FSAC Meeting Minutes
September 27, 2018

Attending: Camillo, Collinsworth, Lane, Premo, Roberts, Whitkus, Whitley
Absent: Newman

Agenda approved with one change: DR adds discussion of one item (editing of RTP policy to address move to OnBase electronic system).

Minutes from 9-13-18 approved with no changes.

Reports:

D.A. Roberts
- Three more TT positions have been posted. The current timeline is working well.
- OnBase trainings are likewise going well, although there is a glitch with how it conincides with RTP policy.
- Nov. 7, from 1-3: First of 2 celebrations this academic year; they are inclusive of service and retirement awards (including this fall's service awards and those who retired last year. Will send out messaging and include ERFSA. Already have an emcee. AC raises the idea of taping the event.

AFS (Collinsworth)
- Have had 2 meetings thus far
- Biggest issue: developing a flow chart to inform new faculty (and not-new faculty) about the process for filing an academic freedom complained.
- Also: looked at a donor letter that included a clause that might violate AF (has to do with funding for events that deny the Armenian genocide). Currently looking for more info.

FSSP (Whitkus)
- Committee looked at its charge and discussed whether it applied just to funded research or all research at SSU.
- New AVP for Research and Sponsored Programs is conducting a listening tour.
- Started very preliminary work on organizing the Faculty and Graduate Student Research Symposium. Currently scheduled for April 29, 2019, from 4-6:30. Student symposia (one for SST, one for everyone else) haven't been scheduled, but will be 4-6:30. Goal is to have them all the same week.
- McNair Program will be continuing under Daniel Malpica
- Koret is funded for one more year.
- Reviewed and updated dates for the coming year: awards and symposia, RFPs for internal grants/RSCAPs
- Question raised of how to reach out to less engaged schools

PDS (Premo/Lane)
- Review letter on teaching sensitive materials; explain background of work.
- DR suggests that we send to AFS first for review. Discussion ensues about the history of the effort between FSAC/AFS and possible AFS objections.
- Also: should not go through deans, but be sent directly to faculty.
- Questions about next steps for informal work such as this: Does FSAC need to formally approve, or just provide feedback. Because this was assigned by ExComm, it has to go back to ExComm before being sent.
- If no one has any problems with it, we should just make any changes and send it back.

OnBase and RTP (Roberts)
- OB is a repository for the WPAF (Working Personnel Action File) and a way for candidates to upload their materials. SETEs are already ingested into OnBase when the candidate process opens. The RTP committee can see everything and upload their own documents.
- The RTP policy is very procedural. This semester (the first that all candidates are using OB) there have been some errors around its language in terms of how things are being uploaded.
- DR suggests: Put off the discussion of whether SETEs are appropriate for some other time, and put the policy on Google Drive so all FSAC members can work with it, then review and agree regarding what portions to attack.
- Example: removing gendered pronouns or adding that new items in the CV should be highlighted. Also, for the self-assessment, define "professional activities" as RSCA.
- Likewise, SETE lingo is wrong: candidates don't need to go to Institutional Research; aggregates vs. SETE summary table vs. SETE summary. Need to define things.
- Concern expressed that candidates are going to DR with questions rather than to their committee members or mentors. Discussion of why that may be. DR confirms that her role is procedural as opposed to policy interpretation.
- More discussion about going up for tenure early when the requirements are criterion based: just doing things is not the end of the story.
- Checklist for RTP that was associated with Moodle has not been removed. Not shows a screenshot.
- Discussion: Who decided to go to OnBase? Did the faculty approve, should they? DR presents history: Her predecessor pioneered this application across the CSU.
- Suggestion: The policy is the purview of Academic Senate, and thus FSAC, but the functional is Faculty Affairs. Thus, work to get the procedural material out of the policy. PL moves that we pull out the procedures from the existing RTP policy.

Emeritus policy
- RP reports on what transpired at 9/13/18 Academic Senate session in regard to the list of people up for emeritus status.

- Noted that retreat rights are not faculty; faculty are faculty, deans are deans. There are no other emeritus positions at SSU, just faculty. Deans are not supposed to be teaching at all.
- DR reports on content of appointment letters and "Professor of" language.
- Need to define clearly who are faculty.
- Text RW added to the preamble (see edited version) is used systemwide.
- Questions raised about when people bring service from other institutions, and whether we could make a general emeritus status because current structure doesn't include academic SSP group, which is Unit 3.
- General remains a general, they're just listed as retired, so emeritus status should be similar.
- RP is to email DR about whether SSPs have gone up for emeritus status: Need to clarify what we're currently doing to see where to go forward.

Inclusion RTP policy
- Ideas on what to do with: incorporate into faculty trainings vs. going into the RTP policy
- Great to have people are of these issues and be able to incorporate them into teaching: Best to start with new faculty to change the environment. (Would long-term tenured faculty have evaluated on these issues as well?)
- Should not force the issue: change will happen organically, similar to how flipped classroom pedagogy became regular practice.
- Mixed reaction from the School of Education faculty.
- Can we use this document and policy to push practice: not a good enough argument.
- RTP has many inconsistencies: If a student feels that teaching is bad, that's a problem. The policy will not be an effective hammer anyway.
- We should state the things that we value: RTP probably doesn't reflect that. The University has other mechanisms, such as professional development.
- This may not necessarily be the role of the teacher in any case: other students, non-classroom, non-faculty areas beyond control of the faculty
- Example of how something like this might be difficult to write into a self-assessment, particularly in graduate programs where the larger issue is with recruitment. Requiring faculty to attend workshops might be better.
- Proposal doesn't work across the board for everyone: For some areas, demonstrating a commitment to URM is more a part of community service than pedagogy.
- Good for the university to have this as part of the strategic plan.
- Question of why it's needed comes down to the URM achievement gap and the Graduation Initiative. Are there other, more effective ways to go about dealing with this gap?
- Campus climate extends beyond the classroom. Need to have someone show why the current approach at SSU is not working and encouraged to demonstrate change in all we do.
- Could show SSU data with time to prepare, use that as the basis in which you figure out how to approach the issue on campus.

- Also, probably strongest way to address is in calls for new faculty: have candidates demonstrate commitment to equity in teaching and a more diverse faculty population.
- Suggestion: Come back to this issue next time and figure out next steps after brainstorming.