

Minutes: February 8th, 2000

SFSU Academic Senate

Minutes of February 8, 2000

The Academic Senate was called to order by Chair Terrell at 2:10 p.m.

Senate Members Present:

Aaron, Eunice; Alvarez, Alvin; Avila, Guadalupe; Bernstein, Marian; Boyle, Andrea; Collier, James; Concolino, Christopher; Consoli, Andres; Corrigan, Robert; Cullers, Susan; Duke, Jerry; Fehrman, Ken; Ferretti, Charlotte; Fox-Wolfgramm, Susan; Gillotte, Helen; Goldsmith, Helen; Gonzales, Angela; Graham, Michael; Gregory, Jan; Harnly, Caroline; Hom, Marlon; Hu, Sung; Hubler, Barbara; Jerris, Scott; Johnson, Dane; Johnson, Sharon; La Belle, Thomas; Langbort, Carol; McKeon, Midori; Moallem, Minoo; O'ate, Abdiel; Raggio, Marcia; Smith, Miriam; Strong, Rob; Swanson, Deborah; Terrell, Dawn; Turitz, Mitch; Vaughn, Pamela; Wick, Jeanne; Wolfe, Bruce; Wong, Alfred; Yee, Darlene.

Senate Members Absent: Craig, JoAnn; Edwards, James; Cancino,

Herlinda; Elia, John(exc.); Eisman, Gerald; Bartscher, Patricia(exc.); Kelley, James(exc.); Scoble, Don(exc.); Sagisi, Jaymee.

Guests: J. Kassiola, G. West.

Announcements and Report

Chair's Report

- Terrell will be going to Long Beach for a meeting of CSU campus Academic Senate Chairs; she will report on this at our next meeting.
- Terrell also announced future Senate forums on lecturers and on engagement.

Agenda Item #1 -- Approval of the Agenda for February 8, 2000

M/S/P (Vaughn, Duke) to change Agenda Item #6 from an action item to a discussion item.

Sung Hu asked for further explanation. Terrell explained that there were questions about the policy that came to the attention of the Executive Committee over the past days, and some changes need to be made; for example, the SSI language is not consistent with the FMI language. We also anticipated that additional questions and points of clarification might come up with discussion today.

The agenda was **approved as amended**.

Agenda Item #2 -- Approval of Minutes for December 7, 1999

The minutes were **approved as printed**.

Agenda Item #3 -- Report from Statewide Senators

Eunice Aaron reminded Senators that minutes from the most recent Statewide Senate meetings have been emailed and highlighted some items from the plenary session. The Senate saw for the first time a Trustee document with the number of units for an undergraduate degree; this document caused palpable tension; the Senate agreed on a resolution asking the Trustees to refrain from action until campuses and Statewide Senate can have some discussion. Aaron summarized one other item of particular interest: the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs Committee will be discussing campus/senate relationships and governmental affairs; this is interesting now because of the effect term limits have now on the knowledge level of the people elected to do the people's business.

Aaron also recounted Chancellor Reed's response to a question on what he meant by "common calendars." Reed answered that common calendars does not mean that all campuses will have the same starting and ending period, and he offered no further response. But the Chancellor's Office is pretty far along in eliminating the campuses that are on the quarter system.

Darlene Yee reported on work completed by the Academic Affairs Committee, which reviewed nine items of business. Four resolutions were presented by the Academic Affairs Committee. The Statewide Academic Senate passed the Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Undergraduate Degrees (mentioned by Aaron above), which recommends postponing action on the revision of Title 5 Regulations until after the CSU Academic Senate's May plenary. The Academic Affairs Committee discussed the recommended change on lowering the CSU graduation requirement from 124 to 120 semester units, noting the Cornerstones and Governor's budget recommendation to shorten time to graduate and that most universities across the nation use 120 units as a minimum unit requirement.

Yee also reported that the Statewide Academic Senate moved, as first reading items, the following three resolutions: Enrollment Management Policy (urging the CSU Board of Trustees to adhere to some specific principles when considering a policy for managing enrollment on the campuses); Impaction Policy (urging the Board to adopt certain specific principles for campuses and programs when implementing enrollment management and impaction); Proposed Title 5 Revisions to Admission Criteria (endorses proposed revisions and makes modifications to the trustee policy on grade point average calculation used to determine freshman admission eligibility).

Yee summarized the following updates discussed by the Academic Affairs Committee: Proposed Community Service Graduation Requirement (campus feedback will be posted

to a website at <http://www.co.calstate.edu/aa/cls/csreq.html>; CSU Community Service Learning Coordinator Erica Freihage feels that there has been some noticeable softening of the Governor's position on a mandatory requirement and a possibility of funding for community service learning); Council of Library Directors (COLD) Draft Library Strategic Plan (input should be submitted ASAP); Common Articulation Numbering System (CANS) Retreat; Stockton Multiple-Campus Regional Center (original plan does not hold much hope; there is a feasibility study in progress); CSU-Channel Islands (the plan is currently being worked on).

Jan Gregory summarized the work of the CSU Academic Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, much of which will focus on Year-Round-Operations, specifically common calendars. On the number of units for an academic degree, there has been a call for campus review of major and GE programs. The reduction is ostensibly not a way of reducing the number of breadth units. They will also be addressing the intellectual property issue.

Gregory also summarized the AAHE meeting, where this campus was well represented. There was a focus on matters like having not only a university mission statement but also college and department mission statements for RTP purposes to which the reward system would be tied. There was a lot of discussion on intellectual property and the role of part-time faculty.

Gregory added that the Statewide Senate appointed three faculty representatives--including Gregory--to a committee to discuss workload, which was formerly comprised only of Provosts and Vice Presidents.

Terrell commented on Yee's mention of the community service learning update, adding that locally our President is Chair of the CSU advisory committee on this issue, which has prepared a draft statement, "Engaged Campuses, Engaged System," and the Director of our Office of Community Service Learning, Gerald Eisman, has prepared a response to that. Both are available at the Senate office.

Agenda Item #4 -- Report from Pamela Vaughn, Chair of Programs for AsiloCampus 2000

Pamela Vaughn summarized the work of AsiloCampus 2000 while encouraging feedback on future retreats. 205 attended, and the primary goal was to offer a diverse program at a low cost, which was possible with the assistance of Conference Programs, the President and the Provost, the academic deans, and the Bookstore. The Committee is now evaluating the assessment forms, and anyone with ideas about whether we should have a campus retreat and what that kind of retreat should have should contact the Committee.

Vaughn finished by thanking all the members of the planning committee: Bonnie

Homan, Alvin Alvarez, Paul Barnes, Jerry Duke, Marlon Hom, Donna Ryan, Dawn Terrell, Susan Taylor, Mitch Turitz, Penny Warren, and, especially, Bernadette Pichay and Susan Cullers of the Academic Senate office.

Agenda Item #5 -- Proposed Revisions to the Bachelor of Arts in Comparative

Literature and the Minor in Comparative Literature

Curriculum Review and Approval Committee Chair Alfred Wong introduced this consent item. The College of Humanities and the Department of World and Comparative Literature are proposing changes to the major and minor in Comparative Literature. These changes are the result of extensive research into current comparable undergraduate programs throughout the United States, an evaluation of curriculum and staffing issues, and more importantly our desire to provide a curriculum which is the best possible and which meets current expectations within the discipline.

M/S/P (Fehrman, Goldsmith) to second reading.

Terrell called the question.

The vote was taken and the proposal was **approved unanimously**.

Agenda Item #6 -- Proposed Policy on Service Salary Step Increase

Terrell introduced the discussion of the proposed policy on Service Salary Step Increase (SSI), first outlining the changes anticipated by the Senate Executive Committee: 1) have language that is consistent with the Faculty Merit Increase (FMI) policy, indicating that reviews for SSIs will occur in departments or equivalent units; 2) indicate that the review procedure that the department settles on for FMI will be the same for SSI.

Mitch Turitz commented that on FMIs, the administration line was that FMIs are not a personnel or HRT matter, and it seems to him that SSIs are a personnel matter, but we are trying to make the two identical. Terrell replied that it is a misconception to say that we are trying to make FMIs and SSIs "identical," but we are trying to join the two processes. **Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)** Chair Marlon Hom added that Turitz has brought up a built-in conflict that comes from the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), which cannot be removed. FMI is not a personnel process and SSI is; this might be reconciled by looking at the criteria for awarding the increases. For SSI, the main concern is the 24 Weighted Teaching Units with, as Terrell clarified, "satisfactory" performance. Hom also added another problem that came up: the FAR has to be part of it, and the FAR is an "annual" report; however, for part-time faculty, an annual report is not sufficient.

Vaughn suggested caution in making FMI and SSI committees the same if

one is a personnel process and the other is not. Hom echoed how difficult it is to resolve this issue. Terrell concurred that this is a major issue, for the FMI policy says that all faculty can sit on those committees but typically only tenured faculty can serve on personnel committees.

Gregory replied to a couple of items, first taking up what defines a personnel matter while also calling on the help of Gerald West: her understanding is that personnel matters include hiring, evaluation, retention, and tenure.

31.38 in the CBA reads "Such a determination shall be after consideration of material in the employee's Personnel Action File."

Gerald West added that Article 15 of the CBA spells out what is meant by faculty evaluation: "The term 'evaluation' as used in this Article shall refer to either a Periodic Evaluation or a Performance Review." He added, reading from 15.18, "A periodic evaluation of a faculty unit employee shall normally be required for the following purposes: evaluation of temporary faculty unit employees; evaluation of probationary faculty unit employees who are not subject to a performance review; and evaluation of tenured faculty unit employees who are not subject to a performance review for promotion." Terrell suggested that this means review for SSI would not fall into this category, and she added that we have consulted with University Counsel in drafting the SSI policy and will do so again in clarifying this issue.

Marian Bernstein commented that there is a dichotomy in terms of how lecturers are evaluated. Lecturers are only expected to teach and are only supposed to be evaluated on teaching.

Andres Consoli raised the following question: his understanding was that with SSIs pretty much everyone was eligible who was not at the top of their classification, but that with the current CBA more became ineligible. Turitz responded that the Step increases used to be automatic; there were four steps and now there are eight half steps. The concept is still the same in that you can move up those steps, but in order to do so you must fill out a FAR. **President**

Corrigan answered that there was not a single person who was ineligible under those terms in the last cycle. He added that the Board of Trustees is somewhat confused: they got hold of MSAs a few years ago but then found out that the MSA was really automatic; the Board and the new Chancellor came in and said that these are not supposed to be automatic, but with the new CBA, the SSI has a lower threshold than FMI, even if the Board is still seeing SSI as a kind of merit thing.

Vaughn suggested that with lecturers all that is expected is to have a FAR

on file. She raised a question about the 24 accumulated units: the practice has been 24 accumulated units, but the CBA states "in the same department." Gregory responded that this also says "or equivalent unit," which means if she teaches English in the English Department and also in the College of Business, all of those units count. Gregory also encouraged discussion with University Counsel about 31.38, which seems to indicate different framing for the SSI than for the FMI.

Sung Hu followed up on Consoli's question: in the olden days, there were five steps in each rank with no overlap; this has been restructured with overlap between ranks and more steps.

Dane Johnson addressed Bernstein's concern, suggesting there is no hindrance for lecturers given the language that SSIs are given "commensurate with rank and work assignment."

Carol Langbort raised a concern about faculty hired through grants, given the new ORSP rule that lecturers must be hired by the project and not the department. She was assured that all would count as university credit. This could affect the ability of lecturers to get an SSI. Hom replied that when lecturers are hired for a project, when the money runs out, the employment is terminated with no entitlement. In terms of the SSI, there better be built-in SSI money in to the project budget. Langbort followed up suggesting that the grant is the "equivalent unit"; this confusion could cause some serious problems.

Provost Thomas La Belle responded to various parts of the discussion: first, he suggested that it might be better to use different language than "department or equivalent unit." On lecturers, the immediate answer is to make sure work assignment is specified as best as one can. Addressing Langbort's question about the source of dollars, La Belle suggested that if the source does not contain sufficient dollars to pay the individual raises, there is a problem, but it is not a new issue. La Belle also commented that there has been some confusion on question of FMI and SSI procedures and processes in parallel; some people think that this will also include criteria.

Jeanne Wick raised a question about the combination of FMI and SSI monies for an individual's salaries. Turitz replied that the contract states that one might fall between steps and that a step increase is 2.5%. Terrell added that a person can receive the step increase for which they are eligible and on top of that receive a full FMI, and that FMI will not affect their subsequent eligibility for an SSI. Hom suggested no longer thinking of steps as a fixed amount but as a percentage. Terrell also remarked that it is my understanding that you

are eligible for 8 step increases regardless of what you receive in FMIs.

Consoli asked again about how the new contract has impacted the eligibility pool for SSIs. Corrigan answered that the pool has not been affected--the individuals who would have been eligible for a SSI are still eligible for a SSI--but there is a risk in that the SSI is no longer automatic.

Jerry Duke made a couple suggestions: we need to clarify the relationship between FMIs and moving up in steps; if we make a statement that we use the same procedure of determining how a department is going to award the SSI, this could be confusing; it would be better to say that the department can choose their method, leaving FMI out of the sentence.

Gregory first suggested extracting the major queries from the minutes today and putting them in a letter for Susan Meisenholder and Jackie McClain so that they have some of the flavor of what has arisen as they prepare for bargaining. Adding another tidbit on SSIs, evaluation, and part-time faculty, Gregory pointed to language in article 12.2 of the CBA: "Each new faculty unit employee shall also be provided no later than fourteen (14) days after the start of the quarter/semester with written notification of the evaluation criteria and procedures in effect at the time of his/her initial appointment." Absent that written information, recommendations about "satisfactory performance" might be detached from verifiable data.

Turitz commented further on steps, quoting from article 31.1: "Employees may be paid salaries at any step on the schedule for their rank/classification in Appendix C, and may also be paid salaries between the rates for each step."

Hom added that FAC tried to get away from the old impression of dollar amounts and steps. FMI awards might be a three or four step increase in the old language, but those are not step awards.

Caroline Harnly asked about timelines. Terrell responded that the SSI review is due the second Friday in March; we had hoped for a policy today, but we want a clean policy. Terrell also commented on La Belle's point that many departments are going beyond simply alerting their faculty to the process but are also suggesting criteria, so we need to be clear that for the SSI we are only talking about who does the review, not the criteria. La Belle asked if it might be conceivable that a department or unit specify what is "satisfactory" for the unit. Terrell replied that that is where Gregory's comment becomes pertinent.

The Senate was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dane Johnson

Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, February 8,
2000
