

FSAC Minutes
January 29, 2004
1:00-3:00 Sue Jameson Room

Present: Elizabeth Stanny, Carlos Ayala, Catherine Freund, Judith Hunt, Helmut Wautischer, John Wingard, Carmen Works.

Meeting Began 1:05

Agenda Amendments: At the request of H. Wautischer, report from the Academic Freedom Committee and a discussion of faculty response to budget crises were added to the Agenda.

Approval of Agenda: Approved as amended.

Approval of Minutes: Approved

Reports:

E. Stanny: Resolution for compensation for lecturers serving on Faculty Senate was placed on the Senate Agenda. The version on the agenda reflects changes made in the second reading by FSAC: the resolve clause was changed from ~~entitled~~ to receive compensation to ~~eligible~~ to receive compensation.

Provost Ochoa is scheduled to come to the next Executive Committee meeting to ask Senate to extend last year=s reduction in compensation for another year.

Syllabus policy is scheduled to go to the Executive Committee.

Grants and Contracts Policy also on Senate Agenda.

The impact of the budget cuts on lecturers was discussed at the Advisory Committee meeting. Per explanation by Judith Hunt: Under worst case scenario (assuming passage of Prop. 57), could meet budget cuts by cutting FERP faculty and temporary faculty. FERP would be eligible to take a 1-year leave of absence without affecting their retirement.

J. Hunt: Two faculty searches underway ~~C~~Special Education and Physics & Astronomy.

J. Wingard: Has cutting probationary faculty been discussed in relation to the budget crises?

J. Hunt: It has not been discussed.

While no formal discussion on cuts has taken place, it has been suggested that closing all small campuses would be less effective than closing one large campus. If golden handshakes are offered, decision to accept must me made between March 31 and July.

If Prop. 57 passes, enrollment is expected to be reduced by 5%.

E. Stanny: Must revise Emeritus Policy to make wording in paragraph III.A consistent with earlier revisions.

III.A At the beginning of each semester, the Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs and the Vice President for Student Affairs shall publish to the campus community and present to the Academic Senate the current list of faculty retired **since the beginning of the previous year semester**.

It was understood that semester would mean January thru August and September thru

December.

Sue Hays (Chair, URTP Committee) joined meeting to discuss issues the URTP committee would like FSAC to consider.

The first issue concerned student and peer evaluations in the newer forms of pedagogy, specifically on-line courses. Current evaluators must observe the faculty member. How do we *observe* on-line course instructors?

E. Stanny: Tom Nolan attended earlier meeting to discuss this matter.

S. Hays and FSAC agreed that it would be appropriate for departments conducting on-line or other alternate format courses to amend their evalution policies to make evalutions of on-line instructors relevant and comparable to evaluations classroom instructors. These ammended policies should be submitted to the URTP for review.

S. Hays: The second issue was to consider reducing the amount of paper used in the RTP process. Excessive copies of RTP documents are being made as reviewers at each level make a copy of the documents before forwarding them to the next level. In addition, the URTP commiteee makes 5 copies for its own use.

S. Hays and FSAC discussed pros and cons of different alternatives including redistributing the five copies made by the URTP committee back down the line after the review in lieu of copies currently being made as the documents proceed up the line. It was also suggested that the documents could be put on a CD instead of paper copy. Another suggestion was to make one copy of the document that would be made available to the committee.

FSAC agreed to consider the paper issue.

S. Hays: The third issues was in regard to plagerism. Department committees often lift verbatim sections from candidates self-assessment letters and use it as part of the departments review document.

J. Hunt pointed out that in the past URTP has sent letters to departments chastising them for doing this.

S. Hays and J. Hunt both emphasized that these letters should not be sent to the candidates themselves.

H. Wautischer: Report from Academic Freedom Committee on campus food policy. L. Schlereth to meet with committee on February 19th to discuss objections to the current food policy.

E. Stanny: Suggested that the Academic Freedom committee look at the *Black Book* to look at the level of expenditures on food.

J. Hunt: Suggested the committee should present the problems that the current policy causes departments before getting into issues of expenditures.

H. Wautischer: Suggested that the faculty should have plans for action with respect to budget issues. These could include joint actions with involving students, faculty and administration.

There should be a clear vision from the faculty and administration for a response to a worst case scenario; possibly some way to directly leverage the state.

Does it make economic sense to lower admissions numbers?

E. Stanny: Only portion of tuition costs actually covered by student fees. Majority comes from state. Lowering admissions lowers state expenditures.

Must be careful not to alienate large number of students by focusing on small numbers.

H. Wautischer: Karlsrud has suggested spreading impacts of budget cuts across the campus.

J. Hunt: It is already happening.

Reiterated that SSU is small potatoes in overall CSU picture.

Discussed ways that faculty can respond to the crisis. There currently exist two extreme positions: a position of total inflexibility or static position and at the other extreme total flexibility or total change. Response must be in middle ground. Must make changes where we can, but recognize that in some cases there will be limits to what can be changed.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Submitted by John Wingard