

SDSU Senate Sponsored Faculty Forum on Professional Behavior in the Event of Job Action

The officers of our senate and the president and vice president of our CFA chapter invite all SDSU faculty to participate in a forum on professional decorum in the event of a faculty strike.

- Who: All faculty
- When: Friday, March 2, 1:00 — 3:00 p.m.
- Where: Hepner Hall 130
- What: Informational briefing and discussion

We find ourselves in a challenging situation that calls for the best from each of us if we are to accomplish the maximum benefit to the faculty with no “friendly fire” casualties among the faculty. Our Senate officers decided to sponsor a broadly based faculty conversation on the maintenance of professional collegiality in the event of faculty job action. The president and vice president of our SDSU chapter of CFA agreed to join in that activity. We all fervently hope that the situation will not deteriorate to the point where faculty strike is called for.

Our forum will be limited to presentations and discussion on the maintenance of professional collegiality and sustainable interpersonal relationships should there be a strike with the understanding that arguments pro and con job action *per se* will be out of order. All members of our panel have agreed to these ground rules. We respectfully request that all attendees do the same.

The session will open with brief comments by panel members followed by ample opportunity for questions, answers, and discussion. Members of our panel will do their best to provide up to the minute reports on

- status of fact finding at the time
- most probable CFA job action at SDSU
- likely CSU and SDSU administration treatment of job action participants

Panel members will be:

Edith Benkov	Prof. and Chair, European Studies Chair Senate Faculty Affairs Committee
Bill Eadie	Prof. of Communication Secretary of the Senate
Fred Hornbeck	Prof. of Psychology Chair of the Senate
Gene Lamke	Prof. of Recreation, Parks and Tourism, Past Senate Chair, VP SDSU CFA Chair Senate Comm. on Academic Resources & Planning
Cezar Ornatowski	Assoc. Prof. Rhetoric & Writing Studies Vice Chair of the Senate
Radmila Prislin	Prof. of Psychology Group conflict scholar
Mark Wheeler	Assoc. Prof. of Philosophy President SDSU Chapter of CFA

Questions and comments in advance of the event may be sent to the Senate at senate@mail.sdsu.edu. Please join us in this activity planned to assist all of us in the maintenance of professional collegiality and sustainable interpersonal relationships in the event of a faculty strike. Ample opportunity will be reserved during the forum for questions, answers, and discussion. Electronic response devices—“clickers”—will be available for voluntary, anonymous response to questions posed to participants. Brownies, coffee, and bottled water will be offered.

SDSU Faculty Forum on Professional Behavior in the Event of a Strike: Opening Comments

Fred Hornbeck, Senate Chair
March 2, 2007

We are in a challenging situation. It calls for the best from each of us if we are to accomplish the maximum benefit to the faculty with no “friendly fire” casualties among us.

CFA has been bargaining with the CSU for a new contract for nearly two years. It is extremely frustrating for all to have bargaining at impasse. A fact finder has been appointed who is examining the situation. She will make non-binding recommendations to the parties. Should a contract not emerge as a result of this process, the CSU will have the authority to unilaterally impose working terms and conditions on Unit 3 employees. However, in the absence of a ratified contract, Unit 3 employees will be permitted under HEERA — the California Higher Education Employer–Employee Relations Act — to undertake job actions. CFA has been gathering data and consulting with members to determine the path that it will pursue.

Our Senate acknowledges that it is neither its role nor responsibility to participate in collective bargaining. It is, however, its role to advocate for actions and policies that produce a quality educational environment at SDSU. In this light, our Senate unanimously passed a resolution noting that the current climate harms morale and threatens our ability to recruit and retain high quality students, faculty, staff and administrators. This resolution called particular attention to matters of faculty compensation, workload, and support for professional growth and development as critical contract issues. The Senate urged negotiators for the CSU and the CFA to use the fact-finding process to reach a reasonable solution that addresses the critical issues without resorting to the imposition of terms and conditions by the CSU nor job actions by CFA.

Let me emphasize that we are not here to argue the wisdom or efficacy of faculty job actions. That is in the domain of our bargaining agent. It is up to CFA to decide that matter. We are here to consider and discuss the nature of appropriate professional conduct in the event of a strike.

Some of us are concerned that thoughtless or careless behavior may severely harm relations within our faculties; that the effects could be quite harmful to the very fabric of our faculty culture. Our Senate officers agreed that it was appropriate for the Senate to sponsor a faculty conversation on the maintenance of professional collegiality in the event of a strike. The president and vice president of our SDSU chapter of CFA agreed. This forum would be limited to presentations and discussion on the maintenance of professional collegiality. It would be understood that arguments pro and con job action *per se* would be out of order. All members of our panel have agreed to these ground rules. We respectfully request that all present do the same.

Bear with me as I describe the dilemma as I see it and the question that I hope we will seek to answer. I shall then recognize members of our panel for their comments before opening the meeting for participation by all.

I joked to my wife that it would be helpful to have an eloquent, charismatic, nonsectarian Solomon true to the spirit of Samuel Gompers whose values embrace those of Christ, Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Cesar Chavez. Well..., we'll just have to go with what we have.

What we have on the one hand is the possibility of faculty job actions, **of a strike**. This tool in the hands of trade unions involves the application of considerable pressure on all members to actively participate and support the collective action of the majority. Those individuals who do not conform are subject to ridicule, criticism, and, occasionally, bodily harm. *Scabs* are scorned.

Reluctant individuals are subjected to extreme efforts to comply. *True believers* justify their means by their ends.

What we have on the other hand is a community of scholars, of professionals dedicated to the highest principles of free inquiry and open expression. Last semester, we adopted an academic freedom policy drafted by a Senate task force, adopted by the Senate, and approved by President Weber. That same task force has completed a policy on the freedom of expression that is now in the Senate. Any policy on freedom of expression must apply equally to everyone — particularly those with whom we disagree. Freedom of expression must be a core value of the academy.

Should there be a faculty strike, it is certain that many will participate in the concerted effort. It is equally certain that some will not. We must find the capacity to appreciate, accept, and honor the decision and behavior of each of our colleagues and to do so without prejudice. We should raise the salience within our faculty of the values of tolerance for others and of mutual respect.

And here is why: Professors are not cigar makers, shoe makers, steel workers, teamsters, longshoremen, farm workers, or auto workers. And, professors are not nurses, public school teachers, air traffic controllers, or airline pilots. They differ from these and other employees who engage in collective bargaining in one profoundly important way. Virtually all important faculty personnel decisions: appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, sabbatical leaves, and grants in aid are decided first and foremost by ones peers. Peer evaluations and recommendations must be based in every instance upon the academic case made by the applicant and judged by fair and impartial professional colleagues. We must not permit differences over bargaining tactics to taint or bias this process. We cannot have those who will determine others' professional fates licensed to threaten, harass, or intimidate any one of our colleagues. It will destroy our very system of peer review itself should differences in beliefs, opinions, and actions in the collective bargaining arena intrude into the academic peer review process. No member of our faculty should be placed in a situation where her or his course of action is controlled by fear of retribution by peers.

How can we immunize ourselves from the development of hostile or negative attitudes toward those who choose a course different from our own? How can we assure ourselves that the civility and collegiality that are essential to the practice of our profession will be protected — particularly without diminishing in a material way the message that a strike is meant to convey to our Board of Trustees and Chancellor? I see this as an incredibly challenging question and ask that we now work together to arrive at some consensus with regard to behavioral norms in the event of a faculty strike. One cannot legislate civility and collegiality any more than one can legislate morality. We are incapable of controlling the attitudes that we and others form toward one another. We can, perhaps, agree on common goals and provide some well considered guidelines for appropriate conduct. Let us proceed to do our best to establish guidelines that preserve the overarching values of self determination and peer review for our faculty...for ourselves.

~~DEFINITION OF A~~ COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING COURSES

**POLICY
APC 245-02**

Effective Date: 10/13/2004

Revised: 00/00/00

Definition

This policy defines a Community Service Learning ([CSL](#)) course, provides a procedure for recognizing existing courses, and provides a recommendation for the use of companion CSL courses

Authority

[President of CSU San Marcos.](#)

Scope

The curriculum of CSU San Marcos.

DEFINITION OF A COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING COURSE**POLICY
APC 245-02**

Effective Date: 10/13/2004

Revised: 00/00/00

I. POLICY DEFINITION

Community Service Learning (CSLLS) is a structured learning experience within an academic course. The service work is directed toward the achievement of course learning objectives and also toward making meaningful contributions to the areas of need identified by the community being served.

The service activity is used to clarify, illustrate, challenge, or stimulate additional thought about the topics covered in the classroom. Structured ~~W~~ritten and/or oral reflection ties the service experiences to the academic content of the course and also provides students with the opportunity to develop or strengthen their awareness of the relationship between the course material and societal needs, a service ethic, and their role as citizens.

The community service could take on a variety of forms. Examples include the following:

- Direct service to people in need
- Policy analysis
- Community outreach and education
- Program assessment and improvement of community resources;
- Organization for action on social, health, safety, or environmental issues;

The service activity should correspond with and must be appropriate to the student's level of academic preparation. Activities must take place only at sites approved by the instructor and under contract with the University in accordance with University risk management procedures. An "Informed Consent Waiver" must be completed when a non-CSUSM-approved site is selected, and should only be considered by the instructor under extraordinary and compelling circumstances.

A Community Service Learning course includes:

- Explicit learning objectives and explanation in the syllabus of the role of the service experience in attaining those objectives;
- Preparation in class for the service activity to increase the student's understanding of the community context that the student will be entering, needs and issues they may encounter, standards of conduct expected of them, etc.;
- Ongoing, structured, critical reflection with regular instructor feedback that ties the community experience with the academic course content, thus enhancing both; and
- Evaluation that is based on the quality of the student's learning; not just the completion of certain hours of service; and a grading weight that is proportionate to the community service learning component of the course.

The time allotted to the community service learning portion of the course includes the preparation and analysis time and the time for written and oral reflection as well as the actual time spent in the community. While, typically, the largest portion of time in community

~~DEFINITION OF A COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING COURSES~~POLICY
APC 245-02

Effective Date: 10/13/2004

Revised: 00/00/00

service learning would be in the service activity, time allotted for ongoing critical reflection should be substantial as well.

The criterion used to determine whether the community service learning makes enough of a contribution to the achievement of course objective for the course to qualify for designation as a Community Service Learning course is that at least 15% of the students' grades [ds1] will be based on the community service learning portion of the course. It is suggested that the service consist of at least 20 hours of direct, academically-relevant community service.

~~II. Procedure: Recognition of Existing Courses~~ PROCEDURES RECOGNITION OF EXISTING COURSES

If all sections of an existing course will meet the definition given above, then the department chair (or program director, or associate dean) should submit a brief memo to that effect to the Catalog and Curriculum Coordinator in the Office of Academic Programs so that the courses can be so coded at the course level.

If some sections, but not all sections, of a course will meet the definition, then the department chair (or program director, or associate dean) should identify the community service learning section(s) to the Academic Scheduler and Space Coordinator in the Office of Academic Programs when the class schedule is under construction.

~~III. Recommendation: Creating Companions to Existing Courses~~ CREATING COMPANIONS TO EXISTING COURSES

~~There are situations where it may be desirable to create a cCommunity sService lLearning course that would operate in tandem with, and supplement another course (referred to here as the "primary" course) which may or may not itself be a cCommunity sService lLearning course. This recommendation suggests how such a companion CSL course might be used to reinforce the academic material and learning objectives in the primary established course. If the primary course did not already have a community service learning component, then the companion CSL course would offer the additional learning strategy of community service learning, and if the primary course did already include community service learning, then the companion course would provide an opportunity to increase the quantity of the community service learning.~~

~~The proposal for a CSL companion course should specify that the primary course is a co-requisite. When both the primary and companion courses are offered, students registering for the primary course would have the option of also registering for the CSL companion course, in which they would participate in community service learning (or in additional community service learning) and the reflection activity associated with the service experience or the additional~~

DEFINITION OF A COMMUNITY SERVICE LEARNING COURSE**POLICY
APC 245-02**

Effective Date: 10/13/2004

Revised: 00/00/00

service experience. For instance, there could be a primary course called XYZ 350 carrying 3 units of credit, and a cCommunity sService lLearning companion course called XYZ 350C, carrying an additional unit of credit; students could register for either XYZ 350 alone, or the pair: XYZ 350 and XYZ 350C.

Like other service learning courses, the companion CSL course syllabus would explicitly integrate the role of the service activity in attaining the overall primary course objectives. The course would include preparation for entry into the service; ongoing structured critical reflection with instructor feedback to tie the service experience to the academic course content; and evaluation that is based on the quality of the student's learning and not just the completion of certain hours of service. In the case where there was no community service learning in the primary course, the CSL companion course might include in-class time as well as in the community time, in order to include the necessary preparation and reflection. If, however, the established, primary course is also a community service learning course with in-class reflection, it is possible that the companion course might consist primarily of additional service hours with which to deepen the student's experience. It would be important, however, to ensure sufficient student reflection and feedback and enough contact to support the students with their increased community involvement. A one-unit CSL companion course should include 45 hours of direct, academically relevant community service.