During the academic year, FAC proposed the following action items to the Academic Senate:

05-06 FAC 1 Veterans Day Holiday and the Ten Year Calendar (Senate approved, 11.29.05)
05-06 FAC 2 Proposed Membership of the Outstanding Professor Selection Subcommittee (ExComm approved, 11.15.05)
05-06 FAC 3 Endowed Faculty Honors (Senate approved 2.7.06)
05-06 FAC 4 PT&R Document Section 4.2.1b (Senate approved 2.7.06)
05-06 FAC 5 Proposed Membership of the Subcommittee on Lecturers (ExComm approved, 2.14.06)
05-06 FAC 6 The Use of “Schools” as an Organizational Unit (Discussed at ExComm 2.28.06 and referred back to FAC. See Don Sawyer’s 3.7.06 memo to FAC)
05-06 FAC 7 Faculty Office, Laboratory, and Studio Space (Senate approved, 5.16.06)
05-06 FAC 8 Proposed Changes to the Range Elevation Policy and Procedures (Senate approved, 5.30.06)

In addition to our action items, FAC considered the following items which I discuss below:

1) The Process for Selection of Outstanding Professor
2) Deadlines for submittal of PTR dossiers
3) Student Evaluation of Online Courses
4) The Ten-Year Calendar
5) The Educational Effectiveness Report for WASC
6) The Professional Leave Committee
7) Lecturer Representation on the Academic Senate
8) Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

1) The Process for Selection of Outstanding Professor
FAC discussed how to increase the number of applicants for this annual award. We suggested that the selection committee be appointed and convened early in the academic year so that its members might encourage applications. We discussed several ways to improve the process: we considered having colleges recommend applicants; we proposed looking at how the process is done on other campuses; and we suggested clarifying the expectations for this award. Some minor corrections should also be made to the documents, since we no longer submit our honoree to a system wide competition. Other issues took precedence, and we reach no final conclusions. This is an issue that FAC should revisit in 06-07AY.

2) Deadlines for submittal of PTR dossiers
I raised this issue as chair. According to our PTR process new faculty members must submit a dossier for retention approximately six weeks after they have begun teaching (deadline Nov. 10). The University sets this early deadline in order to meet a contractual agreement which follows an AAUP recommendation: “The President shall notify a probationary faculty unit employee who has served fewer than (2) years of probation of the final decision on retention no later than February 15.” Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

Over the years we have heard many complaints about this early deadline from our new colleagues, who have recently completed a rigorous application process and have minimal instructional materials to submit. Nonetheless, FAC members presented good arguments about the value of preparing the annual dossier early. However, at a system wide conference on the PTR process, FAC Presidential Appointee Pablo Areola and I learned that other campuses automatically grant new faculty first-year retention and thus alleviate the burden of dossier preparation during their first few weeks of teaching. Since we both thought this would be a good idea, I recommend that FAC revisit this issue.

3) Student Evaluation of Online Courses
FAC had several conversations about online teaching and about a process for student evaluations of these courses. (Please see winter and spring quarter minutes). We heard reports from Carl Bellone’s office thanks to Sue Opp about different methods of online course evaluation. Five faculty members who teach courses online volunteered to have their spring courses evaluated using blackboard; however, to the best of my knowledge, there was no method for distributing these evaluations to us. The practical concerns include not only finding an appropriate system for evaluation but also designating an appropriate department to assume responsibility for the evaluation of online courses. We also discussed the appropriateness of the student course evaluation questions for both online and regular classes. Since there was no solution to this problem, this will certainly be a topic to revisit in 06-07AY.

4) The Ten-Year Calendar
FAC and Senate discussions of the academic calendar raised larger issues about the quarter calendar. In particular, faculty expressed concerns that students and faculty in classes that meet one evening a week be notified in a timely manner that the class might be meeting on a different night than scheduled to compensate for a holiday. Faculty also have ongoing concerns about evening classes that hold only nine sessions because of holidays.

5) The Educational Effectiveness Report for WASC
FAC agreed to provide feedback whenever necessary on the WASC report.

6) The Professional Leave Committee
This past year several concerns were raised about this committee, and FAC discussed the problems and possible remedies. A review of the procedures, however, suggests that any perceived problems this year might be anomalous and that better instructions to the committee members rather than changing the evaluation process would remedy future
problems. FAC might want to review the procedures for the Professional Leave Committee and revisit this issue in the 06-07AY.

7) Lecturer Representation on the Academic Senate
In AY 06-07, FAC will review the representation of lecturers on the Academic Senate. See 4.25.06 Senate minutes and 5.3.06 charge from Senate Chair Sawyer.

After a hiatus, this year the Subcommittee on Lecturers met to make recommendations on the range elevation document. Other than the two elected lecturers who serve on the Senate, this subcommittee is the only venue where lecturers have a voice, limited as it is, in faculty governance. As a subcommittee of FAC, the bylaws require that the FAC chair, presidential appointee, and one elected FAC member serve on this committee. Because of the demands placed on the time of these members, the subcommittee focuses on referrals from FAC and has no time to discuss important issues regarding the status of lecturers. For example, in the late 90s, a subcommittee on lecturers conducted a useful and illuminating survey of lecturers and their concerns. Yet since then there has been no follow-up nor a formal committee for addressing the concerns raised. I would recommend that during its deliberations about lecturer representation, FAC consider recommending a committee comparable to the Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee as an appropriate venue for addressing the ongoing concerns of our lecturers.

8) Procedures for the Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
At our meeting of 5.17.06, FAC discussed faculty concerns with the process for post-tenure review (Evaluation of Tenured Faculty). In our review of the procedures document (http://www.csuhayward.edu/OAA/teneval.pdf), we clarified that a) post-tenure review in all colleges except CEAS, which has established its own approved document, are governed by this document, b) the evaluation is based on “instructional performance including an evaluation of currency in the field” (6.0), and c) a department or college may elect to establish its own procedures which would subject be to FAC review.