. outlines the appointment process for all instances of vacancy in the Chair – “or whenever for any reason a vacancy appears.”
       • FAC has not yet determined if the advisory committee should be a standing committee or if administration should appoint an Acting Chair for “a period not to exceed on and one half quarters.”
       • Frequency of administration appointments of an Acting Chair.
       • Concern that revising the policy should be done carefully and thoughtfully but also in a timely manner

   (2) Earlier referral: Possible additions of Administrators to the Appendix
       No action taken

c. Revision of the Academic Dishonesty Policy
   No action; item has been referred to the Academic Dishonesty Special Subcommittee. See item 5.d.

d. Evaluation of Temporary Faculty (to be in compliance with the CBA)
   No action taken; has been referred to the Lecturer Subcommittee. See item 5.b.
e. Online/Hybrid Policy implementation
   No action; item has been referred to the Online-Hybrid Special Subcommittee. See item 5.c.

f. Referral to FAC regarding revision of the PT&R Policy
   No action; item has been referred to the PT&R Subcommittee. See item 5.a.

g. Evaluation of Coaches referral (effective in 09-10)
   No action; item has been referred to the Lecturer Subcommittee. See item 5.b.

7. New Business
   a. Post-tenure Review modification request (CEAS) – No action taken
   b. Faculty Office Hours (referral February 18, 2009) – No action taken

8. Adjournment
   a. M/S/P: Meeting was adjourned at 4:05 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Toni E. Fogarty