

Faculty Standards & Affairs

4-14-16 minutes

Attending: Ed Beebout (Chair), Armand Gilinsky, Viki Montera, Steve Winter, Melinda Barnard. Elaine Newman, Paula Hammett (recorder)

Guests: Laurel Holmstrom, Richard Whitkus, Merith Weisman

Agenda approved

Minutes approved

Chair report - none

AVP report - Barnard

- Contract: Exceptional Service to Students Award extended an additional year; many campuses not able to give away all money, as many faculty don't bother to apply. Taskforce will need to convene again to send out call for nomination. Promotion is on top of other raises. Working out the details on implementation; some confusion due to paycheck dates, summer contracts, etc. Pay raises don't count for those retiring this year, as rate is based on prior year. Need clarifications on when dates are effective.
- Digital RTP implementation - can we open it up now for opt-in for all? Discuss next meeting.
- Digital PAF is in second phase. Deans can now access the files from their offices
- Barnard received \$6k CSU mini-grant for a workshop for five campuses to show our implementation. Not sure the timing will work out before she retires.
- Searches all done except one. One failed search in accounting, due to salary issues. No international hires this time around. Will bring data on those hires before end of semester.
- Question about how/if contract implementation will impact the number of new hires next year. Much is still up in the air: new president's priorities, "tax" portion of salaries taken from campuses, fewer faculty retiring. All factors in determining number of faculty hired. Will look at compression at time of promotion; provost/president will decide priority between compression and new hires; number of hires will most likely go down.

Discussion Items:

1. Excellence in Teaching Award. Holmstrom brought several issues to discuss:
 - Are FERPs eligible for award? Can't receive more than 1/2 of their salary so they are not eligible.
 - Can faculty be nominated again once they have won the award? No – add "previous recipients are not eligible" to the criteria.
 - Concern about equity across schools but no evidence of inequity. Should we split award between schools? If new donor comes in, or new president may decide on different criteria. No guarantee of funds for next year. Some schools have their own teaching awards. Criteria is on website.
 - Teaching award committee is comprised of two previous recipients and a student; process not shared with Laurel.

- Lots of discussion ensued: fosters competition rather than recognizing collaboration; used to be CSU-wide award, but SSU refused to participate; donors have moved on; last 2 years money came from Presidents Office. What's credibility of award? Recognition, is it important in this form? Egalitarianism or exceptionalism? How do we satisfy both?
- Laurel will update criteria.

2. University Internship Policy creation--Whitkus, Weisman

- We do not have a policy, but Chancellor's Office requires we have one in place in order to get insurance.
- May 5, workshop to provide feedback about the process and policy - not yes or no, getting feedback
- There is an online system on which companies register, answer a set of questions (children, toxics, etc.) if yes to any of them, triggers response to Merith to do a site visit. Most of the time no site visit required. Requires contract for every site and insurance. Contract spells out liability if someone gets hurt. Student teaching, nursing, social work not included, as they have their own existing contracts.
- in long run, all places with student contact will require contracts. Check to see if other CSU has a contract, we can piggyback on to their contract. We are last campus to implement, but site visits have not been a problem for other campuses.
- draft policy draws on best practices from other CSU, and pulled from other policies for contract courses and service learning
- Question re any workload implications? Departments have a say in how their departments implement process.
- It's a University policy not academic-only, so no Senate approval required
- Copies of proposed policy were accidentally omitted from the packet, so FSAC wants more time to review and discuss.
- no change to current internship structure, just formalizing to make us "street-legal"
- need consistent program-specific approach.
- have to create policy before process
- protect your students by requiring organization to fill out forms and register in order to get coverage
- process will include language to include in syllabi
- doesn't have to all be done by fall, iterative process, 1-2 year implementation
- discussion ensued
- what's difference between class assignments vs. internships
- no reassignment time
- want charts on who does what
- make sure there's nothing in the policy that doesn't need to be.
- add in-class off-campus projects to chart
- Merith commits to make necessary site visits in Sonoma County
- problems at other campuses:
 - large organizations, e.g., American Cancer Society, where the local site doesn't have authority to make contracts
 - small organizations run out of an individual's home, or work in private homes
 - driving as part of the internship work
- questions about reimbursement for site visits

- Merith and Richard happy to come visit department to answer questions about bringing our practices into compliance.

Business Items:

1. Biology Department RTP criteria: based on FSAC's feedback they took out section requiring service on three different committees. Thanked FSAC for careful reading and for pointing out possible concerns. Revision approved
2. Office hours discussion at ExCom: they don't want guidelines, and would rather have a policy. Specific concerns:
 - a. Want to see a minimum of 3 hours per week
 - b. Want specific reference to online vs on-campus as it pertains to office hours
 - c. First sentence - why "critical professional responsibility"

ExCom gives us feedback, not policy-making body; we should craft what we think before taking it to Senate, which is free to amend if necessary. After some wordsmithing in the meeting and over email, another draft was ready to take back to ExCom:

Policy Regarding Faculty Availability for Student Advising and Office Hours

Advising and working with students outside of class time is a professional responsibility of all faculty, as outlined in **CBA Article 20.1b**. There are numerous ways to meet this responsibility. Regularly scheduled office hours are a primary means for faculty to work with students outside of the classroom. However, depending on the course structure or delivery (for example, classroom vs. online instruction) other methods might be equally appropriate. Options include electronic or online communication, such as telephone or email or web conferencing. Full-time faculty shall make themselves available for one-on-one consultation with students on a weekly basis, for a number of hours that is proportionate to teaching load. Faculty members are expected to post office hours and/or instructor availability with contact information clearly stated on course syllabi. This information shall also be available in each department and on the department website. Every department is strongly encouraged to develop an advising system that best meets the needs of its students, curriculum, and faculty.

Meeting adjourned 3:00pm