

FSAC Minutes

9/17/08: Convened at 1:03 pm

Members: C. Ayala (recorder), M. Barnard, P. Hammett, R. Senghas, J. Sutanonpaiboon, S. Tiwari, B. Warner, H. Wautischer

Attendees: V. Garlin

Agenda approved with changes Scott Miller at 2 PM, added PPI; **Minutes** approved with minor change “conflict” to “to make worth” in 2d.

Reports:

1. Chair of FSAC – S. Tiwari

- a. FSSP chair provided an end of the year report (available electronically) and was shared with committee. No action taken.
- b. At EXCOM, the president reported that there is no budget and the Provost had no report. Students might bring a textbook resolution forward. No action taken.
- c. Scott mentioned that 51% of the faculty and 2/3 supported the constitutional amendment. No action taken.

2. Vice Provost Report

- a. The Vice Provost will be looking for direction to work with faculty problematic professional conduct that is not at the level of disciplinary action. Professional conduct and responsibility appears to be a counter point to academic freedom yet there are no mechanisms for peer to peer communication and discussion about conduct. HW stated that in the AF Policy there is a mention of the responsibility of faculty. VG stated that the CFA should get involved in these matters earlier because these conduct issues may lead to disciplinary action. Agenda Item proposed.
- b. In the presentations to school department chair meetings, numerical weighting of RTP areas still comes up specifically how the rating is applied or how rating is interpreted. URTP chair stated that the URTP committee does not hold strictly these 40, 30, 20, 10 guidelines. These weightings are an artifact of one department's criteria. While the weighting might be used for promotion since promotion generates a ranked list but no so for Tenure. Oftentimes, the ranking for sabbatical is often confused with this promotional ranking. Agenda Item proposed.

3. **Academic Freedom Subcommittee report:** Membership issues continue. One member has asked to resign because of scheduling conflicts. Another member will mostly likely be elected by the school of Social Science. The current committee has

only three voting members. Is this a quorum? The current pressing issue pertains to IT guidelines and requirements and its effect on academic freedom.

4. **Professional Development Subcommittee:** The new faculty orientations have been very successful by establishing discussions and maintaining a connection with new faculty (i.e., fieldtrips). The committee discussed the results of the new faculty survey which showed a positive view of Sonoma State.

Business:

1. **RTP Policy:** PH and MB continue to provide workshops with candidates, chairs and committees. They reported that concerns expressed in these meetings may be more about the whole peer review evaluation process rather than concerns about the new policy. However, two concerns about the policy may be the need for a RTP glossary and the other is about the development of the department criteria—departments are asking for examples. We do not have examples because we do not want stifle creativity in their development. Concerns about the influence of the dean in the process of creation of the criteria were expressed. The deans are not involved in the review of the criteria. No action taken.

2. **Response to president's memo:** We were charged with identifying the areas that FSAC should respond to in the memo. Workload issues may be relevant in our committee. This would implicate SSU plan (page 2 second paragraph bullets a-c) because these issues would have an influence on FSR. The Green music center business may impact because it may influence FSR. The strategic plan (p. 3 second bullet) questions about strategic planning and shared governance (pg 4) that the transparency of these matters. We discussed that since the fiscal decisions are the president's decision and these ultimately may be the point of contention and therefore we should respond to the whole document. The committee believes that the issue of IDC falls into the domain of this committee as well as the issues of development monies to help with faculty development. Action Taken: The committee has decided to respond to IDC, Development monies, Workload issues (Green music Center), and the Strategic Plan since it has an influence on what we teach and faculty development.

3. Scott Miller, chair of the faculty:

The Chair of the Faculty visited all the standing committees. He stated that he trusts the work of the committees and their products and will be a business-oriented chair—"I trust the process". He provided a copy of the WASC letter and we reviewed the key points of the WASC review letter. He referred to this as marching orders. He asked us to review these in more detail and think about how these marching orders influence our work.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 PM.

