

Minutes: September 22th, 1998

SFSU Academic Senate Meeting

Minutes for September 22, 1998

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

Senate Members Present:

Bartscher, Patricia; Bernstein, Marian; Cancino, Herlinda; Chen, Yu-Charn;
Cherny, Robert; Consoli, Andres; Contreras, Rey; Craig, JoAnn; Cullers, Susan;
Duke, Jerry; Elia, John; Fehrman, Ken; Ferretti, Charlotte; Fielden, Ned; Flowers,
Will; Ganji, Vijay; Goldsmith, Helen; Graham, Michael; Graham, Minnie; Hammett,
Jennifer; Harnly, Caroline; Haro, Roberto; Hom, Marlon; Hu, Sung; Jenkins, Lee;
Jerris, Scott; Johnson, Dane; Kelley, James; Montenegro, Ricardo; O'ate,
Abdiel; Phillips, Mark; Raggio, Marcia; Scoble, Don; Shapiro, Jerald; Strong,
Rob; Terrell, Dawn; Turitz, Mitch; Valledares, Juan; Vega, Sandra; Vaughn, Pamela;
Verhey, Marilyn; Wade, Patricia; Warren, Mary Anne; Warren, Penelope; Wong,
Alfred; Zieff, Susan.

Senate Members Absent: Aaron, Eunice; Barnes, Paul(exc.); Blank,
Mark(exc.); Choo, Freddie(exc.); Collier, James(exc.); Corrigan, Robert(exc.);
Eisman, Gerald; La Belle, Thomas(exc.); Moss, Joanna; Nicholson, Joel; Shrivastava,
Vinay(exc.); Swanson, Deborah(exc.); Tarakji, Ghassan; Zoloth-Dorfman, Laurie.

Senate Interns Present: Marvin Dumon, Happy Dayleg.

Guests: D. Schafer, L. Berry, T. Sampson, T. Jones, G. West,

G. Whitaker, M. Kasdan, A. Barnes, J. Sagisi, G. Dalpe.

Announcements and Report

Chairs Report

- Chair Phillips announced that there will be a **New Senator Orientation** immediately following today's meeting and a reception for **Gary Hammerstrom** following the October 6 Academic Senate Meeting.
- **Jan Gregory (English)** has been elected **Statewide Senator**, joining Eunice Aaron (Black Studies) and Robert Cherny (History) as SFSU representatives to the CSU Academic Senate.
- There will be a joint meeting of the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the CFA Executive Committee on September 29, 1998, to discuss collective bargaining, update contract negotiations, and maintain a united faculty.
- Phillips introduced the two new Senate interns for Fall 1998 --**Happy Dayleg** and **Marvin Dumon**.

Agenda Item #1 - Approval of Agenda for Meeting of September 22, 1998

M/S/P (Warren, Duke) to amend the agenda to change Agenda Item #5 to #5a and add Agenda Item #5b, Resolution on Collective Bargaining.

The agenda was **approved as amended**.

Agenda Item #2 - Approval of Minutes for Meeting of September 8, 1998

As there were no additions or corrections, the minutes were **approved as printed**.

Agenda Item #3 - Report from Statewide Senators

Robert Cherny reported on the work of the Statewide Senate and our SFSU Statewide Senate representatives. He provided background on the Statewide Senate, which has 1-3 senators from each campus and deals at the state level with concerns like those in the SFSU Academic Senate, including curriculum and criteria and standards on faculty hiring and tenure.

Eunice Aaron is on the Fiscal and Governmental Affairs committee, which develops faculty recommendations on the budget and on legislation. There are two committees for which we have no representative from our campus - Teacher Education and Faculty Affairs. The newly elected SFSU Statewide Senator will probably serve on one of these. Cherny is on the Academic Affairs committee, which is responsible for admissions requirements, general education requirements, and curriculum in general. Each Senator is on other committees as well. Cherny sits on the following, among others: the Admissions Advisory committee, the Academic Advisory committee on the California Virtual University, and the Board of Trustees sub-committee on Honorary Degrees.

Cherny reported that the Statewide Senate passed two resolutions during their first meeting of the year on September 9-11. The first is a **resolution of support** for the report from the task force on library collections and restoration of funding for library collections. This resolution recommended that the \$10 million one time supplemental funds included in the CSU budget actually be used for that purpose. It also recommended that this money be added to future baselines for libraries. The **second resolution concerned the program** the CSU has contracted with the British Open University to develop a system for speeding up the credentialing process for teachers on emergency waivers. The resolution specified that the Academic Senate adhere to traditional principles of faculty control of curriculum and campus responsibility for recommending students for credentials.

The Statewide Senate heard from Chancellor Reed, Executive Chancellor Spence, and the team at work on a **new technology initiative** in the wake of CETI.

There is now a plan to use state funds to accomplish the purpose of renewing technology infrastructure of the university.

Reed reported to the Statewide Senate that negotiations are underway for a Compact II to guarantee a stable level of funding for CSU over the next couple of years.

The Chancellor made a commitment that CSU will produce 3,000 more teachers (from 12,000 to 15,000) by the end of the year 2000 and do a better job of it.

The Chancellor raised questions about the baccalaureate curriculum. Cherny suggested that it is likely we will see a strong push to reduce the total number of units from 124 to 120 for a BA.

Cherny reported on the push to find ways to make the higher education process in California more "seamless". This will involve having a general education curriculum that makes it very easy for students to move from any community college to any CSU campus and having lower division classes for majors that will meet requirements at more than one campus.

The Chancellor assured the Statewide Academic Senate that our Board of Trustees is not interested in the document on the Association of Governing Board's web site that is critical of faculty governance.

Agenda Item #4 - Report from the University Promotions Committee

1997-1998 University Promotions Committee Chair Lilly Berry presented an oral report on the deliberations of the promotions committee, highlighting items from the 1997-98 annual report. The UPC is a five member, university-wide, peer review committee that provides a level of review independent of the Vice-President of Academic Affairs with recommendations made directly to the President.

UPC processed 40 applications for promotion, recommending 10 of 11 for promotion to associate professor and 20 of 29 for promotion to full professor. The President promoted 8 of 11 candidates for associate professor and 20 for full professor.

The UPC met 2-4 hours in committee each week during the spring semester plus homework to review the candidates. The initial review was exchanged with the Vice President, followed by a meeting to discuss cases where there was disagreement.

A meeting then followed with the President and the Vice President in which the President took cases where disagreement remained and made the final decisions.

The UPC and the Vice President agreed on 29 of 40 cases initially and 34 of 40 after their meeting. The President followed 33 of the 34 cases where agreement had been reached. Of the 6 unresolved cases, he followed the UPC's recommendation on 3 and the Vice President's recommendation on 3.

Berry summarized the UPC's recommendations about the various bodies involved

in the promotions process. The **UPC recommended that the Senate address the** following items: 1) **normal eligibility** (the policy has language for normal eligibility that mentions MSA's, which we no longer have; UPC has considered normal eligibility as 4 years in rank and asks that the Senate take into account what has happened since the policy was passed); 2) **the terms "significance"** and "superior" (the policy says that it is the responsibility of the departments to define the terms "significance" and "superior," but not all departments have been able to do this. The Senate could provide some assistance in helping departments define what these terms mean for the discipline, addressing, for example, what average and minimally satisfactory performance have to do with significance); 3) **student evaluation of teaching effectiveness system** (there has been improvement in moving toward a more unified grading scale with more departments using the same instrument, at least in a single college. The Senate could address narrowing the variety of quantitative analysis); and 4) **confidentiality** (this report did not include detailed tables because this could violate confidentiality of process).

UPC recommended that people at all different levels of review make an effort to locate, study, and understand the policy and then apply it. It is in the faculty manual as an appendix.

UPC saw some improvement last year in the review letters, but there is still need for more improvement. Departments and Colleges need to understand the promotional profiles as described in the policy and make better attempts to use the evaluation terminology. Close attention needs to be paid to standards (these are higher for full professor than associate) and candidates should be evaluated against others within rank, not by length of time served. Review should be restricted to in-rank activities. Berry also stressed that the candidate must be actively involved in the promotions process.

Mitch Turitz asked about the original reasoning for 4 MSA's versus 4 years. Berry replied that it was a carryover from the earlier promotion policy. Turitz added that Patricia Bartscher told him that the MSA language is in the collective bargaining agreement and wondered if we can change the faculty manual if it's not in the CBA. **Gerald West** said that the practice of the university has been to consider it as 4 years.

Robert Cherny suggested that we owe a great debt to the UPC, which put in enormous amounts of time and makes sure that the faculty role in the process is maintained. Cherny commented on the summary of results, noting that of 95 faculty members who were automatically eligible, only 25 requested performance

review, which means 74% did not request promotion. He added that we know little about why they did not seek promotion, but it should be clear from this that anyone who says that promotion is automatic at SFSU is absolutely wrong, as that is a very large number of people not seeking promotion.

Cherny emphasized another point from the report - the importance of departments specifying the expectations of the discipline. He explained that one of most basic assumptions of faculty governance is that it is the specialized knowledge of the faculty that allows them to undertake the writing of curriculum and the determination of the qualifications of those teaching that curriculum. Departments are closest to the expectations of the discipline, and departments are best qualified to determine what the expectations of the discipline are for promotion; therefore, it is important that departments take that responsibility seriously and that administrators respect what departments have said.

Cherny asked about a couple of ambiguous sentences from the section of the report on recommendations for all levels of review: "personally disagreeing with the policy is not a good reason for failing to apply it" and "it is only right and fair to the candidates that all who are involved in the decisions commit themselves to the standards defined in the policy." He wondered if the committee was trying to say that someone who disagrees with the policy is not applying the policy but other standards. Berry replied that the committee felt that was true to some extent. Some candidates were being held to some standard that was not what was defined in the policy itself, which might be a way of discounting the policy. Berry stressed that what we really need to do is make sure that everyone involved in the review process be very clear what the policy requires of us, which does not give us leeway to make up our own standards.

Jim Kelley commented on the 70 who did not apply: it is a cumulative 70, and some have declined for twenty years, so it has to be compared to the 800 or so tenure-track faculty and not the 95. Berry added that one of the reasons that people don't ask for consideration is that some think they might not meet the standards. Another disturbing thing is that some people decline because of the amount of work to put the dossier together.

Jerry Duke commented that in the promotions process at the department level, it was not always clear what the responsibilities of candidates are with regard to the committee. Duke suggested that this be spelled out somewhere. West explained that departments have the option or responsibility of meeting with faculty who will be considered for RTP in the spring semester preceding the semester in which they will be evaluated, but faculty constantly call to

say no one has spoken to them. West added that it is the responsibility of the department to meet with that faculty member and inform them of the procedure, allowing them ample time to assemble materials for RTP. It is also the responsibility of the department to gather those pertinent materials to include in the working personnel action file. West concluded that most departments do a very good job; there are a handful of departments that do a very poor job, which must be addressed by the colleges. Berry added that the UPC conducts a series of meetings with colleges and also does its own informational meetings for the benefit of candidates, which were fairly well attended.

Phillips seconded Cherny's comment on the importance of UPC. He commented on the image that has been created that the volume of the file has some influence on the outcome in promotions. He stressed the important role of the committee in dialogues with the President and Vice President in terms of policy interpretation.

Phillips suggested two areas that could use further research: 1) faculty who could but do not apply for promotion; and 2) what takes place in the dialogues among the President, Vice President, and UPC. He added that knowing where the areas of tension exist between this interpretation of the policy and that interpretation tells us a lot about some of the issues in terms of the award system of campus.

He concluded that it speaks well to the process that there is ultimately 90% agreement.

Phillips also addressed the question of how much has to do with revisions needed in the policy and how much has to do with procedure. Too specific a policy can be rigid with harmful side effects; if too vague, it is very easy for people all along the line to have different interpretations. FAC is wrestling with the question of how much of the policy needs to be changed. Last time it took almost 4 years from opening up to rewriting the policy. Phillips added that our leaning has been to address clear problems without revising the whole policy.

Turitz raised a question about RTP committee membership where, according to the faculty manual, faculty being considered for promotion are ineligible to serve on tenure committees. He asked about changes for departments where HRT committee and promotion committee are separate such as the library. Phillips responded that an ad hoc committee is dealing with the library aspect and that the larger question will be referred back to FAC.

Agenda Item #5A - Report from California Faculty Association Chapter President **SFSU CFA Chapter President Margo Kasdan** introduced **Terry Jones, President** of the CFA. Terry Jones urged faculty to come together in the spirit of unity and work through this moment of impasse to bargain for a fair contract.

Tim Sampson, CFA Statewide Contract Campaign Chair, reported on the current bargaining situation. He provided historical background on Chancellor Reed's actions prior to impasse. Reed sought a 1% augmentation in compensation funds from the Governor without asking for CFA consultation. He then asked for CFA support but said that he would tell the governor that CFA accepted this money for the merit pay pool, which was not the case. Sampson added that Reed met with key legislators and said that he would find an extra 1% to make 6% total to settle contract, but Reed never made that proposal at the table. The chief management bargainer gave a take it or leave it offer of 5%, which has persisted to this day.

Sampson stated that management maintains the position that since there was no contract on July 1, they will not pay retroactively. The union will fight this.

Sampson addressed current non-financial issues of the bargaining. On workload, management wishes to remove even limited restraints and standards. Management continues to wish to remove department chairs from the unit and the bargaining agreement. On lecturers, CFA is seeking progress on step increases, multi-year contracts, and benefits for more lecturers, and management has not been willing to move on those issues. Sampson added that CFA maintains that counselors be treated as faculty. On family leave and domestic partner benefits, the university has been intransigent, but there has been some informal progress on a decent maternity and paternity leave. On the Faculty Early Retirement Program, the management wishes to cut it from 5 years to 2.

Sampson also explained the current merit pay situation. In extending the current contract, parties agreed that the current PSSI program was dead and would not be implemented, and that merit pay will have to be agreed upon in bargaining for this year; however, management's present proposal is that everyone would have to be considered with no constraint or appeal process and then the president would decide with double the money for these awards.

Sampson outlined the current proposals on salary. The CFA has a 6% package on the table, which is very reasonable given CSU's financial situation. This would amount to 3.9% across the board. The management offer is 2.5% for a general increase. The CFA is pushing for at least a 1 step increase for all eligible for SSI, a 2.4% step. The management offer is a little more than half a step. The balance of the money, after some addition to chair stipends and bringing counselors to parity, would go to merit pay with management insisting on 40% of the package to merit pay. This is the pattern that CSU is pressing on all

employees. The CFA proposal breaks new ground in linking merit pay to the RTP process with its protections of due process and with expectations that the president will ordinarily follow faculty in these decisions. The CFA proposal also has the feature of "shares" where all of those judged worthy of merit increase would be divided into the money available for merit increases, which would spread merit pay more fairly among more people. The Chancellor's counter is to spread it to more by increasing the money to merit pay, 40% versus the CFA's 22% of the total package, and management has not agreed to linkage with RTP.

Sampson concluded with some reminders on the impasse process. It is a statutory process, working with a mediator, and bargaining continues. Details cannot be disclosed unless specifically agreed upon. If mediation fails, the mediator certifies the impasse to fact-finding, where a recommendation is made, but the management can impose their last formal offer, which seems to be their current goal. Sampson asked the Senate to consider and pass the resolution, write the Chancellor, pass around petitions, and get involved with politics.

Agenda Item #5B - Resolution on Collective Bargaining

Dawn Terrell introduced this consent item from the Senate Executive Committee, which was developed in part in response to several Senates bringing forth similar resolutions. Phillips commented that there were four from CFA and the Executive Committee was involved in coming up with a resolution that was not personalized, not accusatory, but that could help in the process of representing us as a unified faculty. There is an impression in Long Beach that the low number of faculty in CFA reflects a significant schism in the faculty, and that image of a split faculty is part of what drives the power of the administration in the collective bargaining process. This resolution is introduced not as a CFA resolution but as an effort to represent a unified faculty on issues that we think are critically important.

Scott Jerris asked for clarification in the second resolve of the clause "including a guarantee of the maximum increase." **Margo Kasdan** replied that this refers back to the promise of 6%.

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

M/S/P (Cherny, Duke) to amend the resolution as follows:

Add a first whereas that reads as follows: "Whereas the quality of education available in the CSU rests in major part on the ability to attract and retain high quality faculty members and to maintain a positive sense of morale among the faculty" and change the third whereas clause to read as follows: "Whereas the existence of this salary gap has a negative impact on the hiring and retention

of a high quality faculty and on faculty morale more generally, therefore be it ". Strike the next four whereas clauses and go directly to the resolved clause: "Resolved that the San Francisco State University Academic Senate call on CSU management and CFA to 1) commit in writing to the faculty a plan to fully address the faculty salary gap over the next three years; 2) provide at least one full step (2.4%) for an SSI for all eligible faculty," striking the old #1 and #3 and striking the entire second resolved clause.

Cherny explained that he is trying to clarify with his amendments why we as an Academic Senate are involved in this. As our bargaining agent, it's up to CFA to determine what the faculty position is in bargaining. Our Senate role is protection of the curriculum and protection of the quality of faculty, and salary is related to that. However, to make clear why we as a Senate are involved in the collective bargaining process, we have to tie it to our role as a Senate, which the first amended whereas's are meant to accomplish. We leave the details to the CFA. It is appropriate for us as a Senate to endorse both sides that they get together and do something. Kasdan asked if adding to the first resolved that Senate calls on CSU management and CFA to commit in writing to a salary gap plan and to provide a step increase doesn't ask of CFA things that are not part of its role.

Sampson saluted Cherny's additions in the initial whereas's but spoke against taking out the details in the whereas clauses and against the position that the Senate does not have business entering this fray. He added that it must be made clear that faculty speaks in one voice on these matters, that we insist on 6%, and that we will not put up with putting it all in merit pay. The CFA needs the support of this and other Senates, and Cherny goes too far in his separation of roles.

Phillips urged a vote against the amendment, but suggested that someone reintroduce the amendment with regard to the whereas clauses. He added that there is an on-going dialogue about the Senate and CFA roles, but this is one of those cases where it is important to send a message of unity.

Penelope Warren concurred with Phillips and stressed the importance that this resolution make it clear that we understand the position that CFA is taking and our endorsing that because the initial motivation on this is to counter the notion that the faculty is somehow significantly divided on these issues. Warren added that she wanted this to be a resolution that comes down strongly that we are together on these issues, and she hoped that Cherny would reintroduce his amendments on the whereas's and that we would defeat this as

a whole.

M/S/P (Ferhman, M. A. Warren) to close debate.

The **amendment was defeated.**

M/S/P (P. Warren, Terrell) to amend the resolution with the additions suggested by Cherny in the whereas clauses.

M/S/P to close debate.

The **amendment passed.**

M/S/P (O'Leary, Craig) to amend the resolution as follows:

Change the first clause of the first resolved to read as follows: "Resolved that the Academic Senate of the SFSU endorses the CFA proposal and calls on management . . . [the rest as written]."

Marlon Hom asked how this affects the second resolved.

Patricia Bartscher commented that this kind of action by the SFSU Academic Senate, which includes students and administrators as members, puts us in a difficult situation.

Cherny agreed with Bartscher on this point. He added that Phillips and others have said that there is a widespread perception that the faculty is divided and we need to show unity. Cherny has heard the message wondering why the Senate and CFA always speak with the same voice, which suggests that the closer the Senate is to CFA, the more likely we are to be ignored. Cherny underscored different responsibilities for the Senate and the CFA roles. He endorsed faculty unity and support but questioned whether a Senate resolution was the best form. Phillips commented that the amendment is unnecessary and may divide us; he asked that we vote against the amendment.

M/S/P (P. Warren, Duke) to close debate on second amendment.

The **amendment was defeated.**

M/S/P (P. Warren, Vaughn) to close debate on the resolution.

The **resolution on collective bargaining passed without dissent.** (To view this resolution, click [here](#).)

Agenda Item #6 - Proposed Revisions to Academic Senate Policy #S93-184 - University Development Priorities Committee Statement of Responsibilities
Deferred to October 6, 1998, meeting.

Agenda Item #7 - Report from the Student Center Governing Board

Aimee Barnes, chair of the Cesar Chavez Student Center Governing Board, Jaymee Sagisi, Renovations chair for the Student Center, and Guy Dalpe updated the Senate on plans to renovate and expand the Cesar Chavez Student Center.

Barnes reported that the Board of Trustees approved the project and that it is moving forward even though bids came in over the estimate. She sought support, advice, and input about how to better communicate with students during the next 18 months of construction. She added that the contract will be signed in early November with construction beginning in early January. The building will be open, but it will not be open like it is now.

Sagisi emphasized the need for cooperation and added that the expansion committee is now addressing concerns that the campus will have during the next 18 months.

Guy Dalpe outlined the work that would be going on, which will definitely impact the campus: putting a new story on the building, and renovating interior areas for safety to meet ADA requirements and general earthquake upgrades. The staging will be primarily on the north side of the building with some done in Lot 4 between the Library and the Franciscan building with a new road to connect these areas. The goal is to have maximum access with the center open. Dalpe added that any suggestions would be appreciated.

The Senate was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dane Johnson

Secretary to the Faculty

Meeting Date (Archive): Tuesday, September 22,
1998
