

**FACULTY STANDARDS & AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Minutes

MARCH 24, 2016

1:00-3:00 p.m., Sue Jameson Room

**Convened:** 1:03 p.m.

**Present:** Ed Beebout (chair), Paula Hammett, Armand Gilinsky (recorder), Elaine Newman, Viki Montera, Steve Winter

**Absent:** Melinda Barnard

**Agenda:** APPROVED

**Minutes of 02/18/16:** APPROVED

**Minutes of 03/3/16:** APPROVED, with minor changes.

**Standing Reports**

**Chair (Beebout):**

- Meeting dates for 2016-17 AY now set. If April 14 is a strike day, our next meeting will be on 4/28

**AVP (Barnard):** Absent, no report.

**PDS (Beebout):**

- Meetings with new faculty ongoing

**AFS (Winter):**

- Still no rep.

**FSSP (pending):**

**URTP (ad hoc):**

- URTP representative will join us on 4/28 to give a report.

**ASI (Vacant):**

**CFA (Newman):**

- We do expect to see the fact finder's report by March 29<sup>th</sup> (Tuesday), meets the framework that we had been anticipating.
- Students for Quality Education Forum March 29<sup>th</sup>.
- Jobs with Justice workers' rights board hearing on Thursday, April 7<sup>th</sup> @6pm at union hall in Rohnert Park.
- KPFA radio interview with Peter Phillips on April 8<sup>th</sup>: Elaine Newman, Jen Egan, Andy Merrifield
- Outreach and bake sale on April 12<sup>th</sup> (on campus)

#### **Information Items:**

1. WASC accreditation – information gathering, criteria for review, FSAC role (Richard Whitkus)
  - PowerPoint presentation regarding WSCUC (WASC Senior College and University Commission) Standards and Compliance. Multiple committees will contribute to the WASC compliance report.
  - FSAC requested to examine WSCUC standards and prioritize those on which it has worked and provide documented input.
  - For example: What (or how do we do it well) does FSAC review and approve policies (i.e. RTP policy; academic freedom; research, scholarship, and creative activity, etc.) in support of our educational mission?
  - FSAC also requested to examine compliance categories, e.g. credit hours and program length review, and provide input.
  - Vicky asked: What's the timeline?
  - Richard replied: by the end of this semester, maybe five sentences.
  - Armand noted that FSAC may only have two more meetings remaining this semester, so we will need to prioritize what input we can provide.
  - Vicki asked if FSAC should also provide input about the availability of realistic resources needed to be in compliance.
  - **Action items:**
    - **Ed to disseminate WSCUC document to committee.**
    - **FSAC to look at all the WSCUC standards and provide input (or solicit input from subcommittees) where appropriate.**

#### **Discussion Items:**

1. Digital RTP – postponed until AVP returns.

#### **Business Items:**

1. Biology RTP Revision Wrap-up (Daniel Crocker, Biology Department RTP chair)
  - Only change in policy is with respect to university service. Most Biology faculty are already exceeding minimum levels.
  - Intent of change — to delete “minimum of three years of committee service” — is to allow faculty with prior service credit to go up for promotion at any time. (One faculty member was denied early tenure because they had not met the minimum time of committee service, even though that person had done substantive committee work)
  - Elaine expressed concern about one aspect of the change: previously, service on **one** committee was required, which would now read “at least three” committees. Paula thought that it looked like you were raising the bar by requiring multi-committee service for someone who, coming in as a new faculty member, may not be sufficiently well-known by others to be elected to a committee. Doing so will increase, not reduce faculty workload. Why do you want to raise the bar, when it is already sufficiently high for candidates for tenure? Elaine added that, “your criteria really require excellence in all three categories.”
  - Vicki noticed a minimum requirement of four committees. Every committee needs members who have continuity and provide stability; but could someone serve on a committee for one year and then resign to serve on other committees just to meet the

three-committee criteria?

- Steve proposed a change in wording to replace “Serve on” with “Looking for service on...” rather than you MUST serve on three committees.
  - Daniel acknowledged these points and offered to bring them back to the Biology Department for discussion.
  - Elaine and Paula commented that it’s about the quality of the service, not necessarily the quantity. Steve’s proposed language would provide more flexibility into the policy, for both the candidate and the RTP committee.
  - Paula noted that the new policy meets university standards.
  - Ed moved to approve, Paula seconded. **Motion to approve change in Biology RTP policy passed, 5-1.**
2. University office hours and guidelines
- Viki provided feedback via submission of an alternate version of the guidelines. Underlying issue: Are faculty adequately available to advise students? Department chairs want something they can point to and hold faculty accountable.
  - For purposes of historical comparison, Ed distributed an AS resolution from 1978 regarding faculty presence on campus (requiring a minimum of three days).
  - Elaine - OK with both, likes the emphasis on advising in Viki’s version. Proposes EPC’s forthcoming Curriculum Guide (or eventually, a Faculty Handbook) as the appropriate place for guidance.
  - Viki suggested professional development workshops with Dept. Chairs to review and discuss any guidance. Numbers of days and hours are less important than Departments having a system for advising.
  - Committee discussed editorial changes to Viki’s version in order to place emphasis on faculty availability to do student advising.
  - Viki asked: is this going to be a stand-alone document or part of a more comprehensive policy document?
  - Title should read **“Faculty Availability for Student Advising and Office Hours.”**
  - Procedural next step: take to EPC for comment and to ExComm to decide if this document should be shared with the AS.

3. Guidelines for peer observations

- We don’t want this to be part of the URTP policy, but we want to help departments create better documents. What kinds of things are issues, what are the kinds of things that we want to address in these guidelines?
- Paula: Questions we should be asking or criteria we should be using?
- Steve: Is it up to FSAC to come up with some sort of minimal standard that departments should be using? Alternatively, should departments place peer evaluation criteria into their RTP policies?
- Paula: don’t think we can mandate peer evaluation criteria to be part of RTP policies. It could be recommendations or guidelines, which permit departments some degrees of freedom. I just want to tell the story about how well a faculty member is doing and give them some feedback on how it could be even better.
- All: *purpose of a peer observation is to provide developmental feedback to acknowledge a faculty member’s strengths as well as to help them to become more effective in the areas of student engagement and learning.*

- Ed: does anyone have access to a format?
- **Action item: consult with current URTPs chair, discuss during 4/28 meeting.**

Meeting adjourned at 2:47 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Armand Gilinsky.

Draft