

FSAC Minutes
September 22, 2005

1:00 - 3:00 Sue Jameson Room

Present: Carlos Ayala, Catherine Freund, Sue Hayes, Carol Blackshire-Belay, Kathleen Scully, Geoffrey Skinner, Susan Stewart, Carmen Works, Helmut Wautischer.

Convened at 1:05 p.m.

Approval of Agenda: Approved.

Approval of Minutes: Approved as amended.

Reports:

C. Ayala provides update on Senate items. (a) Periodic review of university administrators (March 25, 1996) brings open question if comments in review survey need to be signed. Employer-employee relationship seems to warrant a different case law than SETE. The multiple choice part of the survey need not to be signed, only the comment section. The matter is still under investigation. (b) A report to the senate by R. Bruce shows unfavorable SSU statistics for student retention. (c) Plans for development of land across the Green Music Center (Burbank project) were presented to the Senate. (d) Structures and Function conducted a self-study about senate effectiveness and presented a recommendation.

C. Blackshire-Belay states that 15 tenure track searches will be conducted for SSU, to be closed by mid-December. 3-year pools for temporary faculty are due October 15th. RTP workshops are in progress and well attended. A document has been established to facilitate graduation. Each CSU campus is required to respond by December 2nd. The majority of the document refers to academic programs and not to faculty workload. FYE pilot is included, a reduction of credit hours is considered. The entire campus community is invited to provide feedback. S. Hayes states that departments may need to take a look at this document. C. Blackshire-Belay agrees and mentions that copies of the current draft are at CSU website, search for "coded memo 26." [A search did not produce any documents.]

H. Wautischer reports from Academic Freedom Subcommittee that the AFS target date for submitting to FSAC a draft for a revised AFS mission statement is Oct. 20th.

S. Hayes attended trustees meeting in Long Beach. Issues related to voluntary assessment tests for remedial mathematics and English for SSU-bound students were discussed. Logistical

problems remain to be solved, such as additional teacher training and students selection of classes during senior year. Related to a different subject, S. Hayes asked if the update of the SSU faculty handbook had been completed. This task started approx. 4 years ago.

G. Skinner states that there is no report from Sponsored Programs Subcommittee.

Business Items:

Item 1, WASC statement. R. Bruce and E. Sundberg oversee the changes to WASC report. There will be a repository of all comments made about WASC.

Item 2, Resolution on Excessive WTUs. C. Ayala will gather information on contract language, 20/15/12 WTU rationales, and related policies from B. Houghton, M. Dreisbach, and A. Merrifield. Different departments practice different interpretations of WTU expectations. Education is on record for up to 18 WTU, Economics up to 19 WTU. Such extra workload does not seem to translate into overtime pay. It is stated that faculty may not be scheduled for additional WTUs, except in unusual circumstances and if they volunteer to accept additional workload. Duress may be a factor in such decisions.

Item 3, Faculty recruitment policy. C. Ayala (Approval of Description), S. Hayes (Responsibilities and of Search Committee and Confidentiality), and C. Works (Recommendation of Candidates) prepare revisions to different sections of the current text for discussion. Regarding Recommendation of Candidates, C. Blackshire-Belay notes that the president hires, deans offer positions with approval of the provost. The issue of ranking was discussed. Alternative formulations were considered: “The department search committee should individually assess each candidate to form a pool of three most suitable candidates.” “Hiring committee will send 3 items to the dean – eligible pool of candidates, strength and weaknesses on each, recommended one candidate.” There may be a logistical need to have a ranking list, in case the first candidate does not accept the offer. However, this brings an undesired effect to have a second-choice colleague. A revised version of this section will be discussed at next meeting.

Item 4, University RTP policy. Moved to next meeting.

Adjourned 2:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Helmut Wautischer.