

Faculty Standards and Affairs Committee  
Minutes  
August 31, 2017

**Members in Attendance:** Emiliano Ayala, Maureen Buckley, Sandra Feldman, Armand Gilinsky, Elaine Newman, Rita Premo, Steven Winter  
**Absent:** Deborah Roberts

**Meeting Recorder:** Maureen Buckley

Agenda adoption with added business item time permitting (NCA Violations by Coaches Info to Personal Action File).

- I. Standing Reports
  - a. Chair (Gilinsky)
    - i. The Chair will have regular meetings with AVP Robert
    - ii. Ex Comm's first meeting last Thursday included discussion about digitizing some things that are currently paper form (e.g. graduation forms). There is a plan to make this transition. There is a task force to review the new format of Commencement from Spring 2017. There is a grievance grade appeal policy that will be worked on by SAC for Extended Education. Period evaluation of Unit 3 coaches was also discussed. The GE program review and WASC visit are in process this semester.
  - b. AVP (Roberts):
    - i. not present; no report
  - c. AFS
    - i. Rita Premo will continue to serve as representative
    - ii. No report
  - d. FFSP:
    - i. Steven Winter volunteered to serve as representative
  - e. PDS:
    - i. Rita Premo volunteered to serve as representative
  - f. URTP:
    - i. Armand Gilinsky will continue to serve as representative
    - ii. No report as no meetings have occurred
    - iii. URTP will no longer be ranking those up for promotion
  - g. ASI (Briseno):
    - i. AS is working to outreach to students; 100 clubs in 50 days
    - ii. First meeting has been held
  - h. CFA (Newman)
    - i. Two new executive orders (1100 and 1110)
      - 1. They should be fully implemented by Fall 2018
      - 2. We appear to be well ahead on changes to remediation

- 3. We have a ways to go on changes for GE (48 units max/min; area E is possibly in jeopardy) and changes where 9 upper division units are housed
    - 4. These have workload issues and job impact; CFA is collecting data
  - ii. There is a newly bargained agreement for range elevation for lecturers; CFA will do outreach and Chairs should be aware and involved as department policies may need to be revised
  - iii. SSI increases are coming and will impact many faculty; there is a tool on the CFA website that can help you decide if you are eligible. Faculty are advised to double check these calculations
  - iv. There will be a workshop on evaluating teaching effectiveness
  - v. We are in the middle of bargaining for new contract; we are in the last year of the current contract
- II. Business Items (from AY 16-17)
- a. We have a number of policies to review. We discussed the formal notification process (or lack thereof) for approval of policies
  - b. Dept of Geography, Environment Planning RTP Policy
  - c. Dept of Philosophy RTP Policy: this has been reviewed and feedback given; they accepted all elements of feedback.
  - d. Dept of Counseling RTP Policy
  - e. Periodic evaluation of unit 3 coaches
    - i. This has been reviewed by ExComm and Chair of Faculty
    - ii. Steven stated COF expressed that coaches would fall under Review of Temporary Faculty and the subsequent write up was the equivalent of a departmental RTP policy; Elaine recalled a different process being proposed. The disagreement was related to whether or not it needed to go through the full Senate vetting process.
    - iii. This is a policy developed with 4 out of 12 Head Coaches, Steven Winter, Deborah Roberts, and input from CFA. It was then vetted by entire coaching faculty, Head and Assistant
    - iv. This is a policy by which they will be evaluated
    - v. A key issue is the 4 tiered evaluation process; None of our head coaches are hired officially as such. But all those acting in this capacity will be evaluated by the 4 tiered system. There is a custom student evaluation instrument to replace the use of SETEs. (Emiliano asked if this will supplement or replace SETEs. This has not yet been worked out. SETEs are not mentioned in the new policy). There is also a self-observation and peer evaluation. Assistant coach does only 3 tiers. Head coaches have a final committee level review.
    - vi. Currently, coaches are not systematically evaluated; they have one year contracts; a customized evaluation system makes more sense
    - vii. This will impact the content of POAs moving forward

- viii. This will add workload since this process was not previously in place. For example, Head Coaches now have to do yearly evaluation of all Assistant Coaches.
- ix. Elaine provided several comments.
  1. The contract does allow for multi-year contracts for coaches. Other CSUs have language about achieving/maintaining multiyear contracts. She would like the language included in this iteration but Steven mentioned there was not a consensus on this, but that it might perhaps come into the next version. Elaine recommended included existing model language from existing CSUs
  2. There is an issue about reclassifying coaches. Elaine thought that the spot entitled "Purposes" would be a good place to include related language about reappointment and reclassification. Steven supported this step.
  3. Section 2 under appointment: the difference between coach and coaching specialist is foggy. The CSU has definite classifications and our titles should reflect these.
  4. Elaine also questioned why assistant coaches do not have level 4 review. Steven said this was related to workload.
  5. Definitions should be in alphabetical order. Steven agreed.
  6. The change in student evaluation – does it reflect this issues previously raised by coaches? Steven said it does.
  7. The FAR is never defined although it is mentioned in definitions. Steven agreed.
- x. Sandra provided several comments related to clarifying definitions that seemed clear in the coaching profession based on Steven's explanation. She also discussed some terms on the student evaluation (e.g. "proficiency" vs. "skills"; accountability; personal success)
- xi. Emiliano agreed that the language could be nuanced and favored the use of "skill". Elaine raised the issue of validity and inherent biases in SETEs. Also, are students answering the question we think we are asking. The possibility of a piloting of the evaluative measure was discussed.
- xii. This will come back to the committee for further review.

### III. Counseling RTP Policy

- a. Take out any language for 2 year reappointments.
- b. Sandra made a motion to waive the first reading; Emiliano seconded
- c. No option to moving to second reading
- d. Emiliano made a motion to approve the changes including striking the language related to 2 year appointment. Maureen seconded.
- e. Change "5 principles" to "five"
- f. Unanimous passing of changes approved
- g. Chair Adam Zagelbaum will be notified
- h. Faculty affairs website will need the amended version (via Armand)

### IV. Philosophy RTP Policy

- a. Steven reviewed their response to feedback
- b. Elaine commended the growth language in Section 1.1
- c. Steven motioned to waive first reading and Rite seconded; all moved to proceed to second reading
- d. The policy was unanimously approved
- e. Chair John Sullens will be notified

V. GEP RTP Policy

- a. Elaine expressed a belief that the scholarship requirements are much clearer but still has issues with teaching effectiveness (on mathematical grounds)
- b. There was a general debate about the role of SETEs in the RTP process
- c. Emiliano suggested some general language to include, nonbinding, that highlights a more nuanced approach to SETEs.
- d. Steven motioned to waive first reading and moving to second reading. Emiliano seconded. All approved.
- e. Steven suggested removal of sentences two and three under Teaching expectations and replace with language crafted for philosophy. Steven motioned to accept the proposal with the suggestion above to remove and replace. Emiliano motioned to second it. Unanimously approved as is with suggested rewording option.