

FSAC Minutes

2/22/07 Convened at 1:10 pm

Present: C. Ayala, S. Hayes, M. Hess, G. Skinner, S. Tiwari, B. Warner (recorder), H. Wautischer

Absent: C. Blackshire-Belay (attending Access to Excellence meeting)

Agenda approved

Minutes approved with one spelling correction

Reports:

1. Chair of FSAC – C. Ayala

- a. The sabbatical policy will be brought to the Senate. There is a proposal to have the Schools provide a ranking; departments may rank as well. The criteria for awarding leave will be distributed. This matter may be moved from URTP's charge.
- b. FSAC's input on Access to Excellence is being solicited.
- c. There was a discussion of the Provost's role in RTP.
- d. The charge for the Professional Development Subcommittee went to Structure and Functions.
- e. Nominees for Chair-Elect of Faculty Senate are still being solicited.
- f. FSAC will need a new faculty member next year when S. Hayes's term is up. A new Chair will also need to be selected. S. Hayes also noted that an Arts and Humanities faculty member will be needed on the Faculty and Staff Housing subcommittee.

2. Faculty Affairs – C. Blackshire-Belay

No report

3. Academic Freedom Subcommittee – H. Wautischer

No report as there was no meeting.

4. Professional Development Subcommittee – M. Hess

- a. Workshops for Spring were announced:
 1. 2/27: Excellence in Teaching event in Schulz 3001
 2. 3/16: Student Writing with Scott Miller and Greta Vollmer
 3. 4/20: Grantwriting/Research
 4. 5/11: Deconstructing RTP
- b. The PDS received 51 responses to a survey given at Convocation of new faculty. This will help them plan their activities. Some respondents didn't want anything from PDS as they already felt overloaded.
- c. Attendance: We discussed participation rates; there were 25 attendees on the 2/16 workshop on Access to Excellence. Faculty preference tilts to Thursdays, when up to 50 attendees came to lunchtime workshops, but some want a tie-in to "Fridays at Four." Perhaps workshops could be offered twice on different days.

Agenda:

1. Access to Excellence: seems administrative in nature, having to do with operations, but not much about academics, support for programs, and campus climate.
 - a. Domain 1
 - i. There is no mention of re-entry services for adult students.
 - ii. Point 3: this is something the CSU already excels at
 - b. Domain 2
 - i. We already do this well
 - ii. Early Assessment means high school students relax once they've passed, don't keep current in subjects like Math
 - iii. Which set of standards do the high schools follow, CA or CSU?
 - c. Domain 3
 - i. Seems to be catering to business; as their needs shift constantly, should we be tailoring our curriculum to their needs?
 - d. Domain 4
 - i. Are already doing this for the most part
 - e. Domain 5
 - i. Questions about how teaching seems to be less valued than publishing/research
 - ii. No evaluation of Administrators is in evidence
 - iii. Workload issues are not addressed: speed-up, SFR, staff burdens with CMS requirements
 - iv. Decentralization means departments have to pick up slack, e.g. Scantrons
 - v. Decisions made by fiat rather than based on input from those who must implement them
 - f. Domain 6
 - i. S. Hayes gave a history of the role of the CSU in the California higher education scheme as a bridge between Community Colleges and UCs, vocationally-oriented.
 - ii. Discussion of the current role; we can't be all things for all people for underrepresented groups
 - iii. C. Ayala pointed out that we have the largest university system in the world, but each campus competes with the others
 - g. Domain 7 needs to be added regarding funding
 - i. This seems to be another unfunded mandate
 - ii. Community Colleges getting money for small classes for foundational courses
 - iii. If this is a public university, the public needs to fund it
 - iv. Requirement to use University services at exorbitant prices has a chilling effect on organizing gatherings, thus affecting collegiality and campus community
2. RTP Policy Working Document
 - a. Question about whether the Provost has academic responsibility; we concluded that the Faculty Affairs office has responsibility, not a specific officer.
 - b. Concern about adding another layer of administration to an already lengthy process.
 - c. Question about whether this additional layer of review helps build a better faculty.

- d. Practice at other campuses, including CSU Long Beach, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, San Jose State, and East Bay is that the Vice President of Academic Affairs is the one who supplies information to the President on RTP matters. Where the documents mention a Provost, this role is combined with that of the VP position.
- e. A proposal was made to create a cover sheet from Faculty Affairs that would be signed by either the VP or the Provost to indicate that they had reviewed the file. This would summarize the file and the findings. S. Hayes and B. Warner will work on a draft of the form for the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:57 pm.