

FSAC Minutes
November 4, 2004
1:00 – 3:00 Sue Jameson Room

Present: John Wingard, Carlos Ayala, Sandy Brown (student A.S. representative), Catherine Freund, Sue Hayes, Geoffrey Skinner, Helmut Wautischer, Carmen Works. Also attending as TC: Eduardo Ochoa and Santos Torres.

Meeting began 1:05 p.m.

Approval of Agenda:

Approved with the addition of TC 2:00 p.m. – Provost Eduardo Ochoa and Administrative Intern from San Francisco State University, Dr. Santos Torres.

Approval of Minutes: Approved.

Reports:

J. Wingard: Wants to send all committee Chairs a copy of the changes to RTP. He will wait to send the changes until just before the next Chairs' meeting. He said the 1st reading of the Endowed Chairs Policy would occur at the next Academic Senate meeting. There was a *heads up* on a restructuring of GE.

No report by B. Houghton, Faculty Affairs.

Business:

1. Academic Freedom Subcommittee

There was discussion about the committee membership and history. The Structure and Functions Committee is in charge of appointing committee members. The committee has existed for a long time, but it has not always met. Members of Senate committees typically are selected through Academic Senate committee elections, and that is being recommended for the Academic Freedom Subcommittee. It is also recommended that there be one student representative and one FSAC representative. Sue proposed that this be accepted on 1st reading. A motion was made, seconded, and approved.

2. Endowed Chair Policy

It was advocated that the Endowed Chair Policy be restructured using language, which is flexible regarding amount and dates, and that teaching may be specified at the time of endowment. To provide for flexibility, it was recommended that not too much be written into the policy. Concern was expressed over language in 1B of the current policy, specifically the words *appropriate consultative body*, and it was asserted that when selecting *appropriate consultative bodies*, the weight should be placed on faculty representation. There was discussion about the fees, which may be set. Another issue discussed was who is eligible to receive an endowment. John said any faculty could receive an endowment; full time, part time, temporary, and volunteer faculty is eligible. That includes counselors, librarians, and SSP's. There was discussion about the difference between the first sentence of IIA and IIC. It was decided to retain those sections as written. A number of concerns were expressed. Questions were raised about funding pressures if the rate of return is not enough. It was said there are plans for a reserve fund. In case of a shortfall, faculty has retreat rights so the burden is shifted to departments. There was a question about what would happen if two Assistant Faculty had just been hired, and there was a shortfall. Sue said normally in tight financial times, sections would go to tenured and tenure track faculty. It was recommended that any cuts be made in layoff order. The endowment would not go away, even if there were a shortfall. It was asked whether details, such as coverage and rules, should be specified in the policy or in the details of the

endowment. There was discussion about the amount of reserve that should be built into an endowment, and whether it should be 3%, a one year reserve, or another specified amount.

Time certain: Dr. Eduardo Ochoa and Dr. Santos Torres

Dr. Ochoa said the University builds a buffer into endowments and takes a conservative approach. He was asked about faculty retreat rights and said an endowed chair is not counted as part of the department allotment.

3. Faculty Recruitment Policy

Questions were raised as to why FSAC is being asked to review the Faculty Recruitment Policy and what triggered the request. It was noted that there is a faculty search in the School of Business. Also, there was speculation that the request to review this policy is due to the retirement of Judith Hunt, who has been in charge of faculty recruitment for a number of years. There is concern that along with her departure there will be the loss of her institutional memory. However, Sue said there are many faculty recruitment documents in J. Hunt's office. It was proposed that a subcommittee be formed to work with Judith on this.

4. RTP Policy

Dr. Ochoa said there are a number of issues regarding RTP, for which the current policy would not be appropriate. Some departments have explicit expectations for RTP, and it was suggested that all departments should have them. It was advocated that they be reviewed regularly and reviewed upon the hire of new faculty. Others expressed concern regarding workload. If the policy calls for but does not specify criteria, faculty might develop the belief that they need to work overtime to reflect scholarship. It was asked what relative weight is placed on teaching, scholarship, and service. This emphasized the need to state these expectations in the policy. There was unease with anonymous administrative reviews, which are still occurring with surveys. Another issue was the layer of expectations. There are the University expectations, the School's, and the Department's. Developing a template would prevent grievances, and it would simplify the process for the faculty, the Schools and the RTP committee.

Meeting was adjourned at 2:45 P.M

Notes were taken by Catherine Freund.