

Academic Senate of the California State University  
Faculty Affairs Committee

Minutes  
March 8-9, 2006

In attendance: Glen Brodowsky; Bernadette Cheyne; Manzar Foroohar; Jan Gregory; Jacquelyn Kegley; Paul Persons; Robert McNamara; Michael Reagan; Rudy Vanterpool, Romey Sabalius. Observer: Ron Kroman, retired faculty. Staff: Lorie Roth.

1. Approval of Agenda

MSP (Kegley) that we drop the item “Horowitz on Tenure” from our agenda.

MSP (McNamara) that we put the item “NY Times article on online monitoring” on a watch list.

Questions were raised about discussing CO responses to FAC resolutions, resulting in its placement on our agenda at a time certain of 11:45 a.m. This issue is related to Brodowsky’s survey on campus responses to Academic Senate actions, to be placed on the April agenda.

2. Approval of minutes for February 10, 2006.

3. Announcements

Gregory reported on the Executive Committee meeting. Vice Chancellor Gary Reichard was present and Jan reported that her impressions of him were positive. Kegley and Foroohar shared their impressions, also positive.

The Senate Office needs to know which resolutions will appear on the plenary agenda. It appears that we can share the title for the Textbook Prices resolution, the External Security resolution, and the resolution on “Workload for Faculty in EdD Programs.”

4. Reports

McNamara reported on the RTP Workshop, at which there were sessions on New Faculty Orientation; Probationary Plans; and Mentoring. He complimented Roth on her introduction and found the Provosts’ Panel very useful but thought it would have also been useful to include some faculty on the panels or a faculty panel. Having attended the workshop on Probationary Plans, McNamara thought it would have been helpful to have some faculty leading this workshop. Foroohar opined that there should have been some CFA representatives since they often hear faculty concerns; a joint effort would have been fruitful. An important issue for joint cooperation would be the role of service and particularly Shared Governance in RTP. Persons indicated that he had heard that there was discussion of eliminating University-wide RTP Committees, which he thought would be disastrous. He also raised the issue of clear correlation of Probationary Plans (or Progress Plans) with university RTP criteria. Gregory raised the question of whether campus decisions reflected contract provisions; Roth reported that several years ago FAC did a study of campus RTP criteria and processes because of a major incident at

San Diego State that came before the legislature. Gregory asked Roth to provide us with the url for this report, and about implementation on the campuses of a reduced teaching load for new faculty. Brodowsky reported that at SM, department RTP criteria are vetted through the campus senate. McNamara said that at SO the RTP files go directly to the President -- not by way of the Provost. Foroohar felt that eliminating university committees would not be appropriate, noting that SLO puts emphasis not only on scholarship but also on getting funding. This seems to be a way to raise money for the university.

In addition, she asked, had the workshop been the result of a focus group for new faculty? (Roth said it had.) Reagan argued strongly against any attempt to make the RTP processes a system-wide matter. Roth said she was confident that there is no attempt to make RTP criteria or processes a system-wide matter and did not believe that such would come about.

Two issues dominated in the focus groups: 1) workload, e.g. teaching, scholarship and service; 2) of clarity about RTP criteria. Roth said that Gregory had advocated a role for CFA in the RTP Workshop but that the final decision was to have it administratively oriented, and reported that the Workshop on "New Faculty Orientation" featured the "Faculty Orientation Process at San Francisco," which is a five day affair and involves CFA and a broad constituency. It was very well-received. Gregory suggested that if another workshop is held it should be at a place other than the Chancellor's Office. McNamara thought that the faculty workload issue ought to be the topic of another workshop. Gregory inquired whether promotion and tenure decisions are made on most campuses by separate committees; it appears that campus processes vary. Sabalius noted that his senate has developed an overview chart on how RTP processes are handled on each of the campuses, and will send it to the committee.

Gregory suggested that it might be helpful to work up a document that states basic principles for the RTP so that there is a "common score or tune" for those involved and not "too many cooks stirring the pot." Roth will get us the new report on "Faculty Retention." As very few leave the system and most get tenure, she asked, advocating a user-friendlier process, "Why do we put them through a "hazing" process?" She cited as parallel the way we treat students, namely, not to flunk them out, but to encourage them to make it through the university. Brodowsky indicated that there are both formative and evaluative processes: we hire and then work with these people every day, so why do we need this complex, onerous process? Sabalius argued that since the persons who best know the candidate are those at the department level it seems appropriate to have the primary decisions made at that level.

Parsons reported that at the recent meeting of the Presidents all but one claimed they could meet their 2% enrollment and he believed that this would raise new workload issues.

## 5. Resolutions

### Re-examination of the faculty salary structure

Discussion turned to this resolution from FGA. It was suggested that the title be restated as "Resolution of Concern about Faculty Salary Structure." In the Resolved, the phrase "on-going" was deleted as redundant.

Sabalius raised questions about “grey areas” including salary steps for those at the top of the salary scale. Committee members wondered whether we might be stepping into issues that will lead to a slippery slope. Sabalius will bring this up again next year after a contract is signed.

There were also concerns raised about the rationale especially on the statements about the Chancellor’s five year plan. Foroohar and McNamara will consult with FGA members about this over lunch.

**Revised resolution came from FGA at 4 p.m.** The general opinion was that we would go forward to co-sponsor, informing them that if the modifications are not made, we will be speaking to amend the resolution. The modifications desired are to insert “in the current contract or bargaining” before “address” and “strongly” before “urge.”

#### Chancellor’s responses to actions of the CSU Academic Senate.

Sabalius introduced this issue, pointing out a distinctive difference in tone in the October and November responses and those from January. He was especially concerned about the chiding about intervening in collective bargaining issues. McNamara and Gregory both expressed the view that these responses are not surprising and that we will not change his rhetoric nor does the Chancellor even have any requirement to respond in a certain manner.

#### Resolution on faculty workload issues in doctoral programs

Gregory introduced this resolution for discussion. Kroman suggested that we insert “all” before graduate programs. Reagan suggested that we spell out the meaning of NCATE, i.e. National Association for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and delete the phrase “the Parties” in parentheses. There was discussion about the emphasis of the resolution. Is it primarily on the new doctoral programs? If so, then the first resolution referring to “all graduate programs” ought to be eliminated. A number of committee members thought the doctoral program issue was timely and that if the committee was going to address workload in post-baccalaureate and graduate programs it should work on a separate resolution on this problem. It was decided to keep the first resolution, adding the adjective “enduring” to concern and changing “graduate programs” to “post-baccalaureate” programs. The rationale was also modified: “supervision and advising” and “serving on dissertation committees” were added to the tasks that these faculty have to perform.

#### Resolution on external security on campuses.

The committee turned to a review of this resolution and made a number of modifications. There was extensive discussion of the appropriateness of the resolution and the committee finally decided that this was an important issue that should be brought to the attention of campuses and thus allow them to develop local policies and procedures. The specification of suggested content for the guidelines and policies was reduced, although the reference to the issue of diversity of campus communities was maintained.

#### Report by Foroohar on SLO survey of new faculty

Foroohar shared copies of slides from their campus report done by junior faculty on the SLO campus. 108 of a pool of 205 returned the survey. A major issue that emerged from the survey is

that many new faculty members are leaving within the first three years. Foroohar suggested that we recommend that other campuses form task forces to undertake such a survey and make recommendations. Other possibilities are an ASCSU Task Force or a Joint CO/ASCSU, and CFA Task Force.

Resolution on faculty influences on cost of academic textbooks.

Time Certain: Ray Murillo, Associate Director, Student Programs and Student Academic Support.

Murillo reported on the recent legislative hearing on costs, at which the President and another officer of Associated Students testified as did some CSU Bookstore Managers, some Publishers, and a representative from CCC. The main topic was bundled texts. The loan program has not taken off; CSUF has a program but has very few texts. Community Colleges are looking at public domain materials. A representative of the American Association of University Publishers reported that institutions came to them to urge development of bundled materials in order to assist students as well as to help budget problems. Another publisher reported that the cost of texts is among other issues such as faculty use.

Some FAC members felt the resolution seems to lecture faculty and to blame them for the problems. Persons expressed a concern that we not ignore the demands of excellence that often require new editions or supplemental materials; Brodowsky pointed out that textbook costs have always been high and part of the experience of going to a university. Kegley raised a question about the Digital Marketplace project that had as one of its major goals cooperation with publishers in order to provide materials digitally and to thus reduce textbook costs. Gregory inquired whether part of the problem lies with our campus bookstores, especially those that have been threatened with takeover by Barnes and Noble and other commercial bookstores. Sabalius indicated that one of the reasons for this resolution was to support concerns of students; McNamara said that use of e-reserve reduces costs and asked if it is available on all campuses. Murillo agreed to research this. Persons pointed out that another issue is the number of students on financial aid: it is important to address those students who really do have financial difficulties and cannot purchase textbooks. Foroohar noted that on her campus the view is that faculty members are the problem in this matter; Vanterpool argued that there are just too many variables at work in this issue to allow us to deal with this problem fully in a resolution: Cheyne supported the idea that it may be impossible to frame a resolution that can capture all the issues and to be fair to all parties. McNamara moved that this resolution be tabled. This motion passed.

4:10 p.m. Hank Reichman, from the Executive Committee, joined us. He reported that the Executive Committee had a very positive day-long discussion of a number of issues with Vice Chancellor Reichard. There was also a joint meeting with FGA and a conference call with Allison Jones concerning a bill that wants a single lower division GE package for CSU and UC. This will be monitored and raises serious concerns.

The committee closed for the day at 4:15 p.m. with the intent of reconvening again Thursday at 8:45 a.m. to briefly consider the disposition of the other items on our agenda.